

MASTER OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES,
LEIDEN 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: Q0613.LEI

© 2017 QANU

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

CONTENTS

REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME POLITICAL SCIENCE OF LEIDEN 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	7
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	9
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED PROGRAMME ASSESSMENTS.....	13
APPENDICES	23
APPENDIX 1: CURRICULA VITAE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	25
APPENDIX 2: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE	27
APPENDIX 3: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES	29
APPENDIX 4: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM	31
APPENDIX 5: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT	35
APPENDIX 6: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL	37

This report was finalized on 25 September 2017.



REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME POLITICAL SCIENCE OF LEIDEN UNIVERSITY

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

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

Master's programme Political Science

Name of the programme:	Political Science
CROHO number:	60203
Level of the programme:	Master
Orientation of the programme:	academic (WO)
Number of credits:	60 EC
Specializations or tracks:	Political Science, International Organisations.
Location(s):	Leiden
Mode(s) of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	English
Expiration of accreditation:	3 July 2018

The visit of the assessment panel Political Science to the Faculty of Social Sciences of Leiden University took place on 15-16 May 2017.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

Name of the institution:	Leiden University
Status of the institution:	Funded
Result institutional quality assurance assessment:	Positive

COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The NVAO approved the composition of the Political Science panel. The panel that assessed the master's programme Political Science consisted of:

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

The panel was supported by Dr Alexandra Paffen, who acted as secretary.

Appendix 1 contains the curricula vitae of the panel members.



WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

Preparation

The project manager and secretary of QANU met with staff members of the master's programme Political Science on February 6th for a preparatory meeting. QANU received the critical reflection of the master's programme Political Science on April 4th and made it available on a secure online website. The panel members read the critical reflection and prepared questions, comments and remarks prior to the site visit. The secretary collected these questions in a document and arranged them according to panel conversation and subject.

In addition, all panel members read recent theses from the master's programme. In consultation with the chair of the panel, fifteen theses were selected, covering the full range of marks given. Theses were selected from all specialisations and from the academic years 2014-2015 and 2015-2016. The panel members also received the grades and the assessment forms filled out by the examiners and supervisors. An overview of all documents and theses reviewed by the panel is included in Appendix 6.

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

Site visit

The site visit took place on 15 and 16 May 2017 at Leiden University. In a preparatory meeting the panel members discussed their findings based on the critical reflection. Furthermore, the panel discussed its findings with regard to the theses and the questions and issues to be raised in the interviews with representatives of the programme and other stakeholders.

During the site visit, the panel studied documents provided by the Institute's secretary of the board. These documents included course descriptions, course materials, written exams, assignments and other assessments.

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

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

Report

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

Decision rules

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



Generic quality

The quality that can reasonably be expected in an international perspective from a higher education master's programme.

Unsatisfactory

The programme does not meet the current generic quality standards and shows serious shortcomings in several areas.

Satisfactory

The programme meets the current generic quality standards and shows an acceptable level across its entire spectrum.

Good

The programme systematically surpasses the current generic quality standard.

Excellent

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

SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

Standard 1. Intended learning outcomes

The master's programme Political Science of Leiden University (UL) aims to deepen and extend the knowledge and understanding as well as the methodological skills in Political Science that students acquired in their bachelor's programme. It wants to provide students with analytical and academic skills to understand political and societal conflict and decision-making processes and prepare them for a broad range of professional careers. Compared to the qualifications for the bachelor's level, the master's programme aims to teach students to think and work more independently and perform more autonomous research and prepare them for both academic and professional careers. The intended learning outcomes are appropriate for an academic master's programme Political Science, and they reflect the requirements of the domain-specific reference framework and the Dublin descriptors at the master's level. The goals of the master's programme seem ambitious with their strong emphasis on teaching autonomous learning and preparing students for both academic and professional careers. The focus on professional skills and job orientation is one of the assets of the programme. The panel recommends specifying the intended learning outcomes more closely to emphasise its profile and unique characteristics. The planned programme change in September 2017 seems to be an excellent opportunity for doing so.

Standard 2. Teaching-learning environment

This one-year master's programme consists of two tracks: 'Political Science' (PS) and 'International Organisation' (IO). The two specializations share the same general learning objectives and a common core course, 'Conflict and Cooperation', as well as a joint skills course. In addition to the two mandatory courses, there is a choice of elective seminars, allowing students to create their own profile and focus of study. To complete their master's programme, students may opt for a thesis seminar or an internship. Although the panel was positive about the quality of the individual courses of the master's programme, it felt there was a lack of coherence and a clear cumulative structure. Most of the students also considered the present programme to be too general and appreciated the planned change to six specializations. The panel hopes that the new offerings will indeed strengthen the profile of the programme, but it had to focus on the current curriculum design for this assessment.

The quality of the staff members is good: the master students and alumni spoke with enthusiasm about the expertise and teaching abilities of the instructors as well as their motivation, dedication and accessibility. Because of enrolment and staffing issues, the students of the academic year 2015-2016 were confronted with an increased group size, the cancelling of seminars as well as a reduction of thesis theme seminars. This did not meet their previously held expectations of a programme that prides itself on flexibility and choice. The panel thinks that in the future other solutions to similar problems should be offered, as the implemented solutions compromised a coherent and effective teaching-learning environment. The management seems to have missed what lived amongst the students and needs to reconnect with their students, for example by paying more attention to the place the education committee currently holds in the programme.

In addition, the quality of the programme is also affected by the significant differences in the academic level of the students. Students are left to struggle with their academic (methodological) skills and/or their language skills. As a result, the quality of the programme is at risk: the teaching-learning environment seems unable to help these students in meeting the intended learning outcomes. The panel advises the management and staff to think about another admission strategy to ensure that students are able to meet the intended learning outcomes without burdening the current staff members or negatively affecting the teaching-learning environment. Even though the panel is hopeful for the new academic year with the upcoming programme and curriculum design change, the current situation is unsatisfactory and needs to be addressed with serious consideration by the management.



Standard 3. Assessment

All courses and assessments are described in the E-guide. In the master's programme, there is a variety of assessment strategies that are in line with assessment at the master's level and reflect the final qualifications. However, it is not clear to the panel what the weighting is of the different assessments for each seminar/course. More importantly, the learning objectives for each course are not clearly outlined, and there is no visible connection between the learning objectives of a course and the intended learning outcomes of the programme. Although the programme has clearly improved its system of assessment (e.g. by adapting its thesis evaluation forms, assigning an external member as well as a permanent secretary to the board of examiners), it recommends that the programme implements an assessment plan to develop its assessment policy further. Thesis instructors should be advised to fill out the newly improved thesis evaluation forms in more detail so their judgments (and grades) are more transparent for the students. Students were positive about the informal feedback received, but a more formalized feedback procedure may result in a more consistent overview of assessment strategies within the department and thus strengthen the current practices. In view of the improvements in the assessment system in recent years, the panel trusts the management team to successfully adopt these recommendations.

Standard 4. Achieved learning outcomes

Generally speaking, the theses were of the appropriate master's level and met the intended learning outcomes. This was demonstrated, for example, by appropriate surveys of the relevant literature, hypotheses that logically followed from the theory, solid empirical research and, in some cases, independently coded data. Graduates from the programme have entered a variety of professional careers. The master theses and the alumni feedback prove that graduates achieve the intended learning outcomes.

The programme management and its staff have recognized the need for change: the lack of a clear profile and specialization options are the main reasons for the planned changes within the programme. As of September 2017, Leiden University will offer six Political Science specializations which will hopefully also result in more coherence in the curriculum design. The upcoming programme overhaul will thus have a major impact on the existing teaching-learning environment. As the current individual courses are in general of the appropriate level and as the teaching staff is dedicated to their research and students, the panel trusts the programme to implement the necessary changes and address the observed areas of concern in the current curriculum design and interaction with students. It therefore feels that the concerns raised about the current teaching-learning environment need to be taken seriously by the management, but that these concerns do not have to reflect on its overall assessment of the quality of the programme as a whole.

Based on the decision rules as formulated by the NVAO, the panel assessed the master's programme Political Science in Leiden as 'satisfactory'.

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

Master's programme Political Science

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

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

Date: 25 September 2017



Prof. dr. Marijke Breuning



dr. Alexandra Paffen

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

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

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

Explanation:

As for level and orientation (bachelor's or master's; professional or academic), the intended learning outcomes fit into the Dutch qualifications framework. In addition, they tie in with the international perspective of the requirements currently set by the professional field and the discipline with regard to the contents of the programme. Insofar as is applicable, the intended learning outcomes are in accordance with relevant legislation and regulations.

Findings

Profile

The master's programme Political Science of Leiden University (UL) aims to deepen the knowledge and understanding of political science theory as well as the methodological skills that students acquired in their bachelor's programme. It aims to teach students to think and work independently and to perform autonomous research. It welcomes students with a bachelor's degree in Political Science or related disciplines, resulting in a diverse student base. It wants to provide students with the analytical and academic skills to understand political and societal conflict and decision-making processes and prepare them for an academic position or for a broad range of professional careers. The master students the panel spoke to during the site visit recognized these goals and acknowledged the existing profile.

Since the last accreditation, considerable changes to the programme's profile have been introduced. In order to make the programme more attractive for students of other national and international universities, the Institute created a single modular programme without specializations around the theme 'Conflict and Cooperation' in 2012. The introduction of the bachelor specialization 'Internationale Betrekkingen en Organisaties' (IBO) simultaneously led to a considerable growth in student numbers. To cater for these students' interests and the research focus on 'The Institution of Politics', the Institute introduced a master specialization 'International Organisations' within the modular programme in September 2015, benefitting from its proximity to the city of The Hague which is home to many international organizations.

Further changes to the programme are being planned. As of September 2017, Leiden University will offer six Political Science specializations. Four will be taught in Leiden, two at its campus in The Hague. The panel was told that the main reason for this profound change was that management, staff and students currently feel a clear focus is lacking in the master's programme, as will be discussed in detail under standard 2 below. An increasing number of bachelor students therefore opted to pursue a master's degree at other universities that did offer programme specializations. The panel appreciates the willingness of the staff to modify the programme in response to perceived student interests. It hopes that the new offerings will further strengthen the profile of the programme and heartily recommends using this opportunity to link the new focus and profile more clearly to the intended learning outcomes.

Intended learning outcomes

The general goals of the master's programme have been translated into intended learning outcomes that closely follow the Dublin descriptors. The panel judges the intended learning outcomes to be clearly formulated and reflecting the requirements of the domain-specific framework and the Dublin descriptors at the master's level (see Appendix 3). However, the panel recommends specifying the



intended learning outcomes even more in line with the new, specific profile of the master's programme to reflect its unique character. They might include, for instance, that in Leiden students learn that politics is not only visible in formal political institutions but also in the behaviour of social groups and in the way conflicts are resolved and decisions are made.

The Institute also strengthened the professional orientation of the programme over the last few years, for instance by initiating an internship thesis seminar. The students and alumni the panel interviewed appreciated this internship opportunity. The panel sees this initiative as a strong point. It noted in the critical reflection that the master's intended learning outcomes related to the application of professional skills have also been formulated more clearly since the last accreditation period. Students now learn to collect data independently, judge research, integrate knowledge and apply it to societal and political problems. The panel welcomes these changes and recommends including them in the programme's Examination Regulations (OER).

Considerations

The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes are appropriate for an academic master's programme Political Science. They properly reflect the requirements of the domain-specific reference framework and the Dublin descriptors at the master's level. The goals of the master's programme are ambitious with their strong emphasis on teaching autonomous learning and preparing students for both academic and professional careers. The panel considers the programme's professional orientation a strong point. It advises bringing the intended learning outcomes further in line with the new profile, communicating clearly the unique character of the Leiden programme and its six specializations.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 1 as 'satisfactory'.

Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

The curriculum, staff and programme-specific services and facilities enable the incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Explanation:

The contents and structure of the curriculum enable the students admitted to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The quality of the staff and of the programme-specific services and facilities is essential to that end. Curriculum, staff, services and facilities constitute a coherent teaching-learning environment for the students.

Findings

Programme: content, design and didactical approach

The one-year master's programme consists of two tracks: 'Political Science' (PS) and 'International Organisation' (IO). For a schematic overview of the programme, see Appendix 4. The two specializations share the same general learning objectives and a common core course, 'Conflict and Cooperation' (5 EC). This course aims to provide advanced knowledge on the state of the art in Political Science through in-depth reading of major classical works of political science and international relations. Students of both specializations also follow a joint skills course, 'Advanced Academic and Professional Skills' (5 EC). This course provides training in advanced research skills (such as research design and presenting research findings) and training in professional skills, including learning to write a short policy paper.

Students in the IO specialization have an additional mandatory seminar called 'Dynamics of International Organisation' (10 EC). This course has two learning objectives: to deepen students' understanding of international organizations in world politics and - with this knowledge - prepare them for careers related to international organizations and global governance. In addition to the

mandatory core courses, students follow elective seminars (10 EC each), allowing them to create their own profile and focus of study. The seminars offer a variety of subjects in politics and international relations such as 'Crisis Management', 'Preventing Terrorism in Multicultural Europe' and 'Foreign Policy Analysis'. They are closely related to the research focus of the staff and are considered relevant for the professional field according to the staff. The panel looked at several courses during the site visit. It was positive about the content and level of the individual courses, but missed coherence between them.

According to the critical reflection, the didactical approach used in Leiden is based on interaction in class between students and teachers, with room for discussions and in-class presentations. Since the last accreditation, there have been some innovations in teaching methods: e.g. the Advanced Skills course uses the "flipping the classroom" concept, the thesis seminar works with peer review, and several seminars have introduced field trips and simulations. Several of the teachers and students the panel interviewed were enthusiastic about the innovative forms used in the seminars. Furthermore, presentations on innovative teaching methods are given during an annual meeting. The panel sees the development of advanced and innovative didactic forms in the master's programme as positive, although it noted that there is not yet a broadly shared enthusiasm among the staff members about these developments.

Based on the information provided in the critical reflection, the panel worried about the coherence of the programme. It could not find a clear cumulative structure within the curriculum design and had reservations about whether the programme enabled students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The testimonies during the site visit brought these concerns to the fore. The panel spoke with current students and alumni of the programme. They explicitly chose the Political Science programme in Leiden for its general character, flexibility and the amount of choice in courses and subjects. Nevertheless, the students and alumni felt disappointed by the programme: they could not discern a clear structure and indicated that the courses, although interesting by themselves, did not provide a coherent programme and that some were cancelled. Management and staff acknowledged the lack of a clear profile and also reflected upon the way in which this had resulted in a level of incoherence within the curriculum. The management team informed the panel that these concerns were the main reason for changing the programme's profile and structure in September 2017. The panel hopes that with the upcoming introduction of specializations, both the profile and focus of the programme will indeed be improved. The site visit and the reflexive ability of the programme staff and management have not, however, fully addressed the panel's concerns regarding the way in which the current curriculum enables students to meet the intended learning outcomes.

Programme: thesis seminar and internship

To complete their master's programme, students may opt for a thesis seminar (20 EC) or an internship (30 EC). To benefit from joint reading and mutual feedback, the thesis seminar is structured around a broad theme. Students choose a more specific theme for their thesis that fits under the umbrella of the broader thesis seminar theme. The thesis instructors also make an effort to accommodate students who want to focus on a specific research theme that does not fit with the themes on offer. The panel spoke to a number of thesis seminar instructors and ascertained that the thesis seminars are well organised and structured: there is a thesis seminar coordinator, and an instruction meeting for the students is being organized before the start of the seminar. The groups are small (maximum of 14 students) and interactive, and the supervision is individual and intensive. This has a positive effect on the completion rates. The alumni and the current master students agreed that the individual thesis supervision is good and the thesis supervisors are dedicated and accessible, although there are differences among the supervisors.

However, in the last academic year (2015-16) due to the absence of a few key teachers, some thesis seminars were cancelled. The selection of thesis themes was also impacted by the unforeseen absence of instructional staff members. The panel wondered whether these cancellations had to do with factors such as the staff's workload, which was increased partly by the planned reorganisation of the master's programme and the doubling of courses due to the February entry moment. The



panel spoke with management, staff and students about the consequences of these cancellations. From a management and staff perspective, the cancellations were seen as inevitable. From the students' perspective, these changes to the programme were seen as highly disappointing: they had chosen a programme that stood for flexibility and choice. They also felt like the management did not listen or respond to their worries: they felt unheard and lost within the programme. Irrespective of the reasons for the course cancellations, the panel finds that the teaching-learning environment was negatively affected, which in some cases also led to an increase of the group size. The panel strongly recommends that the management and staff think about alternative methods to address the unavailability of instructors (rather than cancellations) if the number of thesis themes and electives is compromised. It is aware that the problems encountered are perhaps only representative for one particular academic year. In the panel's view, the management team should avoid student disappointment and should aim to ensure that the programme delivers what has been advertised to avoid hampering its integrity.

Students who manage to find an internship that entails working at an academic level on a research project may substitute one elective seminar and a regular thesis seminar for an internship of 30 EC. There are clear guidelines for the internship, including a limited time frame for completion, the writing of a research proposal and preparing a thesis on the research conducted. The group of students who opt for the internship is separately supervised, but the requirements for the internship thesis seminar are similar to those for the master's thesis. According to the panel, this could be a strong point of the master's programme, although it did get the impression from students that those who opted for an internship thesis seminar were not very well supervised. It is clear, however, that the Institute is paying more attention to the training of professional skills and preparing students for the job market; in several seminars current policy issues are being discussed, there is an internship option and the possibility for excellent students to shift to the research master's programme after the first semester. The panel appreciates these undertakings of the Institute.

Although more attention is now being paid to the integration of professional skills into the curriculum, the master's programme is mainly dedicated to academic training and has a strong focus on theory and research. The critical reflection reports that the development of theoretical and research skills is evaluated positively by students. However, although both the students and the alumni recognized the strong orientation of the programme to theory, several alumni indicated that they struggled with the methodological approach of their thesis and did not feel sufficiently prepared for their thesis. Other master students and alumni, especially those who also did their bachelor's programme at UL, did not feel sufficiently challenged by the master's programme. The management attributes this to the differences in educational background of the students who enter the programme. As with other Dutch master's programmes, the one at UL is struggling with the different educational backgrounds of the students and their different academic levels. According to the panel, the Institute can do more to make sure the academic entrance levels of students are better aligned with each other.

Admission and study progress

Admission to the master's programme is selective. An admission committee reviews all applications. Students must hold a bachelor's degree in Political Science or a closely related field. They need to have at least 80 credits in Political Science or a related discipline, competence in Social Science research methodology, sufficient proficiency in English, a good academic record with a grade point average of 7, a letter of motivation and letters of reference. These admission criteria are comparable to similar programmes internationally. Since the academic year 2016-17, the same admission criteria have also been applied to students from the bachelor's programme Political Science at Leiden University. Because the courses of the bachelor's programme Political Science at UL are mainly taught in Dutch, these students may have an English language deficiency when they enter the master's programme. The panel suggests offering students from the bachelor's programme Political Science at UL an academic English language course during their bachelor's programme or another suitable measure.

Students with a deficiency in methodological skills can take a conversion course on Research Design and Measurement. The panel recommends defining the admission requirements for methodological research skills more clearly. There seem to be large differences among master students. Some of the students the panel interviewed lacked knowledge of qualitative research skills, others of quantitative research skills. The panel also recommends giving the conversion course before the students start their master's programme (preferably over the summer) and giving a course in January for students who start in February. The master students and alumni the panel spoke to were enthusiastic about the possibility of the February entry moment. For some students this was a reason to choose UL.

Although the master's programme is selective, the intake of students from a wide variety of national and international bachelor's programmes still results in students starting the master's programme at different entrance levels. According to the management team, about 33% of the students are international. This has an impact on the academic level of the master's programme, as described in the critical reflection. The panel observed that these differences in academic level are indeed a struggle for teachers and students as well as for the management team. Therefore, the panel advises a renewed discussion among staff about the best way to bring all admitted students to the same entry level. Possibilities to be considered include clearer and stricter admission requirements or introducing a more extended pre-master's programme (rather than just one conversion course).

The panel agrees with the management that diversity in the student population can have a stimulating effect on a programme: the exchange of ideas is enriching and can provide new perspectives and insights. Diversity may also have negative effects: students may have differences in their level of knowledge and understanding of Political Science as well as a different grasp of methodological and language skills. The panel believes these differences in academic level do not necessarily have to influence the programme negatively; students just need to be prepared well, and deficiencies need to be identified and corrected in advance. It recommends the programme management embrace the diversity of the student population and find a way to make the most of the different cultural backgrounds.

Staff and academic context

The staff members of the master's programme are tenured or tenure-track members of the Institute, and 85% of the teaching staff now holds a BKO (a basic teaching qualification). All participate in the research programme 'The Institutions of Politics' which has recently been assessed and received scores of 'very good' and 'excellent'. In line with the teaching philosophy of Leiden University, there is a strong integration between research and teaching. This link is actively facilitated and encouraged by the Institute: the selection of the master's programme seminar topics reflects the research interests and projects of the staff members. Both the master students and alumni spoke with enthusiasm about the expertise and teaching abilities of the instructors as well as their motivation, dedication and accessibility.

According to the critical reflection, seminars have a maximum of 20 students. Both the master students and alumni and the teachers mentioned the major differences in the group size of the students who start in February and those who start in September. According to the master students, some classes of the September intake were so full that a few students could not sit down, whereas students who started in February claimed that due to the low numbers, in-depth interaction in class discussions benefitted greatly. The students with whom the panel spoke during the site visit were acutely aware that this situation created huge differences in their appreciation of the course work. More worryingly in the panel's view, the group sizes mentioned affected class dynamics and, especially, group discussion and therefore directly impacted upon the teaching-learning environment. The management explained that this situation is partly inevitable because the exact admission numbers are not known until October 1. The management has now taken action to address this problem by hiring new staff.



The master's programme has its own study advisor. The study advisor helps students make choices regarding electives, thesis themes or an internship, as well as dealing with study delay due to personal problems or failing courses. The panel was told that the students know how to contact the study advisor when they need advice. One student even told the panel how the support of the study advisor prevented her from dropping out. The new master specializations that start this September in The Hague will get their own study advisor, who will be available at that location.

In contrast to the visibility and availability of the study advisor, students did not seem to know how to contact the educational committee. To the panel, this seems to be more than a communication problem. There is an educational committee on which staff and students are represented that meets on a regular basis. The educational committee advises the programme management on the results of all course evaluations and discusses educational policies and programme reforms. During the site visit, the panel read the minutes of the educational committee meetings and could confirm that it is doing what is expected of it. However, the committee would benefit from a permanent secretary. To both the panel and the students the panel interviewed, it is not clear what exactly is being done with the advice presented by the educational committee to the Institute's board. The panel advises both the educational committee and the board to make their actions more transparent to the students and to show what is done as a result of their work. That way the students may feel more involved and responsible for their part in the quality assurance system.

Considerations

The panel encountered a master's programme on the eve of change. Over the last few years, the programme has been searching for its place within the Dutch academic landscape. It has experimented with a broad curriculum and introduced a stronger focus on professional skills and job orientation. The implementation of an internship seminar was viewed by the panel as one of the assets of the master's programme. Yet more changes are afoot again: in September 2017, a new programme with six specializations will replace the current programme with two specializations. Although the panel was positive about the content of individual courses of the current programme, it shares the view of the management, staff, students and alumni that change is needed: the current programme and curriculum design lack coherence and a clear profile. It concluded from student and alumni testimonies that the lack of coherence has negatively affected the teaching-learning environment.

In addition, the academic year 2015-2016 seems to have been a particularly difficult year for the master's programme: the absence of core staff members negatively influenced the students' experiences and seems to have resulted in a communication breakdown. Students and alumni were generally positive about the quality and dedication of the individual staff members and about the help provided by the study advisor, but were very disappointed in the programme. They felt like they had missed out and were lost and unheard. The programme did not meet their previously held expectations. The panel was struck by this and finds that the management made some errors of judgement by, for instance, increasing the group size, cancelling seminars and reducing the number of thesis theme seminars. These solutions to enrolment and staffing issues all compromised a coherent and effective teaching-learning environment and presented the panel with the problem of how to weigh these testimonies, which are to some extent anecdotal. However, the panel feels that the management seems to have been unaware of the students' needs, and it advises the programme to reconnect with the students, starting with paying attention to the place the education committee currently holds in the programme.

Another issue encountered is the significant differences in academic level of the new students. The panel strongly recommends the programme to reassess its current entry policy. Some students indicated that they struggle with their academic (methodological) skills and/or their language skills, while other students found the master's programme did not add obvious value to their bachelor's programme. As a result, the quality of the programme is at risk: the teaching-learning environment seems not to help these students sufficiently to achieve the intended learning outcomes. Although the panel applauds the programme's wish for diversity and its ability to attract international students,

it advises the management and staff to think about another admission strategy, because it is clear that the current strategy is not working. Instead of offering just one conversion course, the management and staff should think about a pre-master's programme to ensure that students are able to meet the intended learning outcomes, without burdening the current staff members or negatively affecting the teaching-learning environment.

The panel was pleased by the management's drive to change and is aware that a new master's programme will start in September 2017. It cannot, however, judge the programme based on plans. Even though the panel is hopeful about the new academic year, the current situation is unsatisfactory and needs to be seriously addressed by the management. In particular, it feels that the communication with students should be improved. Based on the evidence presented in the critical reflection and the site visit, too many problems compromised the students' ability to meet the intended learning outcomes, especially in the academic year 2015-2016.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 2 as 'unsatisfactory'.

Standard 3: Assessment

The programme has an adequate assessment system in place.

Explanation:

The tests and assessments are valid, reliable and transparent to the students. The programme's examining board safeguards the quality of the interim and final tests administered.

Findings

All courses and assessments are described in the E-guide. The panel scanned the E-guide and looked in depth at a sample of courses during the site visit. In the master's programme, there is a variety of assessment strategies which are in line with a master's level and reflect the final qualifications. Most core and elective courses are assessed through a combination of papers, presentations and participation in seminar meetings. However, it is not clear to the panel what the weighting is of the different assessments for each seminar/course. More importantly, the learning objectives for each course are not clearly defined, and there is no visible connection between them and the intended learning outcomes of the programme. Therefore, the panel strongly advises the programme management to design a test matrix. This will make two things clear: the relationship between the learning objectives and the intended learning outcomes (as described in the OER) and the matching forms of assessments. This is even more important in light of the upcoming changes in the programme. The panel was very glad to learn that a request for an assessment plan was recently made by the examination board to the management team of the master's programme.

The examination board and the management team seem to be increasingly aware of the fact that every programme needs to have an adequate assessment system and can benefit from the streamlining of procedures regarding assessments. In recent years there have been quite a number of improvements to guarantee the quality of assessments. In December 2013, an external member was appointed who independently checks a number of theses twice a year and who inspects a sample of examinations. He reports his findings to the head of the examination board. The examination board has also been professionalized over the past few years: it has added a permanent secretary, meets on a regular basis and reports on its activities yearly. The panel applauds these changes. The professionalization of the board would be augmented further if it made minutes of these regular meetings.

Another improvement since the previous visitation is the adaptation of the thesis evaluation form. Part 1 of the form addresses the quality and level of the research analysis, and part 2 covers the more formal aspects (e.g. presentation, referencing, layout). Both parts must be graded with a minimum of 6 (on a scale of 10), and all criteria of part 1 must be adequately met. This last rule was



introduced to ensure the level and quality of the thesis. All criteria reflect the intended learning outcomes of the programme. The panel welcomes the changes that have been made; the assessment criteria are clear, as is their weighting.

All theses are assessed by the supervisor and a second reader assigned by the thesis coordinator. Both of them first have to approve the research proposal. The second reader is also asked to deliver input and literature suggestions at the thesis proposal stage. In the end both assessors must agree on the final grade and approve the thesis evaluation form before they sign it. Initially, the panel wondered whether the second reader was sufficiently independent because s/he seemed very involved in the entire thesis process, not just the assessment of the final product. The programme management reassured the panel that the second reader is only involved in the beginning and at the end and that his/her independence is assured. However, it is not evident to the panel where the assessment of the second reader becomes visible. There is just one evaluation form, and the feedback on the form is written by the supervisor. The panel would advise the thesis coordinator to adjust the form and leave room for the evaluation by the second reader or preferably have the second reader fill out another form independently.

The panel also noticed a great variety in the extent of feedback on the evaluation forms. One of the panel members received an evaluation form that was not filled out at all. For some theses, the panel could not discern how the grade was established. The panel spoke at length about this with the examination board and the management team. They both agreed that there is a great variety in feedback on the forms and that this is not acceptable. The examination board had discussed this with the instructors and concluded there is still resistance to completing the forms in more detail. Although the students mentioned that they did receive detailed feedback informally, some political scientists in Leiden still appear to resist more formal means of ensuring quality. The panel is relieved that at least orally the thesis feedback is transparent to the students. However, it strongly advises the management team to make sure the thesis supervisors fill out the thesis evaluation forms: students have a right to both oral and written feedback, and the system of grading should be fully transparent.

Considerations

The master's programme has improved its system of assessment since the last accreditation: e.g. it assigned an external member as well as a permanent secretary (recently) to the board of examiners and improved the thesis evaluation forms. The panel recognizes and appreciates these improvements. However, it strongly recommends that the management team (in cooperation with the instructors and the board of examiners) implement an assessment plan including a test matrix and make sure all examiners commit to this. In addition, it is important that instructors complete the evaluation forms in more detail to make their judgments (and grades) more transparent. The feedback to the students of their assessments seems to be transparent informally but should also be transparent formally. In view of the improvements in the system of assessment in recent years, the panel trusts the management team to successfully adopt these recommendations.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 3 as 'satisfactory'.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Explanation:

The level achieved is demonstrated by interim and final tests, final projects and the performance of graduates in actual practice or in post-graduate programmes.

Findings

To determine if the intended learning outcomes are achieved, the panel read fifteen theses and their assessment forms and interviewed several alumni during the site visit. The sample of theses spanned

the full range of marks from 6 to 9 (on a scale of 10). In the master's thesis (20 EC, between 8000-10,000 words) the student can demonstrate his/her ability to undertake independent academic research. Generally speaking, the theses were of the appropriate master's level and met the intended learning outcomes. In three cases, the panel found the work to be a marginal pass at best. The quality of the other theses was at the appropriate level. This was demonstrated for example by appropriate surveys of the relevant literature, hypotheses that logically followed from the theory, solid empirical research and, in some cases, independently coded data.

According to the critical reflection, graduates from the master's programme have entered a variety of professional careers. The Institute recently made an inventory of alumni who are active on the LinkedIn page of the Leiden Alumni Association of Political Science (LAP): 55% is employed in political and administrative careers or in media and communication. The study association (SPIL) also organizes all sorts of career events. Some alumni are members of the Institute's advisory council on which former staff active in the professional field are represented. However, it is very difficult to obtain complete data. Therefore, the Institute is participating in a faculty-wide effort to strengthen contacts with alumni. The panel welcomes this initiative.

The panel spoke to four alumni of the programme. One of them had recently started working for the organization in which he did an internship. The other three had not yet entered the professional field for various reasons (e.g. finishing an internship, pursuing another field of study). The alumni spoke very openly with the panel and shared a lot of ideas on how the master's programme could be improved. Although the alumni are clearly represented in the alumni association and the advisory council, the panel recommends that the Institute use the input and feedback of alumni in relation to current issues as well, for instance, the upcoming changes in the master's programme.

Considerations

Based on the sample of theses and the interviews with alumni, the panel concludes that graduates achieve the intended learning outcomes. The theses show that students are able to conduct an independent research project on a master's level. The grading seems fair, although the written feedback could be improved to make the grading more transparent. From the available data it appears that alumni have entered a variety of professional careers.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 4 as 'satisfactory'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The intended learning outcomes are appropriate for an academic master's programme Political Science, and they reflect the requirements of the domain-specific reference framework and the Dublin descriptors at the master's level. The goals of the master's programme seem ambitious with their strong emphasis on teaching autonomous learning and preparing students for both academic and professional careers. The clear focus on professional skills and job orientation is one of the assets of the programme. However, the panel recommends specifying the intended learning outcomes more according to the programme's specific profile and uniqueness. This has also been recognized by the programme management: the lack of a clear profile is the main reason for the upcoming changes within the programme. As of September 2017, Leiden University will offer six Political Science specializations.

Although the panel was positive about the individual courses, it could not see a cumulative structure, coherence nor a clear profile. It hopes that the new specializations will indeed strengthen the programme's profile. The quality of both staff members and individual seminars is good. Because of enrolment and staffing issues, the students of the academic year 2015-2016 were confronted with an increased group size, the cancelling of seminars as well as a reduction in the number of thesis



theme seminars. The panel feels that other solutions should be offered to similar problems in the future, because this situation compromised a coherent and effective teaching-learning environment. The quality of the programme is also affected by the significant differences in the academic level of the students who are entering the programme. The panel advises the management and staff to think about another admission strategy.

The master's programme has improved its system of assessment, but should implement an assessment plan to improve its assessment policy further. Thesis instructors should fill out the thesis evaluation forms in more detail to make their judgments (and grades) more transparent not only informally but also formally. The panel trusts the management team to successfully adopt these recommendations. The master theses and the alumni feedback prove that graduates achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Summing up, Standards 1, 3 and 4 were assessed as 'satisfactory', and the planned changes of the programme should improve both its coherence and profile, which are lacking in the current programme design. The panel found that the teaching learning-environment of several students, at least in the academic year 2015-2016, had been compromised by various circumstances, only some of which were outside the management's control. Hence, it assessed Standard 2 as 'unsatisfactory'. The planned programme overhaul will also influence the teaching-learning environment. As the current individual courses are of the appropriate level and the teaching staff is dedicated to their research and students, the panel trusts the programme to implement the necessary changes and address the observed areas of concern in the curriculum design and interaction with students. It feels that the concerns raised about the current teaching-learning environment need to be taken seriously by the management and considered during the planned programme overhaul, but that they do not have to reflect on its overall assessment of the quality of the programme as a whole. The final assessment of the programme is, therefore, 'satisfactory' according to the decision rules of the NVAO.

Conclusion

The panel assesses the *master's programme Political Science* as 'satisfactory'.

MEASURES FOR IMPROVEMENT

The panel recommends specifying the intended learning outcomes to match the programme's profile and unique characteristics more closely. The panel could not find coherence and a clear cumulative structure in the programme it assessed. It hopes that the new specializations will indeed strengthen the profile. It also wants to suggest that management and staff think about another admission strategy to enable students to meet the intended learning outcomes. Because of enrolment and staffing issues, the teaching-learning environment of the academic year 2015-2016 was compromised. The panel advises the management to think of other solutions if similar issues occur in the future. For instance, the management could strengthen the position of the education committee. An empowered education committee is key in a healthy teaching-learning environment. The panel recommends that the programme implements an assessment plan to highlight the connection between the learning objectives and the intended learning outcomes. In addition, the thesis instructors should fill out the thesis evaluation forms in more detail.

APPENDICES



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

Dr. C. (Christien) van den Anker is Associate Professor of Politics and International Relations at the Faculty of Health & Applied Sciences at the University of the West of England in Bristol (UK) since 2006. Between 2001 and 2016, she worked as a Lecturer in Global Ethics and as Deputy Director at the Centre for Global Ethics at the University of Birmingham, UK. Christien is an internationally established specialist in human rights and contemporary slavery. In her work, she refocused the narrow human trafficking debate to encompass all forms of slavery, clarified the migration-slavery nexus, and pioneered partnerships working for research-based advocacy.

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

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

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

Dr. R. (Renske) Doorenspleet is Associate Professor at the University of Warwick, UK. She is a graduate of the University of Leiden; after a postdoctoral fellowship at Harvard University (USA) in 2002/2003, she started a research project on democracy in divided countries, funded by NWO. She has taught courses on comparative politics, democratisation and development, statistics and research methods. During the academic year 2011-2012, she received an academic fellowship and grant from the Institute for Advanced Teaching and Learning, in order to innovate teaching in politics, combining film and theatre projects with academic research and teaching around the theme of democracy. During 2012-2014, Renske was the political science coordinator of Warwick's interdisciplinary Q-step Centre, and developed new politics degrees offering quantitative social science training. Her research focuses on democratic transitions and consolidation in a comparative perspective. Her articles have been published in academic journals such as *World Politics*, *Democratization*, *Acta Politica*, *the International Political Science Review*, *Ethnopolitics*, *Government and Opposition* and *the European Journal of Political Research*. She is also the author of *Democratic Transitions* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2005), co-editor of *One-Party Dominance in African*



Democracies (Lynne Rienner, 2013) and of *Political Parties, Party Systems and Democracy in Africa* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014). At the moment, she is working on a new book, which will explore the value of democracy in a comparative perspective (Palgrave Macmillan, 2018).

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

F. (Felix) Wagner has been a bachelor student of Political Science at the Radboud University Nijmegen since 2012. Felix recently completed a semester at the Higher School of Economics in Moscow, Russia. Between 2014 and 2016, he was a member of the Programme Committee of Political Science. He is also a freelance journalist, writing for the Nijmegen Student Journal *Vox*.

APPENDIX 2: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE

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

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

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

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

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



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

APPENDIX 3: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

Master's programme Political Science

Learning outcomes

Graduates of the programme have attained the following learning outcomes, listed according to the Dublin descriptors:

a. Knowledge and understanding

Graduates of the programme are expected to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the 'State of the Art' in Political Science (with a particular emphasis on the field of International Organisation for the graduates of the specialisation in International Organisation). The master's programme builds upon the qualifications of Political Science Bachelor degrees or a degree in a related field, and extends this knowledge and understanding towards developing and applying original ideas, often within a research context.

b. Applying knowledge and understanding

The master's programme aims to provide additional knowledge and understanding which is geared towards problem-solving in new or unfamiliar environments within the broader scholarly and applied context.

c. Judgement

By time of the completion of the master's programme, graduates are expected to have the ability to integrate the knowledge and understanding they have acquired during the study for handling complexity, and formulating judgements with incomplete or limited information. The master's training is also expected to include reflections on the social and ethical responsibilities that arise from the applied side of Political Science.

d. Communication

Graduates of the master's programme will be able to communicate the conclusions of their scholarly research, their knowledge and understanding to an audience beyond traditional academia. The master's training will provide them with the necessary presentation skills.

e. Learning Skills

The learning skills acquired during the master's programme will allow students to continue to think analytically, study independently, and work autonomously as well as collectively.



APPENDIX 4: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Master's Programme in Political Science 2016-2017

Table 1: Program Master's in Political Science (2016-17)						
Courses	Ects.	Level	Methods of Instruction	Examination	Contact Hours	M/E*
<i>Semester 1 Core Courses</i>						
Conflict and Cooperation: Classics	5	500	seminars	Final paper or written exam	28	M
Advanced Academic & Professional Skills	5	500	lectures and seminars	Short papers, policy paper, and group and individual presentations	28	M
Semester 1, Electives (students can choose 2 seminars from the list below; one in each bloc)						
Political Communication and Media Effects	10	600	seminars	Presentations, reaction papers, final paper	28	E
Conflict and Cooperation: Applying Game Theory in International Relations	10	600	seminars and lectures	Research paper, article style (+/- 8000 words)	28	E
Crisis Management (recommended for the Research Master's)	10	600	Seminars	Book review, research proposal, final paper	28	E
Preventing Terrorism in Multicultural Europe	10	600	Seminars	Reaction papers, participation, oral presentation, policy paper, final research paper	28	E



Consensus and Conflict in the Netherlands	10	600	Seminars	Essays, observation report, presentation, reflection papers, final paper	28	E
Conflict and Intervention	10	600	Seminars	Participation, presentation, final paper	28	E
Multiculturalism and Democracy	10	600	Seminars	Participation, presentation, short papers, final paper	28	E
Semester 2, Mandatory Course						
Thesis Seminar MSc Political Science	20	600	Mixed: (sub)group, individual sessions	Thesis proposal, master's thesis	**	M
Semester 2 - Electives (PS students can choose 1 seminar from the list below)						
Foreign Policy Analysis	10	600	seminars	Research paper	28	E
Russia and the World	10	600	seminars	Participation, oral presentation, short papers, final paper	28	E
Capital and Crises	10	600	seminars	Participation, presentations, essays	28	E
Governance and Diversity in Developing Countries	10	600	seminars	Two essays, presentation, participation	28	E
Optional: Internship						
Internship MSc Political Science, including Internship Thesis	30	500	seminars	Six assignments, thesis	28	E
* M: mandatory, E: elective ** In block 3 bi-weekly sessions, in block 4 contact hours vary according to need of students						

Table 2: Program Master's in Political Science: Specialisation International Organisation (2016-17)

Courses	Ects.	Level	Methods of Instruction	Examination	Contact hours	M/E*
<i>Semester 1 Core Courses and Mandatory Specialisation course</i>						
Conflict and Cooperation: Classics	5	500	seminars	Final paper or written exam	28	M
Advanced Academic & Professional Skills	5	500	lectures, seminars	Short papers, policy paper, group and individual presentations	28	M
Dynamics of International Organisation	10	600	lectures, seminars	Reaction papers, participation, final paper	28	M
Semester 1, Electives (students can choose 1 seminar from the list below)						
Political Communication and Media Effects	10	600	seminars	Presentations, reaction papers, final paper	28	E
Conflict and Cooperation: Applying Game Theory in International Relations	10	600	seminars, lectures	Research paper, article style (+/- 8000 words)	28	E
Crisis Management (recommended for the Research Master's)	10	600	seminars	Book review, research proposal, final paper	28	E
Preventing Terrorism in Multicultural Europe	10	600	seminars	Reaction papers, participation, oral presentation, policy paper, final research paper	28	E



Semester 2, Mandatory Course						
Thesis Seminar MSc Political Science International Organisation	20	600	Mixed: (sub)group, individual sessions	Thesis proposal, master's thesis	**	M
Semester 2 - Electives (PS students can choose 1 seminar from the list below)						
Foreign Policy Analysis	10	600	seminars	Research paper	28	E
Russia and the World	10	600	seminars	Participation, oral presentation, short papers, final paper	28	E
Capital and Crises	10	600	seminars	Participation, presentations, essays	28	E
Governance and Diversity in Developing Countries	10	600	seminars	Two essays, presentation, participation	28	E
Optional: Internship						
Internship MSc Political Science, including Internship Thesis	30	500	seminars	Six assignments, thesis	28	E
* M: mandatory, E: elective ** in block 3 bi-weekly sessions, in block 4 contact hours vary according to need of students						

APPENDIX 5: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

Panel Management (15 mei, 10.45-11.15)

Naam	Functie
Prof. Dr. Ingrid van Biezen	Wetenschappelijk Directeur
Dr. Niels van Willigen	Onderwijsdirecteur
Prof. Dr. Daniel Thomas	Derde lid
Lisanne Trouw	Student-lid bestuur
Danielle Lovink	Studie-adviseur BSc
Marjan Rijnja	Studiecoördinator

Panel BSc-students (15 mei, 11.45-12.30)

Naam	Specialisatie	Jaar
Ariane Litjens	Internationale Betrekkingen en Organisaties (IBO)	1
Anouk van Vliet	IBO	2
Ries de Moor	IBO	3
Evelien Lambooj	IBO	4
Floris Giltai	Politicologie (POL)	1
Fedde van der Herberg	POL	2
Nikki Gommers	POL	4

Panel teachers BSc (15 mei, 13.30-14.15)

Naam
Dr. Tom Louwerse
Dr. Rebekah Tromble
Dr. Brenda van Coppennolle
Dr. Oda van Cranenburgh
Dr. Hans Vollaard
Dr. Marco Verschoor
Dr. Michael Sampson
Prof. Dr. Rudy Andeweg

Panel MSc-students (15 mei, 14.30-15.15)

Naam	Specialisatie	NL/Internationaal
Alide Groenveld	PS	NL
Kay Robinson	PS	Int.
Philippa Stroud	IO	Int.
Olivier ter Meulen	IO	NL
Jinte Veldman	IO	NL

Panel teachers MSc (15 mei, 15.45-16.30)

Naam

Dr. Nico Blarel
Dr. Corinna Jentsch
Dr. Hans Oversloot
Dr. Maria Spirova
Dr. Petr Kopecky
Dr. Francesco Ragazzi

Panel Alumni (15 mei, 16.45-17.15)

Naam	Studie (BSc, MSc of beide)
Jip Stam	BSc en MSc
Anne Lise Olsthoorn	BSc en MSc
Ewan van den Broek	BSc en MSc
Jaap Valkenburg	BSc

Panel Educational Committee (16 mei, 9.30-10.00)

Naam	Functie	
Dr. Huib Pellikaan	Voorzitter (interim)	
Dr. Frank de Zwart	Docentlid	
Niels Park	Studentlid BSc	
Steven Kroon	Studentlid MSc	

Panel Examination Board(16 mei, 10.00-10.45)

Naam	Functie	
Prof. Dr. Joop van Holsteyn	Voorzitter	
Prof. Dr. Arjen Boin	BSc	
Dr. Michael Meffert	MSc	
Dr. Floris Mansvelt	Secretaris	

Panel final meeting management (16 mei, 11.45-12.30)

Naam	Functie
Prof. Dr. Ingrid van Biezen	WD
Dr. Niels van Willigen	OD
Prof. Dr. Daniel Thomas	Derde lid
Lisanne Trouw	Student-lid bestuur
Prof. Dr. Paul Nieuwenburg	Vice-Decaan
Jorrit Sterk, MSc	Bestuurssecretaris

APPENDIX 6: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

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

1024116, 1578847, 1309579, 1005049, 1278509, 0935433, 726478, 907758, 1078674, 1134116, 1299255, 1451960, 1580868, 1720295, 172962

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

- Course materials of the following courses:
 - Conflict and Cooperation: Classics
 - Advanced Academic and Professional Skills
 - Multiculturalism and Democracy
 - Governance and Diversity in Developing Countries

- Course- and Examination Regulations (2016-2017)
- Additional information regarding the appointment of an external examiner and his active role as external check regarding theses

