



NVAO • NETHERLANDS

ADVISORY REPORT  
Maastricht University

INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE  
ASSESSMENT

*15 JANUARY 2019*



NVAO • NETHERLANDS

## ADVISORY REPORT

Maastricht University

## INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE ASSESSMENT

*15 JANUARY 2019*



## Contents

<b>1</b>	Summary advisory report.....	4
<b>2</b>	Introduction and justification .....	7
2.1	Purpose of the institutional audit.....	7
2.2	Composition of the audit panel .....	7
2.3	Procedure observed by the panel.....	8
2.4	Structure of the advisory report and the chapters .....	9
<b>3</b>	Profile of the institution .....	10
3.1	General data .....	10
3.2	Profile of the institution .....	10
<b>4</b>	Assessment.....	12
4.1	Standard 1: Philosophy and policy .....	12
4.2	Standard 2: Implementation.....	15
4.3	Standard 3: Evaluation and monitoring .....	18
4.4	Standard 4: Development .....	20
4.5	Final conclusion.....	23
<b>5</b>	Recommendations.....	25
	Appendix 1: Accreditation portrait .....	27
	Appendix 2: Composition of the panel.....	31
	Appendix 3: Schedule of the site visit.....	33
	Appendix 4: Overview of the documents perused .....	38



# 1 Summary advisory report

This report contains the panel's advice to NVAO on the institutional audit of Maastricht University. The audit assesses whether the university has a quality culture and a system of quality assurance which guarantee that the education offered at Maastricht University meets (inter)nationally accepted standards and demands. When assessing the university according to the four standards of the NVAO assessment framework, the panel took the ambitions, vision and choices formulated by the institution as a point of departure and reviewed the realisation of these ambitions.

The panel considers that the educational vision of Maastricht University is clear, coherent and widely shared by all stakeholders within and beyond the university. The panel is impressed by the way in which the student takes up a central position in the considerations underlying the educational vision of the university: problem-based learning, internationalisation, research education (Strategic Programme: "Community at the CORE") and meaningful student experiences (The Maastricht University Student Experience; MUSE) are very student-centred concepts. The university's current attention to assessment makes the panel wonder if assessment should become a fifth component of the educational vision. This, however, will require the university to come up with an explicit narrative aligning UM's vision on assessment with the vision on problem-based learning.

Throughout the visit, the panel observed that the Executive Board is operating as a very professional team that consists of three enthusiastic individuals who pull together in the same direction and who are supported by their 'critical friends' of the Supervisory Board. Moreover, the Executive Board is successful in gathering faculties and services, staff and students, alumni and professionals around a common vision for the development of the university: the UM community is indeed core to the university. This is supported by effective governance structures relating to several strategic themes: PBL, continued professional development, HR, internationalisation, examination boards, assessment / constructive alignment, think tanks, etc. These coordination structures provide ample room for a bottom-up development of strategy and policy but also are under a clear direction of the Executive Board requiring execution of the policy decided on. In the last years this coordinating structure has been strengthened.

The panel considers that UM's educational vision is translated adequately in a wide range of policies that are fit for purpose. Across all policies and actions, the panel observed a number of commonalities, which it connects with the 'Maastricht way of doing things': the panel commends UM for the way in which policies (such as the new HR strategy) are co-created between the relevant layers and bodies representing management, faculties, services, staff and students. The panel supports the university for taking its time to implement change (for instance with regard to constructive alignment) as this allows to maintain quality whilst ensuring that staff and students buy in the changes. The panel also thinks highly of the contribution of both staff and students in developing policies and implementing actions and processes: the sheer enthusiasm of the interviewees demonstrates that their commitment goes well beyond the minimal requirements of formal involvement.

The panel considers that UM has a strong system in place to monitor and evaluate the quality of its education at all levels of the university. The effectiveness with which reported concerns and flaws in course delivery and assessment are addressed by the teaching staff is impressive. The panel commends the university for adding another quality assurance cycle with programme input from external reviews. At central level, the panel considers that the spring and autumn meetings between Executive Board and faculties and the horizontal platforms of vice-deans of education, chairs of Examination Boards, etc. are good practices. Across all levels of the university, the panel observed that students, staff, alumni and the professional field are consulted in a systematic way. In so far as the actions from the Strategic Programme 2017-2021 are concerned, the panel considers that the university can be more effective in formulating the actions and in gathering data that monitor the follow-up and successful delivery of these measures. A better definition of aims to achieve might strengthen focussed evaluation and reflection on assuring quality.

The panel considers that UM is doing very well on both systematic improvement and development. The panel is impressed by the breadth of the activities and by the depth with which reported flaws in quality

are taken up and communicated. The panel considers that the university is well connected to the city, region, province and Euregion. UM has reached a new stage of development, establishing EDLAB and co-creating the Brightlands campuses. The panel thinks highly of EDLAB both in terms of its purpose and of the work that has been undertaken so far. Furthermore, the panel applauds the interdisciplinary approach to education and research across faculties. The panel however, has also noticed that in handling innovation the university is mainly looking for in-house expertise. It therefore welcomes the EDview study on problem-based learning and invites the university to use the enthusiasm this initiative has generated as a lever to also look for inspiration outside the university.

The panel found ample evidence that a PDCA cycle is followed in many areas of strategic development. This PDCA cycle might be more systematized in that the panel thinks a more convincing narrative could be developed connecting the subsequent steps: Plan, Do, Check and Act. In the majority of cases it was clear which issue was being addressed, but not in all cases. UM's evaluation instruments provide a wealth of information but could be better linked to the results or strategic aims. Improvements do not always follow clearly on paper from reflection on evaluation results, but also stem from informal sources such as meetings.

The site visit has convinced the panel that there is a genuine Maastricht University quality culture: it is grounded in dialogue and interaction, welcomes feedback and involvement, and promotes mutual understanding. From the perspective of the panel, the enthusiasm of the interviewees and the open atmosphere in the discussions are also very important indicators of this culture.

In sum, the panel concludes that Maastricht University meets each of the four standards of the assessment framework. Its overall judgement on the institutional audit of Maastricht University is therefore positive. Given this outcome, the panel advises NVAO to take a positive decision.

The panel also looked into the quality of internationalisation as a specific aspect of Maastricht University. The panel's findings and considerations are reported in a separate document, in accordance with the CeQuInt procedure for the assessment of quality in internationalisation at institutional level. The panel considers that Maastricht University fulfils each of the five standards of the CeQuInt assessment framework - intended internationalisation, action plans, implementation, enhancement, and governance - up to a level which systematically surpasses the generic quality that can be reasonably expected from an international perspective. The panel considers Maastricht University in many respects a 'best-practice' delivering comprehensive internationalisation in several areas. UM is committed to using international perspectives throughout its teaching, research and service missions as a higher education institution while internationalization influences all of campus life through the international classroom and extra-curricular activities in the context of MUSE. The panel's advice on the quality of internationalisation at Maastricht University is therefore positive.

As part of the institutional audit, the panel also reviewed the plans of Maastricht University with regard to the Quality Agreements it is about to sign with the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. The Quality Agreements relate to the period 2019-2024 and address six themes: (i) intensive and small-scale education; (ii) student guidance; (iii) study success; (iv) education differentiation; (v) facilities; and (vi) professional development of teachers. The panel's findings and considerations are reported in a separate document. The panel considers that Maastricht University complies with each of the three criteria: improved educational quality, stakeholder involvement, and realisation of ambitions. In particular, the panel observed that the six priorities of UM's Quality Agreement plans constitute a very good match with the vision of the university and the actions presented in the Strategic Programme, that there has been a very good involvement of the entire UM community in developing the Quality Agreement plans, and that the planned ambitions have been formulated in such a clear way that they can be monitored and evaluated properly. The panel's advice on the plan to implement the Quality Agreements is therefore positive.

The Hague, 15 January 2019

On behalf of the assessment panel charged with assessing Maastricht University

Em. Prof. dr. Janke Cohen-Schotanus  
(Chair)

Mr. Mark Delmartino MA  
(Secretary)



## 2 Introduction and justification

### 2.1 Purpose of the institutional audit

The institutional audit assesses whether an institution harbours a quality culture and a system of quality assurance which guarantee that the education offered by the institution meets (inter)nationally accepted standards and demands. The institutional audit takes the ambitions, vision and choices formulated by the institution as a point of departure, but requests the institution to account for the realisation of these ambitions. The audit is centred around four contiguous questions:

1. Are the vision and policies of the institution regarding the quality of education sufficiently supported and coordinated, both internally and externally?
2. How does the institution realise its vision on quality?
3. How does the institution monitor that its vision on quality is realised?
4. How does the institution work on improvement?

Participation in the institutional audit is not compulsory for institutions. The audit functions alongside the assessment and accreditation of individual study programmes. Passing the institutional audit gives institutions the right to have their programmes assessed on the basis of the framework for the Limited Programme Assessment. When an institution fails the institutional audit, its programmes need to be assessed according to the standards for the Extensive Programme Assessment.

In the first round of institutional audits (2011 to 2016), 35 institutions passed the audit. These institutions offer around 80% of the total number of degree programmes in Dutch higher education.

NVAO appoints a panel of experts ('peers') for conducting the institutional audit. These experts have no ties with the institution under review or any other conflict of interest. The panel comprises leading expertise on the management of institutions, educational expertise in higher education, and audit expertise and/or expertise in the design and efficiency of systems of quality assurance. Students and the work field are also represented in the panel.

A qualified and independent secretary assists the panel and writes the advisory report based on the discussions in the panel. NVAO offers a training and/or briefing to all panel members and the secretary prior to the audit. An NVAO staff member coordinates the audit and acts as a liaison officer between the institution and the expert panel.

Full details of the institutional audit process can be found in the framework posted on the NVAO website: Assessment Framework for the Higher Education Accreditation System of the Netherlands 2016. Information on the assessment of the quality of internationalisation according to the CeQuInt methodology is available on the website of ECA: [www.ecahe.eu](http://www.ecahe.eu). Details on the assessment of the Quality Agreements are found on the website of the NVAO.

### 2.2 Composition of the audit panel

The expert panel comprises:

- Prof. em. Janke Cohen-Schotanus, former Head of the centre for innovation and research medical education, faculty of Medical Sciences, Groningen University, chair;
- Dr. Agneta Bladh, vice-President of the Council of the Magna Charta Observatory, former Rector University of Kalmar, Sweden, member;
- Prof. Ramses A. Wessel, professor of International and European Law and Governance, Centre for European Studies, University of Twente, member;
- Prof. Jeroen Huisman, professor of Higher Education at CHEGG - Centre for Higher Education Governance Ghent, Ghent University, member;
- Mr. Jan Zuidam, former Chairman Limburgse Werkgevers Vereniging, former Deputy-Chairman of the Managing Board of Directors DSM, member;

- Ms. Lara Schu, master student Computer Science at the University of Kaiserslautern, Germany, student-member.

The panel is assisted by:

- Mr. Mark Delmartino, MDM CONSULTANCY bvba , secretary
- Mr. Frank Wamelink, NVAO process coordinator

The resumes of the panel members are included in Appendix 1.

## 2.3 Procedure observed by the panel

The panel received the university's self-evaluation report (SER) on 29 August 2018. On 23 February 2018, the NVAO chairman and the NVAO process coordinator met with the Executive Board of Maastricht University to discuss the programme of the site visit.

The members of the panel exchanged their initial impressions on the self-evaluation reports by e-mail and met for a preparatory meeting in Schiphol on 17 October 2018. At this meeting, the three audit tasks were discussed. The panel also listed the key issues that would require clarification during the site visit. This visit took place from 22 until 26 October 2018 and consisted of two parts: an exploratory part on 22 and 23 October 2018, and an in-depth visit focusing on the audit trails from 24 to 26 October 2018.

The panel members gathered on Sunday evening 21 October to prepare the first interviews. The site visit started on 22 October 2018 with a meet and greet, offering the opportunity for panel and interviewees to connect in a more informal setting. During the site visit, the panel met with more than 180 staff members, management and stakeholders, such as the Executive Board, the Supervisory Board, the educational management, lecturers, students, quality assurance staff, university services staff, alumni and representatives from the professional field. A detailed overview of the programme visit is provided in Appendix 3.

The panel carried out four in-depth audit trails:

- Trail 1: past performance and internal quality assurance;
- Trail 2: assessment;
- Trail 3: quality of internationalisation;
- Trail 4: Quality Agreements

Trails 1 and 2 are part of the regular institutional audit. The past performance trail took place on 24 October. The panel visited the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the School of Business and Economics. The main aim of the so-called past performance trail is to establish if the quality of education is ensured at the level of programmes. The panel looked into four programmes with a different track record in external programme assessment: the bachelor's programme Arts & Culture, the master's programme European Studies, the bachelor's programme International Business, and the master's programme Economics.

The morning of 25 October was dedicated to the trail on assessment. The panel visited the Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences (FHML) and spoke mainly to representatives of two programmes that are at different stages of implementing the programmatic assessment approach: the bachelor's programme Biomedical Sciences and the master's programme Physician-Clinical Investigator.

The trail on the quality of internationalisation took place on the afternoon of 25 October and was part of the university's application for the Certificate for Quality in Internationalisation (CeQuInt). The meetings were held at the Faculty of Law. The panel's assessment is reported in a separate document, according to the CeQuInt framework for internationalisation at institutional level.



The trail on Quality Agreements was held in the morning of 26 October. The panel held two in-depth sessions with staff and students on the ambitions of the university, the feasibility of the plans, and the process of how the Quality Agreements had been established with the different stakeholders.

## 2.4 Structure of the advisory report and the chapters

After the site visit, the secretary drafted three reports – this advisory report on the institutional audit, the CeQulnt report, and the report on the Quality Agreements. All three reports were circulated among the panel members for comments and amendments. Those comments and amendments were incorporated in new versions, which were approved by the panel and validated by the chair on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2019. The validated versions of the report were then presented to Maastricht University with a request to check for errors of fact. The remarks made by the university have been taken into account in the final version of the respective reports.

Chapter 3 of this advisory report contains general information on Maastricht University, as well as a number of key figures. Subsequently, in chapter 4 the panel presents its judgement on the institution's quality assurance in relation to each standard of the assessment framework. For each standard, the panel's findings are listed, followed by its considerations. The findings that are based on the audit trails serve as casuistic evidence for the manner in which the quality assurance system as a whole functions within the university. The findings, therefore, do not comprise an assessment of the programmes or curriculums involved in the audit trails. Chapter 5 provides recommendations for improving the quality assurance system. The report concludes with a summary table of the judgements regarding the institution's quality assurance.

In addition, the report comprises four appendices with:

- An accreditation portrait of Maastricht University
- Information on the composition of the panel
- The programme of the site visit
- An overview of the documents perused

## 3 Profile of the institution

### 3.1 General data

Country	Netherlands
Institution	Maastricht University
Locations	Maastricht, Sittard-Geleen, Heerlen and Venlo
Status of the institution	Publicly funded

### 3.2 Profile of the institution

Maastricht University (UM) was founded in 1976 as the eighth medical faculty in the Netherlands. The university's founders opted for an innovative educational approach called Problem-Based Learning (PBL). PBL with its principles of collaborative, contextual, constructive and self-directed learning became the didactic method of UM. Over the years, UM has continued to evolve and grow while it remained focused on and committed to quality education and internationalisation. The university now counts more than 17,000 students, over 4,000 staff and offers 69 programmes at six faculties: Arts and Social Sciences; Business and Economics; Health, Medicine and Life Sciences; Law; Science and Engineering; and Psychology and Neuroscience.

The university's identity is rooted in its history and its location. UM's research is clustered along three themes that reflect Maastricht and the Limburg region: quality of life, learning and innovation, and Europe and a globalising world. The university is one of the initiators in the development of the Brightlands Campuses in Limburg, four unique communities where government, business, knowledge institutions, entrepreneurs, investors, researchers and students are brought together around themes for a sustainable future for the region and beyond.

At the core, UM is a tight-knit academic community striving to create a level playing field for staff, students and external partners alike. The strategic programme and the policy choices and decisions of the Executive Board and Management Team provide the framework within which educational quality is maintained and developed at UM. Based on the participatory governance structure, policy development and monitoring is increasingly becoming a collaborative process in which input of those involved is both legally required and highly valued. Central policies serve as frameworks leaving room, where possible, for creativity and tailored needs, and for staff and students to be able to make their own mark on their faculty.

UM is a publicly funded university and relies for this funding primarily on the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. The management concept of UM is balanced between central strategy and decentralised responsibility. The Executive Board featuring the President, Vice-president and Rector is responsible for the administration and management of the university and holds final accountability for educational quality. Twice per year, in the so-called spring and autumn meetings, the Executive Board holds a planning and review meeting with each faculty. To ensure that policies are well coordinated, the Executive Board consults monthly with the six faculty deans in Management Team meetings.

Maastricht University is part of the Transnational University Limburg (tUL). Programmes of tUL which fall under the legal responsibility of UM are covered by the Dutch system of accreditation and registration, and thus by the Institutional Quality Assurance Audit. Following a positive outcome of this institutional audit, tUL programmes are subject to the procedure for limited programme accreditations.

## Key figures

Student numbers (2017)	Total number of students of which international students Bachelor's students Master's students	17464 9168 11381 6083
Programmes (2017)	Total number of programmes of which English-language programmes Bachelor's programmes Master's programmes	69 53 18 51
Degrees awarded (2017)	Bachelor's degrees Master's degrees	2809 2907
Staff (2017)	Total scientific and support staff of which scientific staff Full professors Associate professors Assistant professors Researchers Lecturers PhD staff	3450 FTE 2079 FTE 189 FTE 192 FTE 368 FTE 323 FTE 255 FTE 752 FTE
Financial data	Total budget (2017)	€ 405 M



## 4 Assessment

### 4.1 Standard 1: Philosophy and policy

*Standard 1: The institution has a broadly supported educational philosophy and pursues a corresponding policy focused on the internal quality assurance of its education.*

#### A. Findings

UM was established in 1976 as a mono-disciplinary institution offering medical education and research in South-East Netherlands. The university distinguished itself from other medical faculties across the country by stimulating students' learning behaviour through the use of problem-based learning (PBL). This education system proved successful and - over the years - has accelerated the growth of the university in terms of students, both national and international, programmes and faculties. Now, 42 years later, UM holds the educational vision that it is a research university offering innovative and high-quality bachelor's and master's programmes using methods of instruction that promote active learning to build knowledge, develop academic (research) skills and foster an academic and professional attitude.

Reading the self-evaluation report, the panel struggled somewhat with getting the respective components - and interlinkages - between vision and strategy of the university fully clear. The discussions on site, however, convinced the panel that UM aims to educate resilient, highly-skilled graduates who are prepared for the regional, national and international labour market and who can make a meaningful contribution to society. To achieve this, UM relies on four pillars: problem-based learning, internationalisation, research education, and meaningful student experiences. Each pillar is an integral part of the educational vision and constitutes in itself a strategic element in the development of the university. It is important to appreciate the pillars of the general vision, for instance to develop PBL further for the 21<sup>st</sup> century skills.

PBL and internationalisation are in the university's DNA for a long time already. The educational theory of problem-based learning promotes the principles of constructive, collaborative, contextual and self-directed learning and underlies all bachelor and master programmes of UM. In this way students learn to become critical thinkers, to be flexible and prepared for a professional future. Internationalisation at UM has developed naturally as the university was striving for quality and diversity in education with the intention to develop competent and highly skilled graduates for the academic labour market in and beyond the Netherlands. Its current internationalisation strategy is built on two approaches - enhancing internationalisation at home and developing into a European university with a global outlook - which set a framework for the different university-wide internationalisation goals and actions.

The other components, research education and meaningful student experiences, have recently been codified as the Collaborative Open Research Education concept (CORE) and the Maastricht University Student Experience (MUSE), respectively. UM aims to deepen the connection between research and education by introducing the CORE concept in the current Strategic Programme. This should result in more interdisciplinary programmes and activities for students, in strengthened links with local, regional and international partners, and in students acquiring important 21<sup>st</sup> century skills such as analytical learning, complex problem-solving in a globalised world and (intercultural) teamwork. Creating valuable relations between the university and society and encouraging students to be actively involved in this partnership, contributes to a meaningful study experience and enhances their employability. Through MUSE, the university wants to increase its array of experiences and support those students who engage in a meaningful experience during their time in Maastricht, both within and outside their study programme, by formally recognising this engagement.

The panel noticed that all four components of the vision play an important role in UM's Strategic Programme 2017-2021: Community at the CORE. The programme also takes stock of the university's achievements 40 years after its foundation. This has resulted in a Strategic Programme setting out concrete actions to be implemented, monitored and evaluated in terms of education, research, internationalisation, alumni engagement, employability, staff development, operations, etc.

The programme also confirmed the university's core values of innovation, inclusion, responsibility and sustainability and stipulated that these will be reflected in all activities.

Furthermore, the panel observed that the six priorities which UM identified to enhance the quality of education in the framework of the Quality Agreements (2019-2022) with the Ministry of Education, are concrete translations of the university's vision on education and of the ambitions mentioned in the Strategic Programme. These priorities, which will be elaborated in a separate report, are also included in the regular internal quality assurance cycle.

Throughout its visit, the panel learned that 'community' is an important concept within UM. According to the Strategic Programme, UM sees itself first and foremost as an open and inclusive academic community striving for a good mix between Dutch, European and other international students and staff. The panel observed that this community also exists in reality: all interviewees were knowledgeable about the educational vision of UM and invariably subscribed to the values of the university. Moreover, they were enthusiastic about the current policies of the university and the plans that are envisaged for the near future.

In terms of building an open and inclusive academic community, the panel noticed that the management at UM is leading by example: several interviewees emphasised that the Strategic Programme and the self-evaluation reports for this institutional audit, as well as for CeQuInt and the Quality Agreements, have been developed in a very comprehensive and inclusive manner. After initial discussions between the Executive Board, Supervisory Board and the University Council, a bottom-up process was initiated engaging think tanks composed of staff and students to shape the cornerstones of the strategic programme. Similarly, the self-evaluation report was based on dialogue with and information by staff and students from faculties and service centres. Ten interfaculty teams were formed to analyse educational and internationalisation policies and their findings were discussed within the UM community before they were fine-tuned and finalised by the university management and the participatory bodies. Several interviewees indicated to the panel that these exercises proved to be very informative for the individual contributors and have strengthened their relationships and networks within the university. The Executive Board mentioned that the university had gained valuable insights during the exercises and that they intend to continue similar discussions in the future.

This is supported by effective governance structures relating to several strategic themes: PBL, continuous professional development, HR, internationalisation, examination boards, assessment / constructive alignment, think tanks, etc. These coordination structures provide ample room for a bottom-up development of strategy and policy but also are under a clear direction of the Executive Board requiring execution of the policy decided on. In the last years this coordinating structure has been strengthened.

## **B. Considerations**

During the site visit the panel has come to understand - and appreciate - the university's vision on education. According to the panel, this vision is clear, coherent and widely shared by all stakeholders within and outside the university. Both vision and Strategic Programme are based on experience that was accumulated over the past decades retaining those elements that are key to the university and adding / adjusting components in order to realise the vision (even) more effectively. This is particularly visible in the case of internationalisation: as internationalisation is a fundamental constituent component of the university's *raison d'être*, there is a strong match between the educational vision of the university, UM's current Strategic Programme and its strategy on internationalisation.

The panel is impressed by the way in which 'the student' takes up a central position in the considerations underlying the educational vision of the university: PBL, internationalisation, CORE and MUSE are all very much student-centred concepts. Taken together, these components do ensure - according to the panel - that the university is preparing students who are fit for the future.

Furthermore, the panel considers that the Executive Board is successful in bringing together faculties and services, staff and students, alumni and professionals around a common vision for the development of the university: paraphrasing the title of the strategic programme, the UM community is core to the university - according to the panel - as all stakeholders are actively involved in setting and discussing

priorities. It therefore comes as no surprise to the panel that the vision on education is supported widely and that its constituent components PBL, internationalisation, CORE and MUSE are internalised by all stakeholders.

Throughout the visit, the panel observed with appreciation that the Executive Board is very much operating as a professional team that consists of three enthusiastic individuals who pull together in the same direction. The discussion with the Supervisory Board revealed that the individuals on this Board are good ambassadors for the university and are operating in very much a similar way as the Executive Board: according to the panel, there is a good teamwork within and among the Boards, within the limits of their respective authority. The panel fully understands that the Supervisory Board views itself as a 'critical friend' of the Executive Board, and commends the bodies - and individuals - for such a constructive and effective relationship. Finally, the panel thinks it is highly appropriate that both Boards are composed of Dutch and non-Dutch men and women, as this mirrors the diversity that is present in the overall academic community.

Notwithstanding the production of good quality self-evaluation reports following extensive bottom-up, top-down and horizontal discussions, the panel did notice that some elements in the vision, strategy or policy of UM were very much present in the minds of the interviewees in an implicit way, but had not yet been explicitly motivated in a coherent narrative. In the trail on assessment, for instance, the interviewees explained at length the innovative actions they had undertaken but did not link the activities to a pre-existing problem they wanted to solve, neither linked it to the expectations that were connected to the innovation or to the broader goals they wanted to reach. According to the panel, the university could for instance state more explicitly why it chooses the educational concept of problem-based-learning and how UM sets itself apart from other institutions through this choice.

Furthermore, and following its extensive attention to (innovative developments in) assessment at UM, the panel wonders if assessment should become a fifth component in its own right of the educational vision. This, however, will require an explicit narrative aligning (UM's vision on) assessment to (its vision on) problem-based learning.

Before the panel arrived at Maastricht, it had read in the self-evaluation report that UM's quality culture can be "characterised as an environment in which there is room to give and receive feedback, an environment with a high level of (active) student and staff involvement, and an environment of mutual understanding and good relationships among and between staff and students. Regarding these characteristics, dialogue and interaction are key." Five days of meetings and discussions have convinced the panel that there is a genuine Maastricht University quality culture and that the above-mentioned elements are all part of this culture. The enthusiasm of the interviewees and the open atmosphere which the panel experienced during its visit are other very important indicators of the quality culture.

### **C. Judgement**

In the opinion of the panel, Maastricht University meets standard 1, Philosophy and policy.



## 4.2 Standard 2: Implementation

*Standard 2: The institution realises its educational philosophy in an effective manner, which is demonstrated by appropriate policy actions and processes, particularly relating to staff, student assessment, services and facilities, and students with a functional impairment.*

### A. Findings

The panel has established in the previous section that UM has a clear, coherent and widely supported educational vision. Before and during the site visit, the panel had the opportunity to verify to what extent this vision is translated in adequate policy measures and feasible ambitions.

The findings and considerations of the panel with regard to the internationalisation component will be described extensively in a separate report on the quality of internationalisation (CeQuInt). In short, the panel considers Maastricht in many respects a 'best-practice' delivering comprehensive internationalisation in many areas. UM is committed to using international perspectives throughout its teaching, research, and service missions as a higher education institution while internationalization influences all of campus life through the International Classroom and extra-curricular activities in the context of MUSE.

During the site visit, the panel discussed the recent endeavours of the university on PBL. Since its foundation, UM has applied problem-based learning in all educational programmes. Over time, UM has grown significantly and with it the variety of interpretations and implementations of PBL. The Executive Board asked EDLAB, the UM Institute for Education Innovation, to reflect on the development of PBL in a research project called EDview. An internal survey among 1743 students and staff found that on the one hand PBL fits well with state-of-the-art educational theories to enhance deep learning and 21st century and lifelong learning skills; on the other hand, respondents want more creativity and flexibility in implementing PBL in the future. The panel attended the final EDview symposium and learned that the university will maintain PBL whilst allowing for flexibility in order to achieve the full potential of PBL as a constructive, collaborative, contextual and self-directed form of learning. Henceforth, educational design will start from one key question: following the UM philosophy of PBL, how to design education in a way that best achieves the learning objectives?

The self-evaluation report, as well as the numerous documents on the digital platform, provided a very extensive and systematic basis for the panel to get acquainted with the university's handling of teaching staff, assessment, services and facilities, and studying with functional impairment. The panel noticed from the written materials and the discussions on site that in each domain, the university (i.e. the combination of management, faculties and services) has developed specific policies with concrete ambitions that are pursued by the appropriate entities. Furthermore, the panel observed in the discussions that interviewees are knowledgeable about the relevant actions and processes, and enthusiastic about the way these policies are designed and implemented.

In many cases, policies and services have existed for a long time and are regularly evaluated and adjusted. For instance, the Disability Support Office (DSO) has a long track record as central point of contact for all students studying at UM with a functional impairment. The facilities and support to students are regularly evaluated and amended. Recently the cooperation between DSO and the faculty stakeholders has been enhanced. Interviewees with a functional impairment indicated to the panel that they are satisfied with the support they receive from the central services and the student counsellors in the faculty. Students with chronic conditions welcome in particular the fact that they should only register once for special facilities in courses and exams. Students, moreover, mentioned to the panel that they know where to voice their concerns and that both faculty and central services go at lengths to accommodate their requests.

During the visit, the panel discussed the ambitions of the university for a new UM-wide HR strategy, called "HR policy 2.0 UM = sustainable employability". The components of this strategy include among others continuing professional development, academic careers, work-life balance and a new method of yearly appraisals. The panel observed that the HR policy developments are very inter-dependent and that the newly hired HR director aims to accommodate all components within a strict central framework.

This framework has been discussed extensively at all layers of the university; once it has been agreed upon, it will leave little leeway for individual deviancy at faculty level. The panel gathered from the discussions that there is a common understanding among the different stakeholders that common UM-wide rules will put the administrative burden with the HR team centrally and in the faculties, while freeing up time for the core business of the academic staff. HR policy development is an example of the strengthening of governance structures facilitating effective implementation of the educational strategy.

The panel noticed from the written materials and the discussions on site that since the previous institutional audit the university has paid considerable attention to assessment. Following a number of external programme accreditations that found gaps in the assessment of bachelor and master theses, the Executive Board appointed a central assessment coordinator. This coordinator developed an assessment framework in close collaboration with the faculties and assisted each faculty in setting up or fine-tuning its assessment policies.

The panel gathered from the past performance trail and the trail on assessment that across the university more attention is paid to constructive alignment in educational design: in this way, the assessment tasks are interlinked more closely with the teaching and learning activities in a course and the respective intended learning outcomes of the programme. Several interviewees mentioned, moreover, that in order to enhance clarity and transparency in assessment, a professionalisation process for the Boards of Examiners and the educational management was organised. One of the elements was (re)defining who is Responsible, Accountable, and who should be Consulted and Informed (RACI). The panel observed that the RACI process has led to the reorganisation of assessment processes and to a better positioning of the Board of Examiners and the Assessment Committees.

The panel learned with interest about several initiatives and good practices at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASoS), the School of Business and Economics (SBE) and the Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences (FHML). According to the panel, the latter faculty has developed a particularly interesting vision on assessment, featuring assessment of learning, assessment for learning and assessment as learning. Moreover, the experiences of two FHML programmes with programmatic assessment are highly encouraging as it seems a particularly suited assessment form that strengthens the alignment with the educational approach based on the principles of problem-based learning.

The discussions also highlighted that there is a pattern in the way policies are developed, decided upon and implemented. The panel gathered from several examples that the general framework is developed through bottom-up and top-down consultations, as well as in horizontal platforms such as the Education platform of Rector and Vice-Deans of Education, or the gathering of Chairs of the Boards of Examiners. In all cases, final decisions are taken by the Executive Board upon consultation of the faculty deans in the Management Team.

Finally, the panel gathered both in the written materials and the discussions on site that students and staff play an important and active role within the university. UM stimulates student – and staff – involvement in the participatory bodies such as the University Council, Faculty Councils and Education Programme Committees. In several faculties students are advisors in Faculty Boards, department meetings and course planning groups. At several occasions, staff and students indicated to the panel that they appreciate working together, both in formal settings and in informal gatherings, e.g. to discuss self-evaluation reports. Students and staff alike feel that UM is putting in practice the idea of an open and inclusive UM community, while from their side students and staff can express their commitment to UM through enthusiastic engagement.

## **B. Considerations**

The panel considers that UM's educational vision is translated adequately in a wide range of policies that are fit for purpose. In this respect, panel considers that the Strategic Programme 2017-2021 constitutes a timely document featuring a comprehensive range of actions to support the further development of the university in the near future.

Moreover, the many examples of actions and processes which the panel came across during the visit are often inter-related: for instance, the past, present and future developments regarding problem-based



learning have a bearing on students, staff, assessment and programme management. The panel also thinks highly of the way in which several internationalisation policies are pursued, for instance on the international classroom, the language policy, student recruitment and student mobility opportunities. Moreover, the university has put in place adequate structures and resources to ensure that internationalisation policies are executed effectively. Similarly, the panel commends the university for addressing pressing issues such as the high staff workload and the increased stress levels among students through a variety of actions.

Across all policies and actions, the panel observed a number of commonalities, which it connects with the 'Maastricht way of doing things': first of all, the panel was struck by the particular decision-making process that underpins every policy decision. The panel commends UM for the way in which policies are co-created between the relevant layers and bodies representing management, faculties, services, staff and students. In each case, the process entailed a strengthening of the coordinating structures. A good example according to the panel is the way UM is approaching the new HR policy.

Secondly, the panel observed with satisfaction that the university takes its time to implement change. An appropriate pace of development allows to maintain and increase quality, whilst ensuring at the same time that the staff and/or students concerned buy in the changes. The panel considers that the developments regarding constructive alignment of programmes and courses follow an adequate pace within the different faculties.

Thirdly, the panel thinks highly of the contribution of both staff and students in developing policies and implementing actions and processes. While Dutch law stipulates the formal involvement of both staff and students in participatory bodies, the sheer enthusiasm of the interviewees has convinced the panel that their commitment goes well beyond the minimal requirements of formal involvement. Although the panel is aware that it has spoken to a selected group of students during the visit, their level of knowledge on the respective policy issues was impressive. The breakfast session with 20+ students strengthened the panel's view that across faculties students are committed to the university and appreciate the education delivered and the services offered. Similarly, the panel enjoyed very much the lively discussions it had with teaching and service staff - often at a high level of specialisation - on a variety of issues such as problem-based learning, curriculum development, constructive alignment, quality assurance of education, etc.

The panel considers that within its community UM has at disposition an enormous wealth of expertise and experience. While the university makes very good use of this 'in-house' expertise and disseminates its experiences abundantly across the globe, the panel observed that the university does not take in to the same extent expertise from elsewhere. In fact, the panel only heard of one example: in the framework of MUSE and the envisaged certification of meaningful student experiences, UM is currently looking at the practices in this regard of one Australian university. Nonetheless, the panel came across plenty of examples where external viewpoints are obtained from alumni and local stakeholders, not in the least on the Brightlands campuses. However, if the university wants to remain a dynamic and innovative force, it would benefit according to the panel from looking at developments elsewhere and from gathering in a more systematic way input from stakeholders that are genuinely external to the university.

### **C. Judgement**

In the opinion of the panel, Maastricht University meets standard 2, Implementation.

### 4.3 Standard 3: Evaluation and monitoring

*Standard 3: The institution systematically evaluates whether the intended policy objectives relating to educational quality are achieved. Relevant stakeholders are involved in this process.*

#### **A. Findings**

Based on the materials and discussions, the panel gathered that quality assurance at Maastricht University consists of an interlinked system which is structured according to the Deming cycle plan-do-check-act and is present at various levels: institutional, faculty, programme and course. Within these levels, more cycles are embedded, linked to specific themes. According to the panel, UM is aware of the importance of evaluation and evaluation tools as it is using various instruments to check progress and results. The outcomes are discussed and used to improve the policy and process, where needed.

The Executive Board has overall responsibility for the quality of education, which is regularly discussed in the Management Team with the deans. The Faculty Boards are mandated by the Executive Board to ensure the quality of education within the faculty. Within the general UM framework, each faculty has its own setup of the quality assurance cycle. The Faculty Boards also conduct annual planning and monitoring meetings on the qualitative and quantitative aspects of teaching. In the two larger faculties Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences (FHML) and School of Business and Economics (SBE), these responsibilities are mandated to the respective Institutes for Education.

As part of its inquiries on the past performance trail, the panel was informed about the quality assurance system at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASoS) and at the School of Business and Economics. The panel observed that FASoS has a system that addresses educational quality at strategic level (mirroring the UM annual strategy measurement cycle), at tactical level (per programme) and at course level. Quality Assurance at SBE is organised through the Education Institute as a continuous improvement process with several annually recurring “closing the loop” cycles at different levels. In order to maintain the overview, the School is using a year calendar that is aligned with the planning of the decision making bodies and a monitoring table that includes all recommendations and actions to be taken as part of the PDCA-cycle. Furthermore, the panel learned that SBE is regularly peer reviewed by not only national (NVAO) but also international (AACSB, EQUIS, AMBA) accreditation bodies and incorporates their respective requirements in a comprehensive quality assurance system featuring elements such as the assurance of education, assurance of learning and assurance of assessment, and external signals such as surveys, rankings and changes in legislation.

During the visit, the panel was shown the management information system ‘Be Informed’, a central data warehouse in which information from difference source systems is gathered. In order to retrieve more accessible and easy-to-use information, the system has been expanded recently with a dashboard that generates data sets following very specific UM-wide definitions on education, study success, research, human resources, valorisation, strategy, finance and facilities. The panel noticed, moreover, that UM is using a balanced score card with commonly agreed key performance indicators to measure the performance in a certain area. The indicators are linked to the strategic programme, but are not one-on-one reflections of the strategic programme goals.

Since the previous institutional audit, UM is paying more attention to peer review visitations and external accreditations. As of 2017, the six-year external programme accreditation cycle is integrated as an additional loop in the internal quality assurance system of UM. The panel understands from the discussions that UM, following a series of partly problematic programme accreditations, wants to incorporate feedback and recommendations from peer reviews to complement the signalling function of its internal system. In this cycle, Faculty Boards report to the Executive Board within six months after each programme accreditation presenting a plan of action that is based on the input received. Within three years the programme is expected to complete a midterm review, the results of which are shared again with the Executive Board .

The panel observed that, also with regard to monitoring and evaluation, UM students play an important role in the quality assurance cycle. Students are represented in all participatory bodies at central, faculty and programme level. Moreover, individual students are asked to assess the quality of each course,

including the assessment. Students indicated that their concerns are taken seriously and that the outcomes of course evaluations are shared with the staff and followed up where needed. Moreover, the panel came across several cases where alumni are directly involved in the programme or the domain they have studied: alumni at FASoS are part of external advisory boards, at the Faculty of Law they meet in alumni councils, and SBE invites alumni to their International Advisory Boards at faculty or programme level. In line with what was mentioned in the previous standard, the panel noticed that the embedding of input from the professional field requires further attention, both at central university level and at some – not all - faculties.

### **B. Considerations**

The panel considers that UM has a strong system in place to monitor and evaluate the quality of its education. The system is functioning well at all levels of the university. This particularly positive appreciation of the panel is motivated by the numerous and invariably positive examples it has come across during the visit.

At course level the panel is impressed about the openness and effectiveness with which reported concerns and flaws in course delivery and assessment are addressed by the teaching staff. In case course evaluations give rise to adjustments, the envisaged improvements are communicated in the course manual for next year.

The panel thinks highly of the additional quality assurance cycle at programme level that has been created by the Executive Board taking on board programme input from external peer reviews. According to the panel, the comprehensive approach to educational quality assurance at the School of Business and Economics constitutes a very good practice of how a faculty can ensure the quality of its education across programmes.

At central university level, UM has at disposition adequate mechanisms to follow-up the quality of its education: in this regard, the panel thinks particularly highly of the spring and autumn meetings with the faculties and the horizontal platforms in which vice-deans of education, chairs of Examination Boards, etc. meet on specific issues. Moreover, the panel considers that the university is well equipped to collect and retrieve quantitative information at different aggregation levels and to anticipate and analyse risks. Several interviewees from different faculties have indicated that following their educational ambitions, the number of incoming students is likely to grow in the near future. This growth, however, will be accommodated within the quality parameters of the respective faculties. In this respect, the panel is convinced by the statement of the Executive Board that quality prevails over quantity and that every planned increase in student numbers growth is accounted for in the faculty plans.

Furthermore, the discussions have convinced the panel that the university involves a broad range of stakeholders in measuring the quality of its education and services at different levels: students, staff, alumni and in many cases also the professional field are consulted in a systematic way.

The current system of quality assurance is particularly strong with regard to the university's performance in education. However, the panel does see room for improvement in the way actions from the Strategic Programme have been formulated, their implementation can be followed up and their delivery / effectiveness can be measured. Intended actions such as 'develop arrangements for students in need of additional guidance and support', 'strengthen ties between regional developments and internationalisation' or 'provide optimal support for the primary process of education and research' require more concrete operationalisation. The panel suggests to define more specifically what is needed to monitor these actions and gather more focussed 'measurements' to reflect on the results.

### **C. Judgement**

In the opinion of the panel, Maastricht University meets standard 3, Evaluation and monitoring.

## 4.4 Standard 4: Development

*Standard 4: The institution has a focus on development and works systematically on the improvement of its education.*

### A. Findings

The panel has established that UM has a strong and comprehensive system in place to monitor and evaluate the quality of its education. During the site visit, the panel also had the opportunity to verify to what extent the university focuses on development (based on vision) and systematic improvement (based on evaluation).

Looking at systematic improvement, the panel observed that the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences has taken important steps to 'close the loop' and enhance both the quality of its education and the mechanisms to ensure this quality. Following a number of external reviews that found gaps in the quality of the bachelor and master theses for certain programmes, the programme management, faculty management and Executive Board have worked together to not only repair these flaws on assessment, but also to do a complete overhaul of the programme curricula and to strengthen the quality assurance mechanisms. The panel gathered from the discussions that the quality culture within the faculty was very much based on teaching and research, and is now extended to assessment and quality assurance. The faculty hired an educationalist to support the changes in the thesis trajectory, the thesis assessment format and the overall assessment policy across all programmes, including those that received a positive external accreditation review. In order to ensure that bachelor students acquire sufficient academic research skills by the time they start the thesis, a research skills learning line was elaborated featuring among others a new course in academic writing in the first year. Moreover, all programmes and their courses were revised according to the principle of constructive alignment and staff received professional development training to cope with the new programmatic developments notably with regard to assessment. Finally, all members of the Board of Examiners and the Education Programme Committee were trained to ensure that they are up to standard when it comes down to assuring the quality of education and assessment. The panel noticed during the discussions that interviewees have experienced the problematic review as a wake-up call and used it as a lever to improve the quality of their education programmes in a comprehensive way. According to one interviewee, "all these changes have resulted in a situation that now we live in a completely different faculty – in the good sense."

During the visit, the panel has come to appreciate UM as an innovative institution with an entrepreneurial spirit where there is ample room for development. UM sees education innovation as the process of developing new ideas and practices to address educational needs. The university's focus within innovation lies in the overarching strategic ambition of implementing CORE, which stands for: Collaborative – education and research are best organised in teams rather than individually; Open – open minded and inclusive; and Research Education - the integration of research and education. The panel observed from both the self-evaluation report and the discussions on site that EDLAB plays an important role in realising the CORE component of the university's vision and strategy. The previous accreditation panel had commended the university for its 'Leading in Learning' programme, which supported the development of grass-roots education projects with a potential for UM-wide uptake. In 2015, the university has turned the programme into a fully-fledged institute, under the leadership of the Vice-Rector Education. EDLAB consists of and serves the UM community of learners and educators by fostering a culture of exchange and collaboration. It is well connected to the faculties and connects individuals who are seeking inspiration from colleagues they may not encounter otherwise. EDLAB accumulates a body of knowledge and experience that allows it to be proactive, taking into account the overall mission of the university. Throughout its visit, the panel has discussed many issues that have a direct connection to EDLAB: the EDview symposium and research study on PBL, constructive alignment, global citizenship education, or the excellence programmes MaRBLLe, Honours+ and PREMIUM. The panel noticed that EDLAB is indeed a laboratory for education and a meeting place for people across the university with ideas and practices they want to share. Moreover, the experience gathered in EDLAB is used to deliver a UM-wide training offer that is complementary to the existing faculty offers and serves needs and requirements that are relevant to UM teaching staff, irrespective of their educational discipline.

The panel learned during the discussions that the university is also involving external stakeholders in its improvement and development activities. In addition to having alumni and professional field representatives structurally involved in the quality assurance cycle of programmes and faculties, the panel learned that UM is taking an active role in the strategic and economic development of the Euregion. Together with the Maastricht University Medical Centre and Zuyd University of Applied Sciences, and in close cooperation with the provincial authorities, UM has developed the “Kennis-As” (knowledge axis) programme featuring four Brightlands campuses across the province of Limburg. Brightlands is based on the triple helix concept: collaboration between government bodies, knowledge institutions and businesses ensures that the knowledge gained through research is quickly translated into new business opportunities and jobs. The research institutes on campus take an interdisciplinary approach to societal issues and challenges in the fields of health and life sciences, smart materials and sustainable chemical production processes, data science, and healthy diet. By developing educational programmes on these campuses, UM students are in contact with potential future employers and based on the PBL concept, they are tackling actual interdisciplinary assignments and problems of the organisations on site.

## **B. Considerations**

The panel considers that UM is doing very well in terms of both systematic improvement and development. The panel has read and heard about many small-scale and comprehensive initiatives to enhance the quality of education following the results of both internal and external evaluations. The panel is impressed by the breadth of the activities and by the depth with which reported flaws are taken up and communicated. The panel commends the efforts of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences in overhauling its programmes to gain full control of the quality assurance cycle.

The panel has also observed examples of effective cooperation across faculties, both in formal bodies such as the horizontal platforms of vice-deans for education or chairs of Examination Boards and in more ad hoc settings that are often organised through EDLAB. These gatherings ensure according to the panel that experiences and practices – both positive and less positive – do not remain ‘hidden’ within the walls of the programme, department or faculty, but are shared and disseminated across the university. In this respect, the panel shares the opinion of several interviewees who applauded the constructive and respectful attitude as well as the knowledgeable input from the central services in addressing flaws and adjustments on the work floor.

The panel considers that the university is well connected to the city, region, province and Euregion. UM has reached a new stage of development, establishing EDLAB and co-creating the Brightlands campuses. The panel thinks highly of EDLAB both in terms of its purpose and of the work that has been undertaken so far. Furthermore, the panel applauds the interdisciplinary approach to education and research on the Brightlands campuses and is convinced that students benefit considerably from the exposure to real-life problems issued by companies that are relevant for their future professional career. In this regard, the panel commends the university for its plans to develop more interdisciplinary institutes and programmes where teaching staff from different departments and faculties join forces in research and education.

In so far as internationalisation is concerned, the panel welcomes the changes that have been made in the governance of internationalisation since the previous accreditation. The new structure befits the organisational culture of the university and allows to gather timely input on internationalisation actions and goals from all levels of the organisation, as well as from external stakeholders. Moreover, the allocation of the internationalisation portfolio to the university President demonstrates according to the panel that internationalisation is indeed of very high importance to Maastricht.

Further to its consideration under implementation, the panel has noticed that for instance with regard to problem-based learning, the university appears rather closed to outside views. While the panel acknowledges the extensive expertise and experience of the university in this regard, UM to some extent is suffering under the rule of the restrictive headstart: being a first mover inhibits further developments because of the accumulated advancements in the past. However, there are also other universities that implement PBL and have engaged in research on the topic. Moreover, developments in society (information technology), educational innovations (flipping the classroom) and changes in student attitude (digital natives) following these developments and innovations require the university to look beyond its own approach to PBL. The panel therefore welcomes the EDview study and invites the

university to use the enthusiasm this initiative has generated as a lever to also look for inspiration outside the university.

Finally, the panel invites the university to consider the above suggestion not only within the context of PBL, but also to enhance its extensive and continuous innovation efforts by collecting good practices from institutions beyond UM.

**C. Judgement**

In the opinion of the panel, Maastricht University meets standard 4, Development.



## 4.5 Final conclusion

In the previous sections, the panel has argued that Maastricht University meets each of the four standards of the evaluation framework. According to the panel, the university:

- has a clear, coherent, student-centred and widely supported vision on education;
- has translated this vision in a wide range of policies that are fit for purpose;
- has a strong system in place to monitor and evaluate the quality of its education at all levels;
- is doing very well in terms of systematic improvement and development;
- has a genuine quality culture that is grounded in dialogue and interaction, welcomes feedback and involvement, and promotes mutual understanding.

The panel considers that the educational vision of Maastricht University is clear, coherent and widely shared by all stakeholders within and beyond the university. The panel is impressed by the way in which the student takes up a central position in the considerations underlying the educational vision of the university: PBL, internationalisation, CORE and MUSE are very student-centred concepts. The university's current attention to assessment makes the panel wonder if assessment should become a fifth component of the educational vision. This, however, will require the university to come up with an explicit narrative aligning (UM's vision on) assessment to (its vision on) problem-based learning.

Throughout the visit, the panel observed that the Executive Board is operating as a genuine team that consists of three enthusiastic individuals who pull together in the same direction and who are supported by their 'critical friends' of the Supervisory Board. Moreover, the Executive Board is successful in gathering faculties and services, staff and students, alumni and professionals around a common vision for the development of the university: the UM community is indeed core to the university.

The panel considers that UM's educational vision is translated adequately in a wide range of policies that are fit for purpose. Across all policies and actions, the panel observed a number of commonalities, which it connects with the 'Maastricht way of doing things': the panel commends UM for the way in which policies (such as the new HR strategy) are co-created between the relevant layers and bodies representing management, faculties, services, staff and students. The panel supports the university for taking its time to implement change (for instance with regard to constructive alignment) as this allows to maintain quality whilst ensuring that staff and students buy in the changes. The panel also thinks highly of the contribution of both staff and students in developing policies and implementing actions and processes: the sheer enthusiasm of the interviewees demonstrates that their commitment goes well beyond the minimal requirements of formal involvement.

The panel considers that UM has a strong system in place to monitor and evaluate the quality of its education at all levels of the university. The effectiveness with which reported concerns and flaws in course delivery and assessment are addressed by the teaching staff is impressive. The panel commends the university for adding another quality assurance cycle with programme input from external reviews. At central level, the panel considers that the spring and autumn meetings between Executive Board and faculties and the horizontal platforms of vice-deans of education, chairs of Examination Boards, etc. are good practices. Across all levels of the university, the panel observed that students, staff, alumni and the professional field are consulted in a systematic way. In so far as the actions from the Strategic Programme 2017-2021 are concerned, the panel considers that the university can be more effective in formulating the actions and in gathering data that monitor the follow-up and successful delivery of these measures.

The panel considers that UM is doing very well on both systematic improvement and development. The panel is impressed by the breadth of the activities and by the depth with which reported flaws in quality are taken up and communicated. The panel considers that UM has reached a new stage of development, establishing EDLAB and co-creating the Brightlands campuses. The panel thinks highly of EDLAB both in terms of its purpose and of the work that has been undertaken so far. Furthermore, the panel applauds the interdisciplinary approach to education and research on the Brightlands campuses. The panel however, has also noticed that in handling innovation the university is mainly looking for in-house expertise. It therefore welcomes the EDview study and invites the university to use the enthusiasm this initiative has generated as a lever to also look for inspiration outside the university.

The site visit has convinced the panel that there is a genuine Maastricht University quality culture: it is grounded in dialogue and interaction, welcomes feedback and involvement, and promotes mutual understanding. From the perspective of the panel, the enthusiasm of the interviewees and the open atmosphere in the discussions are also very important indicators of this culture.

In sum, the panel considers that Maastricht University has a quality culture and a quality assurance system that guarantee that education at this institution fulfils national and international requirements. In the opinion of the panel, the final conclusion of the institutional audit of Maastricht University is positive.





## 5 Recommendations

The panel judges positively the quality culture and quality assurance system at Maastricht University. In addition to findings and considerations, the previous sections also contained a number of suggestions. The following three recommendations have been discussed during the audit and aim to support Maastricht University in its further development:

1. The panel observed during the visit that certain elements in the vision, strategy and policy were very much present in the minds of the interviewees in an implicit way, but had not yet been explicitly motivated in a coherent narrative. The panel suggests that the university pays good attention to developing a narrative in which the implicit is made explicit.
2. The panel observed that the Strategic Programme contains several actions that have not been formulated in a way to allow for monitoring and evaluation. Moreover, the data that are currently gathered through business intelligence and key performance indicators do not encompass all actions in the Strategic Programme. The panel suggests to define more specifically what is needed to monitor these actions and gather more focussed 'measurements' to reflect on the results.
3. The panel observed that in its improvement and development efforts the university is mainly relying on in-house expertise. The panel suggests that in order to remain a dynamic and innovative force, the university looks at developments elsewhere and gathers in a more systematic way input from stakeholders that are genuinely external to the university.

### Overview of the advice

The table below reflects the panel judgement regarding each standard as presented in chapter 4.

Standard	Judgement
Vision and policy	Meets the standard
Implementation	Meets the standard
Evaluation and monitoring	Meets the standard
Development	Meets the standard
Final conclusion	<b>Positive</b>



## Appendix 1: Accreditation portrait

This document gives an overview of the accreditation outcomes of all 62 applications that Maastricht University submitted over the period 2011-2018. Only NVAO decisions under Framework 2011 are included<sup>1</sup>. This is the “second phase” of the accreditation system in the Netherlands<sup>2</sup>, i.e. before 1 July 2018. In 2011 and 2012 the NVAO still made decisions under the previous Framework. In 2012, 16 programmes of Maastricht University were positive accredited under the previous framework.

The accreditation record (or ‘portrait’) shows the results as they have been retrieved from NVAO’s documentation and information system. The data have also been verified by the university. The data presented are based on the accreditation decisions and the underlying external assessment and advisory reports. The NVAO framework for limited assessments of programmes is applicable for Maastricht University given the positive outcome of the institutional audit in 2013 (May).

The programme assessment focuses on the following quality standards: the intended and achieved learning outcomes, the teaching and learning environment, and the students’ assessment. The existing programmes are usually assessed within an assessment group by expert panels approved by NVAO. Expert panels convened by NVAO assess the new programmes. All panels are assisted by secretaries trained by NVAO.

Panels judge the quality of an existing programme on a four-point scale: unsatisfactory (onvoldoende), satisfactory (voldoende), good (goed) or excellent (excellent). New programmes and until 2012 also existing programmes are assessed as either positive or negative. Since 2014 the NVAO can also require obligatory improvements if substantial but repairable shortcomings are determined (Herstelperiode). In this case an additional assessment is conducted to establish repair of the shortcomings (Na Herstel). In 2014 a large number of programmes of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASoS) faced requirements(\*). In 2015 and 2016 all programmes proved to comply with the requirements (two even scored a ‘good’).

All the other applications for accreditation submitted by Maastricht University in the period under review have resulted in positive accreditation decisions. Several applications for initial accreditation has been withdrawn for different reasons.

The Hague, 11 October 2018

(\*) See page 17 of SER: “Policy and implementation: The necessity to give due consideration to the development of assessment policies was underlined by the fact that in 2013-2014, several programmes at FASoS were confronted with gaps in the assessment of bachelor and master theses as part of the accreditation process”.

---

<sup>1</sup> Excluding the NVAO decisions taken within the first phase of the accreditation system and until June 2018.

<sup>2</sup> The second phase of the accreditation system per 1 January 2011 (decision 21 December 2010, Stb. 2010, 862).

### Accreditation applications

Naam instelling	Universiteit Maastricht
-----------------	-------------------------

Som van Aantal									
Soort dossier	Eindoordeel en besluit	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Eindtotaal
Accreditatie NL	Goed (a)			2	2	2	1	1	8
	Herstelperiode			8	1				9
	Voldoende (a)	7	7	3	5	8	3	12	45
Totaal Accreditatie NL		7	7	13	8	10	4	13	62
Toets Nieuwe Opleiding NL	Aan voorwaarden voldaan			1					1
	Aanvraag ingetrokken (b)			2					2
	Positief				2		1	2	5
	Voorwaarden		1						1
Totaal Toets Nieuwe Opleiding NL			1	3	2		1	2	9
Eindtotaal		7	8	16	10	10	5	15	71

(a) included are 9 positive decisions on compliance with requirements after imposing requirements ('herstelperiode').

(b) Two applications are withdraw due to expiration of 'macrodoelmatigheid'. No assessment was conducted. In 2018 one additional application is withdrawn due to a negative assessment (after June).

Included are the Dutch tUL programmes

Naam instelling	transnationale Universiteit Limburg
-----------------	-------------------------------------

Som van Aantal		Jaar besluit		
Soort dossier	Eindoordeel en besluit	2013	2014	Eindtotaal
Accreditatie NL	Voldoende	1	2	3
Totaal Accreditatie NL		1	2	3
Eindtotaal		1	2	3



## NVAO decisions chronologically

Naam instelling	Universiteit Maastricht
Soort dossier	Accreditatie NL

Som van Aantal					
Jaar besluit	Naam opleiding CROHO	ISAT	Eindoordeel en besluit	Bijzondere procedures	Totaal
2012	B Geneeskunde	56551	Voldoende		1
	B Psychologie	56604	Voldoende		1
	M Arts - Klinisch Onderzoeker	66585	Voldoende		1
	M European Public Health	60296	Voldoende		1
	M Geneeskunde	66551	Voldoende		1
	M Mental Health	60006	Voldoende		1
	M Psychology	66604	Voldoende		1
2013	B Biomedische Wetenschappen	56990	Voldoende		1
	B International Business	50019	Voldoende		1
	M Affective Neuroscience	75041	Voldoende		1
	M Global Supply Chain Management and Change	60445	Voldoende		1
	M Information and Network Economics	60018	Voldoende		1
	M International Business	60019	Voldoende		1
	M Management of Learning	60001	Voldoende		1
2014	B Cultuurwetenschappen	50004	Herstelperiode		1
	B Europese Studies	56051	Herstelperiode		1
	B Kennistechnologie	50300	Voldoende		1
	B Liberal Arts and Sciences	50393	Goed		1
	M Advanced Master in Intellectual Property Law and Knowledge Management LL.M.	75064	Herstelperiode		1
	M Advanced Master in Intellectual Property Law and Knowledge Management M.Sc.	75065	Herstelperiode		1
	M European Public Affairs	60003	Herstelperiode		1
	M European Studies	69303	Herstelperiode		1
	M European Studies (SSST)	60002	Voldoende		1
	M Forensic Psychology	69305	Goed		1
	M Health Professions Education	75037	Voldoende		1
	M Kunst- & cultuurwetenschappen	60087	Herstelperiode		1
	M Mediastudies	60830	Herstelperiode		1
2015	B European Public Health	50296	Voldoende		1
	M Cognitive and Clinical Neuroscience (research)	60121	Goed		1
	M European Public Health		Voldoende		1
	M European Studies (research)	60377	Herstelperiode		1
	M Global Health	66902	Goed		1
	M Health Food Innovation Management	60512	Voldoende		1
	M Health Sciences (research)	60120	Voldoende		1
	M Mediastudies	60830	Voldoende	na herstel	1

2016	B Cultuurwetenschappen	50004	Voldoende	na herstel	1
	B Europese Studies	56051	Voldoende	na herstel	1
	M Advanced Master in Intellectual Property Law and Knowledge Management LL.M.	75064	Goed	na herstel	1
	M Advanced Master in Intellectual Property Law and Knowledge Management M.Sc.	75065	Goed	na herstel	1
	M Business Research (research)	60013	Voldoende		1
	M Economic and Financial Research (research)	60012	Voldoende		1
	M European Public Affairs	60003	Voldoende	na herstel	1
	M European Studies	69303	Voldoende	na herstel	1
	M European Studies (research)	60377	Voldoende	na herstel	1
	M Kunst- & cultuurwetenschappen	60087	Voldoende	na herstel	1
2017	M Executive Master of Finance and Control	75019	Voldoende		1
	M Health Professions Education	75037	Voldoende		1
	M International Executive Master of Finance and Control	75023	Voldoende		1
	M Kunst- & cultuurwetenschappen (research)	60087	Goed		1
2018	B Econometrie en Operationele Research	56833	Voldoende		1
	B Economie en Bedrijfseconomie	50950	Voldoende		1
	B Fiscale Economie	56402	Voldoende		1
	B International Business	50019	Voldoende		1
	M Econometrics and Operations Research	60307	Voldoende		1
	M Economics	66401	Voldoende		1
	M Financial Economics	60321	Voldoende		1
	M Fiscale Economie	66402	Voldoende		1
	M Global Supply Chain Management and Change	60445	Voldoende		1
	M Human Decision Science	60464	Voldoende		1
	M Information and Network Economics	60018	Voldoende		1
	M International Business	60019	Voldoende		1
	M Management of Learning	60001	Goed		1
Eindtotaal					62



## Appendix 2: Composition of the panel

### **Em. prof. dr. Janke Cohen-Schotanus (chair)**

Janke Cohen-Schotanus is emeritus professor at Groningen University and the University Medical Centre Groningen. She studied Psychology at Groningen University and did her PhD on the effects of curriculum changes. She was head of the Centre Innovation and Research Medical Education at UMC Groningen. Professor Cohen-Schotanus is an internationally renowned education expert in the field of quality assurance, curriculum development, educational effectiveness, and assessment. For twenty years she has been a member and chairperson of various audit committees for medicine, human movement science and health science programmes and has served on international accreditation panels in the medical sector, both at university and professional master level.

### **Dr. Agneta Bladh (member)**

Agneta Bladh is currently an independent consultant in the field of higher education and research. She holds a PhD in Political Science from Stockholm University. Dr Bladh served as State Secretary at the Swedish Ministry of Education and Science and was Rector of the University of Kalmar. Dr Bladh is chair of the Board of the Swedish Research Council, Vice-President of the Magna Charta Observatory Council and member of the Swedish Environmental Forum. Dr Bladh has been member of the governing boards of several universities in Sweden and Norway as well as commissions and evaluations in several European countries. In 2017, she was appointed by the Swedish government as special examiner of Internationalisation at Swedish Higher Education Institutions. Agneta Bladh is an expert in CeQulnt evaluations of programmes and institutions.

### **Prof. dr. Ramses Wessel (member)**

Ramses A. Wessel is Professor of International and European Law and Governance and Co-Director of the Centre for European Studies at the University of Twente. He graduated at the University of Groningen in International Law and International Relations and did his PhD at the Utrecht Law School. Professor Wessel has been a Dean of Internationalisation and a Dean of the School of Management and Governance and former Vice-Rector (Dean of Educational Innovation) of the University. In the latter role he was responsible for the design and implementation of the Twente Education Model (TOM). Professor Wessel frequently participates in higher education audits.

### **Prof. dr. Jeroen Huisman (member)**

Jeroen Huisman is professor of Higher Education and director of the Centre for Higher Education Governance Ghent (CHEGG). He studied Educational Science at Groningen University and obtained his PhD in Public Administration at University of Twente. In 2005 he was appointed professor of Higher Education Management at the University of Bath. In 2013 Professor Huisman joined Ghent University. His research interests are organizational change; institutional strategy, identity and image; and national and supra-national higher education policies and their impact. Professor Huisman is editor of Higher Education Policy, co-editor of the SRHE/Routledge Higher Education book series and co-editor of the Emerald series Theory and Method in Higher Education Research.

### **Mr. Jan Zuidam (member)**

Jan Zuidam studied Chemistry at the Technical University Delft. He joined DSM research in Geleen in 1973 where he held several positions in plant management, purchase management, business management and strategy. In 1992 he became director of DSM Research and joined the Managing Board of Directors of DSM in 1998. From 2001 until his retirement in 2010, Mr. Zuidam was Deputy-Chairman of this Board. He is member of the Supervisory Board (Raad van Commissarissen) of different companies and has been Chairman of the Limburg Employers Federation (Limburgse Werkgeversvereniging) until summer 2018.

### **Ms. Lara Schu (student-member)**

Lara Schu studied two bachelor degrees, in Mathematics and Computer Science. Since October 2015, she is enrolled in the MSc programme Computer Science at the Technical University of Kaiserslautern in

Germany. Lara has been student assistant, research assistant and teaching assistant. Throughout her studies she has been active in student unions and university committees. She also represented students during the restructuring of the German accreditation system and has been student-member in several expert panels in Germany and the Netherlands. She is certified by the European Consortium for Accreditation (ECA) to assess the quality of internationalization of programmes and institutions who apply for CeQuInt.

The panel is assisted by:

- Mark Delmartino, MDM CONSULTANCY bvba, secretary;
- Frank Wamelink, NVAO process coordinator.

All panel members and the secretary have signed a declaration of independence and confidentiality.





## Appendix 3: Schedule of the site visit

### Day 1 – Monday 22 October 2018: Institutional Audit

- 08.30 Preparatory meeting panel
- 11.00 Brief tour of UM education facilities by Harm Hospers, Vice-Rector Education
- 11.30 Welcome luncheon and introduction of UM
- Meet & greet between panel members and UM staff and students
- 13.00 Session 1 – meeting with the Executive Board
- Meeting with the President, rector and Vice-president
  -
- 14.00 Session 2 – meeting with the Supervisory Board
- Meeting with the Chair and two members
  -
- 15.15 Session 3 – ITK standard 1 (vision)
- Meeting with the Rector, Dean FHML and Vice-Dean Education FSE
  - 
  - meeting with the Managing director / teaching staff FPN, Teaching Staff and Chair EPC FASoS
  - Meeting with the Coordinator B European Law School and Staff member EDLAB (researcher EDview study)
  - meeting with the Chair University Council (FHML)
  - meeting with a student member University Council (FHML)
  - meeting with the former President Zuyd University of Applied Sciences
- 16.45 Presentation Management Information System
- meeting with the Vice-Rector Education
  - meeting with the Business Analyst (MUO)
- 17.00 Open consultation hour
- Two people made use of this opportunity
- 18.00 Internal meeting panel
- 19.00 End of day 1

### Day 2 – Tuesday 23 October 2018: Institutional Audit

- 08.00 Session 4 – Breakfast with students
- Students of participatory bodies
- meeting with the president Student Project Team and a member Education Programme Committee Medicine (FHML)
  - Meeting with a member EPC Liberal Arts & Sciences (FSE) and a meeting with member Faculty Council FPN
  - Meeting with 3 student members UC
- Students combining study with a functional impairment or top sport
- Meeting with top athlete (FoL), an alumna UM, student functional impairment (FSE), student B Dutch Law, functional impairment (FoL) a top athlete (SBE), student functional impairment (FoL)
- Students combining study with an excellence programme
- Meeting with a student PREMIUM (FHML), student MaRBLe (FPN), student Honours Plus (SBE), student Honours Plus (FoL), student MaRBLe (FPN), student PREMIUM (FHML) and a student MaRBLe (FHML and FPN)
- Students combining study with volunteer work or study association
- Meeting with a student part of the Refugee Project Maastricht, president United Nations Student Association, student part of the Refugee Project Maastricht, a co-head of the Journal, United Nations Student Association and a secretary-general of EuroMUN, UN Student Association
- 09.15 Session 5 – ITK standard 2 (implementation)
- Meeting with the Vice-Dean Education FPN
  - Meeting teaching staff and Chair Board of Examiners (FHML)
  - Meeting with a Policy advisor assessment (MUO)
  - Meeting with the EDLAB training coordinator and teaching staff (FSE)
  - Meeting with the Director SSC and Director HRM

- Meeting with the Head Education Office (SBE)
  - Meeting with the Study Advisor FoL
  - Meeting a student member UC (FHML)
- 10.45 Session 6 – ITK standard 3 (monitoring and evaluation)
- Meeting with the Vice-Rector Education, and Vice-Dean Education FASoS
  - Meeting with teaching staff FPN and meeting the chair Board of Examiners FHML
  - Meeting with teaching staff SBE
  - Meeting with the senior lecturer and Director of Studies FoL
  - Meeting with the Head Business Intelligence Organisation (MUO)
  - Meeting with the student B European Studies (FASoS)
- 12.00 Lunch and internal panel meeting
- 13.00 Meeting about internal audit procedures
- Meeting with the Internal Auditor (MUO)
  - Meeting with the Vice-President and the Vice-Dean Education FASoS
- 13.30 Session 7 – ITK standard 4 (development)
- Meeting with the Dean FSE and the Vice-Dean Education FoL
  - Meeting with the Director MUO and Strategic Developments
  - Meeting with the EDLAB coordinator
  - Meeting with the teaching staff FHML, staff member EPC
  - Meeting with the project manager CORE, MUSE, Employability (MUO)
  - Meeting with the staff member UC (FPN) and the teaching staff FPN
  - Meeting with Alderman for Education, City of Maastricht
- 15.00 Session 8 – Meeting with staff in governance and management of education
- Meeting with the Rector,
  - Meeting with the Dean SBE and Dean FPN
  - Meeting with the Director Education Institute SBE and Director Education Institute FHML
  - Meeting with the Vice-Dean Education FSE
- 15.45 Internal panel meeting
- 16.30 EDview symposium – presentation of results on PBL research
- 17.30 Co-creation session on first part of ITK visit
- Meeting with the President and
- Rector and the Vice-President
- 18.15 Internal panel meeting
- 19.15 End of day 2

**Day 3 – Wednesday 24 October 2018: Past Performance trail**

- 08.30 Session 9 – Introduction of Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
- Meeting with the Dean and the Vice-Dean Education
  - Meeting with the Programme Director B Arts & Culture and with Programme Director M European Studies
  - Meeting with the Director
  - Meeting with the student B European Studies and student advisor FB
- 09.15 Session 10 – Bachelor programme Arts & Culture
- Meeting with two members of the teaching staff
  - Meeting with the teaching staff and chair EPC
  - Meeting with the teaching staff and member AC
  - Meeting with the teaching staff and member FC
  - Meeting with the , student B Arts & Culture and student member EPC
  - Meeting with the policy advisor education
- 10.00 Session 11 – Master programme European Studies
- Meeting with the teaching staff and member EPC
  - Meeting with teaching staff and chair EPC
  - Meeting with teaching staff and member FC
  - Meeting with a member assessment committee and education scientist
  - Meeting with the student member EPC
- 10.30 Session 12 – Board of Examiners
- Meeting with the teaching staff and Chair BoE (until August 2018)
  - Meeting with the teaching staff and Chair BoE (as of September 2018)



- Meeting with the teaching staff and vice-chair BoE
- 11.15 Session 13 – Students
  - Meeting with two student bachelor student Arts & Culture
  - 
  - Meeting with the master student European Studies
  - Meeting with a bachelor student European Studies, former advisor FB
  - Meeting with the president student representatives
- 12.00 Lunch and internal panel meeting
- 13.00 Session 14 – Introduction School of Business and Economics
  - Meeting with the Dean
  - Meeting with an Associate Dean Research and Education
  - Meeting with the Director Education Institute and a Director bachelor's programmes
  - Meeting with the Director master's programmes
  - Meeting with the Policy advisor Quality Assurance
  - Meeting with a student B Economics & Business Economics, student advisor FB
- 13.45 Session 15 – Board of Examiners, Assessment Committee and participatory bodies
  - Meeting with the teaching staff and chair BoE
  - Meeting with the teaching staff and member FC and teaching staff and member EPC
  - Meeting with the teaching staff and member assessment committee
  - Meeting with a policy advisor
  - Meeting with an student M Econometrics & Operations Research and member EPC
- 14.30 Session 16 – Bachelor International Business and Master Economics
  - Meeting with the programme leader bachelor IB
  - Meeting with the course coordinator B IB
  - Meeting with two programme leaders M EC
  - 
  - Meeting with the course coordinator M EC
  - Meeting with the student and career counsellor
- 15.00 Session 17 – Students and alumni
  - Meeting with 3 students B IB
  - Meeting with 3 students M EC
- 15.30 Internal panel meeting
- 16.00 Co-creation session discussing findings past performance trail
  - Meeting with the Dean SBE and the Associate Dean Research and Education
  - Meeting with the Director Education Institute SBE
  - Meeting with the Dean FASoS and the Vice-Dean Education FASoS
  - Meeting with the Vice-Rector Education
- 16.45 Internal panel meeting
- 18.00 End of day 3

#### **Day 4 – Thursday 25 October 2018**

##### ITK Trail Assessment at Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences

- 08.30 Session 18 – Introduction FHML and topic assessment
  - Meeting with the Vice-Dean FHML and the
  - Meeting with the Director Education Institute
  - Meeting with the Programme director domain Health, the
  - , Programme director domain Medicine and Programme director domain Biomedical Sciences
  - Meeting with the Head education policy
  - Meeting with a student member Board of Directors Health
- 09.15 Session 19 – Master programme Physician-Clinical Investigator (PCI)
  - Meeting with the Programme director domain Medicine and the
  - Programme coordinator
  - Meeting with the Coordinator thesis phase and the course coordinator
  - Meeting with two master students PCI
  -
- 10.15 Session 20 – Bachelor programme Biomedical Sciences (BMS)
  - Meeting with two programme directors

- 
- Meeting with the , thesis coordinator
- Meeting with the portfolio coordinator and
- course coordinator
- Meeting with two bachelor students BMS
- 11.00 Session 21 – Quality assurance assessment
  - Meeting with the teaching staff and Chair BoE domain Health
  - Meeting with the teaching staff, Chair BoE domain Biomedical Sciences
  - Meeting with the Chair assessment committee
  - Meeting with the Chair ‘bloktoets’ review committee
- 11.45 Session 22 – Quality assurance assessment
  - Meeting with the chair EPC domain health,
  - Chair EPC domain Medicine and
  - chair EPC domain Biomedical sciences
  - Meeting with a master student Medicine and Vice-chair EPC
  - Meeting with a bachelor student Biomedical Sciences and Vice-Chair EPC
  - Meeting with the policy advisor
- 12.15 Lunch and internal panel meeting
- 13.00 Co-creation session discussing findings Assessment trail
  - Meeting with the Rector,
  - Vice-Dean FHML and
  - Director Education Institute
  - Meeting with 3 programme directors
  -
- 13.30 Short tour through the campus facilities by a student

#### CeQuInt Trail at Faculty of Law

- 14.00 Internal panel meeting
- 14.45 Session 23 – CeQuInt Standard 1
  - Meeting with the Dean
  - Meeting with two teaching staff and chairs FC
  - 
  - Meeting with four member of the teaching staff
  - 
  - Meeting with a bachelor student European Law School
  - Meeting with the policy advisor internationalization (MUO)
  - Meeting with the Director BCS Higher Education Consultancy (Luxembourg) and EFMD Business School Services and EU policies in higher education
- 15.45 Session 24 – CeQuInt standards 2-3-4
  - Meeting with the director of studies
  - Meeting with the coordinator Bachelor European Law School
  - Meeting with the, teaching staff and expert International Classroom
  - Meeting with the coordinator M Intellectual Property Law and Knowledge Mgt
  - Meeting with the teaching staff and chair BoE
  - Meeting with the bachelor student European Law School
  - Meeting with the Alumna European Law School and M Globalisation and Law
  - Meeting with the Associate Director Marketing and Communications
- 16.45 Session 25 – CeQuInt standard 5
  - Meeting with the President and Vice-Dean Education
  - Meeting with the teaching staff and vice-chair FC
  - Meeting with four members of the teaching staff
  - 
  - Meeting with the attorney and teaching staff
  - Meeting with a bachelor student European Law School
- 17.30 internal panel meeting
- 18.30 End of day 4

#### **Day 5 – Friday 26 October 2018**



09.00 Co-creation session discussing findings CeQuInt trail

- Meeting with the President, Dean FoL and the Vice-Dean Education FoL
- Meeting with the teaching staff SBE and former Vice-Dean Internationalisation

Trail Quality Agreements

09.30 Internal panel meeting

10.00 Session 26 – Quality Agreements standards 1 and 3

- Meeting with the Vice-President, the Vice-Rector Education and the Dean FoL
- Meeting with the Member UC
- Meeting with the Director Education Institute SBE
- Meeting with the Chair Faculty Council FSE
- Meeting with the Business Analyst (MUO)
- Meeting with a student University Council (FHML)
- Meeting with a former member Faculty Council SBE

11.15 Session 27 – Quality Agreements standard 2

- Meeting with the Rector, the Chair UC and Chair Faculty Council FHML
- Meeting with the policy advisor Quality Agreements (MUO)
- Meeting with the master student Dutch Law and student advisor FB (FoL)
- Meeting with the master student Medicine and student assessor FB (FHML)
- Meeting with a student University Council (FoL)

12.30 Lunch and internal panel meeting

15.00 Feedback panel on all three audits: ITK, CeQuInt and Quality Agreements

15.30 end of site visit



## Appendix 4: Overview of the documents perused

### *Basic documents*

- Self-evaluation report institutional audit 2018, Maastricht University, October 2018
- Self-evaluation report 2018. Certificate for Quality in Internationalisation, October 2018
- Quality Agreements 2019-2024, Maastricht University, 2018
- Community at the CORE. Strategic programme 2017-2021, Maastricht University, 2016

### *Additional background information for the visit*

In view of the institutional audit and its different trails, the university had prepared a digital archive with many documents on the issues raised in the self-evaluation reports and/or to be discussed during the trails. The documents were organised per evaluation standard/trail and contained above all examples illustrating the principles mentioned in the reports and practices highlighted during the trails.

### Standard 1 – Vision

- Example development UM Strategic Programme
  - Preparation strategic programme
- Updates implementation strategic programme
  - Example development MUSE
  - Employability
  - Excellence programmes

### Standard 2 – Implementation and policy

- Staff
  - Example PDCA professional development teaching staff
  - Human resources background information
  - Work-life balance
- Assessment
  - Assessment policy PDCA
  - Assessment logistics
- Facilities and services
  - Examples from the university library
  - Examples of the educational logistical process
- Studying with a functional impairment

### Standard 3 – Monitoring and Evaluation

- Spring and Autumn meeting cycles
  - documents for each faculty, Student Service Centre and University Library
- Examples PDCA balanced score card
- Examples PDCA internationalisation
- Examples PDCA matching
- Examples PDCA assessment
- Reports NSE and ROA

### Standard 4 – Development

- Brightlands campus development
- CORE and MUSE
- EDLAB

### Audit trail QA at Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASoS)

- Examples PDCA cycle development Education Plans
  - Education plans Bachelor Arts & Culture
  - Education plans Master European Studies

- General documentation on Bachelor Arts & Culture and on Master European Studies
  - Academic year 2015-2016
  - Academic year 2016-2017
  - Academic year 2017-2018
  - Examples evaluations and student feedback incorporation at course level
- Spring and Autumn meetings sessions FASoS – Executive Board

#### Audit trail QA at School of Business and Economics (SBE)

- Quality Assurance cycle bachelor International Business
  - Example community building
- Quality Assurance cycle master Economics
  - Redesign MSc Economics

#### Audit trail Assessment at Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences (FHML)

- Reading guide
- General information on FHML
- Faculty assessment policy
- General information on study programmes audit trail
- Assessment policy at programme level
  - Assessment policy Physician Clinical Investigator (A-KO)
  - Assessment policy Biomedical Sciences (BMS)
- Assessment evaluation for the two programmes
  - Assessment evaluation A-KO
  - Assessment policy BMS

#### *Additional documents*

Several sessions started with a short presentation by the university on the topic of discussion. The presentations were handed out to the panel on site:

- Business Intelligence
- UR policy 2.0 UM = Sustainable Employability
- QA at FASoS. Educational Quality at strategic, tactical and course levels
- School of Business and Economics. Facts, Governance, Portfolio and QA
- SBE QA Year Calendar
- SBE QA Monitoring Table Education
- Introduction to FHML: education and assessment
- EDview position paper on PBL
- EDview. The do's, don'ts and don't know's of teaching and learning at UM
- CeQuInt audit trail at Faculty of Law
- Confirmation Faculty Councils on Quality Agreements



The panel was commissioned by NVAO to draw up this advisory report within the framework of the Institutional Quality Assurance Assessment of Maastricht University.

Application no.: 006282

#### Colophon

Draft Advisory Report  
Maastricht University  
Institutional Quality Assurance Assessment  
*15 January 2019*



Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatieorganisatie  
Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders

Parkstraat 28 • 2514 JK Den Haag  
P.O. Box 85498 • 2508 CD The Hague  
The Netherlands

T +31 (0)70 312 23 00  
E [info@nvao.net](mailto:info@nvao.net)  
[www.nvao.net](http://www.nvao.net)