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Foreword

This report describes the findings of the European Public Health assessment committee for the bachelor's programme European Public Health of Maastricht University. The report is part of the quality assessment of university bachelor's and masters's programmes in the Netherlands. The purpose of this report is to present a reliable picture of the results of the degree programme, to give feedback to the internal quality assurance of the programme, and to serve as the basis for accreditation of this programme by the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO).

Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities (QANU) aims to ensure independent, unbiased, critically constructive assessments using standardised quality criteria, while taking specific circumstances into account.

The QANU European Public Health assessment committee has fulfilled its task in Maastricht with great dedication. The programme has been evaluated in a thorough and careful manner. We expect that the judgements and recommendations will be carefully considered by the programme organisation and the Board of the University.

We thank the chairman and members of the assessment committee for their willingness to participate in this assessment and for the dedication with which they carried out their task. We also thank the staff of the department concerned for their efforts and for their cooperation during the assessment.
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Mr. Chris J. Peels
Director

Dr. Jan G.F. Veldhuis
Chairman of the Board
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Director
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PART I: GENERAL PART
1. Structure of the report

In this document, the European Public Health assessment committee reports its findings. The report consists of two parts: a general part (Part I) and a programme part (Part II).

The general part summarises the tasks, composition, input documentation and working methods of the assessment committee. This part of the report also contains the domain-specific requirements that were used by the assessment committee. The programme part describes the evaluation and assessment of the bachelor's programme in European Public Health at Maastricht University. This programme part is structured in accordance with the accreditation criteria of NVAO (Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders).
2. Task and composition of the assessment committee

2.1. Task of the assessment committee
The task of the assessment committee is to evaluate and assess the bachelor's programme in European Public Health at Maastricht University according to the accreditation criteria set by NVAO. Based on and in accordance with these criteria, the assessment committee is expected to assess different aspects of quality of the programme, based on the information provided by the programme in the self-evaluation report and on discussions during the site visit. The assessment report contains implicit recommendations by the committee; however, the emphasis lies on the assessment and justification of basic quality. The assessment committee has been requested to assess the bachelor's programme European Public Health (CROHO number 50296).

2.2. Constitution of the committee
The assessment committee consists of a chairman and four members. Appendix B lists short descriptions of the curricula vitae of the committee members.

Chair
- prof. dr. J. (Jan) de Maeseneer, a Belgian physician and professor of family medicine at the University of Ghent, Belgium.

Members
- prof. dr. W. (Walter) Devillé, professor ‘Refugees and Health’ with the department of Medical Anthropology, Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, University of Amsterdam;
- prof. dr. M. Wieringa-de Waard professor, Department of General Practice/Family Medicine, Academic Medical Center, University of Amsterdam;
- dr. D. Zeegers, executive director of European Public Health Association;
- A. van der Star, student of the bachelor’s programme Health Sciences, Institute of Health Policy & Management, Erasmus University of Rotterdam.

All members of the assessment committee signed a declaration of independence as required by the QANU protocol to ensure that the committee members judge without bias, personal preference or personal interest, and the judgement is made without undue influence from the institute, the programme or other stakeholders.

The project leader of the assessment was N.M. Verseput MSc, QANU staff member. The site visit took place on 25 and 26 October 2010. The programme of the site visit is included in appendix C.
3. Working method of the assessment committee

3.1. Introduction
The assessment committee was constituted formally on 25 October 2010. During this inaugural meeting the assessment committee discussed its task and the working methods. Furthermore, the assessment committee discussed the proposal for domain-specific requirements. This proposal was adjusted and subsequently instituted as the Domain-Specific Requirements, provided in chapter 4.

3.2. Preparatory phase
After receiving the self-evaluation report, the project leader checked the quality and completeness of the information provided. After approval, the self-evaluation report was forwarded to the assessment committee. During the initial meeting at the start of site visit, the assessment committee discussed their findings.

In addition to the self-evaluation report, the committee members each read three theses for the programme that is assessed. This led to the assessment of a total of 15 theses for the entire programme. When considered necessary, committee members could read additional theses during the site visit. Selection of the theses was done at random by the project leader and the members of the committee. Since the assessment committee has to evaluate programmes leading to a scientific degree (BSc), specific attention was given to the scientific level of the theses, the requirements, carefulness of judgement by the reviewer of the programme and the assessment procedure used. After all, in a thesis the student has to show evidence of the required qualifications to earn a degree.

Within the committee a specific allocation of tasks was agreed upon, based on its expertise and composition. It should be emphasized that although specific tasks are assigned, the entire assessment committee remains responsible for the judgements and the final report.

3.3. Site visit
Before the site visit the project leader created a programme for the interviews. The draft programme was discussed with the chair of the assessment committee and the coordinator of the programme. During the site visit, interviews are held with a representative of the faculty board, Director of Education Health, Chair of the Department of International Health, Deputy Director of the Institute for Education, Programme Coordinator, Educational Committee, Examination Board, alumni, study advisor and other supporting staff. Furthermore, a selection of both students, lecturers and coordinators was interviewed.

During the site visit the committee received additional information, for example study books and reports from the meetings of the Educational Committee. This information was studied during the site visit. A consultation hour was scheduled to give students and staff of the programmes the opportunity to talk to the assessment committee. No requests were received for the consultation hour.

The assessment committee used a significant part of the final day of a site visit to discuss the assessment of the programme and to prepare a preliminary presentation of the findings. The site visit concluded with a presentation by the chairman in which the preliminary findings were provided. The presentation consisted of a general assessment and several specific findings and impressions of the programme.
3.4. Scores of the standards
The assessments are performed in accordance with NVAO’s accreditation framework. The scale for the scores of the standards prescribed by NVAO was adopted; each standard is scored on a four-point scale (unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good, and excellent), themes are scored on a two-point scale (satisfactory, unsatisfactory).

The assessment committee adopted the standard decision rules provided by QANU. These are:

- Unsatisfactory, which means that the level for this facet is below the basic standard of quality;
- Satisfactory, which means that the level meets the best basic standards of quality;
- Good, which means that a quality level is attained that exceeds the basic standards of quality and is the result of a well-considered policy;
- Excellent, which means that a quality level is attained that is very good in all aspects and meets international benchmarking. It is an example of international best practice.

The default assessment is ‘satisfactory’, i.e. the programme complies adequately with the criteria. The assessment committee feels that despite critical remarks, the score ‘satisfactory’ can be given to a specific standard. In those situations, the critical remarks will be accompanied by positive observations.

When the assessment committee observes a good national practice, the judgment will be ‘good’. When both a good practice and a critical remark are observed by the committee, a weighed average score is given. In the rare case that the assessment committee decides to grant an ‘excellent’ score, it aims to signal a best international practice that deserves to be copied within the academic community.

3.5. Reporting
After the site visit the project leader writes a draft report based on the findings of the committee. The draft is first read and commented upon by the committee members. The draft report is then sent to the faculty involved to check for factual irregularities. Any comments of the faculty are discussed with the chair of the assessment committee and, if necessary, with the other committee members. After that, the report becomes official.
4. Domain Specific Requirements

The programme wrote its own Domain Specific Requirements. The programme management is of opinion that the programme fits these Domain Specific Requirements.

Mission of the programme
The mission of the programme is to train students to become state-of-the-art, all-round specialists in European Public Health, specialists capable of appreciating, analysing and comprehending the impact of European and transnational integration on public health, health systems, health services, and the changing role of citizens, clients and patients.

Therefore, the focus within the B-EPH programme is upon:

- Public health as collective action for sustained population-wide health improvement, reflecting the present-day academic context of public health;
- The European dimension of public health issues and developments within local, regional, national and global public health arrangements, thus reflecting the European perspective of the programme;
- A contemporary and adaptive European agenda for Public Health, listing current and future public health issues, problems and challenges in the European region, thus providing the scope and limits of the curriculum.

Scientific context of the programme
The scientific domain of Public Health is described as: “The science and art of preventing diseases, prolonging life and promoting health through the organised efforts of society”. The ongoing relevance of the definition is reflected in its continued application, for example in the concept for New Public Health: “The broad pole of public health defines a very wide scope of organised activities, concerned not only with the provision of all types of health services, preventive and therapeutic, but also with the many other components relevant to the operation of a national health system. These involve questions on health behaviour and the environment as well as the production of resources (personnel and facilities), the organisation of programmes, the development of economic support, and the many strategies required to ensure equity and quality in the distribution of health services.” New Public Health therefore no longer only includes the traditional disciplines of epidemiology, social medicine, microbiology, human biology, socio-medical hygiene and prevention, and is not focused only on public groups at risk, but in the modern vision includes as its most important areas for attention environmental hygiene, ecology, health promotion, mental and social health hygiene, social sciences such as sociology, economics, psychology, political science and organisation and administrative studies, as well as research and theory in the field of care and health care systems.

Within the programme public health is defined from the perspective of New Public Health, namely collective action for sustained population-wide health improvement. Thus, it focuses on actions and interventions that require collective, collaborator or organised actions, highlighting the need to embed “healthy” policies not only in the area of health and health care policy making but other relevant policy fields (e.g. market, food, regional development) as well, and identifying the goals of public health as population-wide health improvement and the reduction of health inequities.
The European Perspective of the Programme

The European dimension within the programme places local, regional, national and global public health developments within a wider European perspective. Since the Treaty of Maastricht, the EU has played an increasing role in public health policy. The consequences of this are visible in the way in which internationally, within Europe and nationally, (public) health and health care are discussed and considered. According to the European Commission, community public health problems and challenges facing the Member States call for an increase in policy cooperation and coordination in the EU. The European Commission thus issued a Health Strategy, called “Together for Health”. Here, the European Commission has acknowledged the added value of working on population health – even in a global perspective – and calls for coordinated action in “healthy policy making” under the coordination of its Directorate General SANCO. However, public health policy and actions today do not only originate from the European Commission and EU Members States; other international organisations are significantly active in the international public health arena: WHO, OECD, the World Bank, and the Council of Europe, plus many NGOs such as ASPHER, EUPHA and EHMA. Accordingly, the B-EPH curriculum focuses on activities of local, regional and national health authorities, the EU, WHO, OECD etc. and important NGOs, and includes guest speakers from relevant organisations.

A European agenda for Public Health

To an increasing extent, an implicit European agenda for Public Health is determining thinking on public health and health care within the sovereign states of Europe. This European agenda for Public Health is an essential and guiding concept within the course of studies, and reflects the outlines of thinking on public health in Europe. It is not a formal, legitimised or sanctioned document, but instead is a description of current and future developments visible within academic and professional European public health thinking. The agenda is a living document in the sense that the agenda items are updated each year.

Continuous reality check from the professional world

The B-EPH remains on the right track, being responsive to the challenges and needs of the professional world, owing to experienced teaching staff carrying out research and consultancy on the European Public Health stage and working in scientific associations such as the European Public Health Association (EUPHA), as well as holding positions in the Association of Schools of Public Health in the European Region (ASPHER). A vital role is also played by regular checks by the Advisory Board of European Health that includes representatives from DG SANCO, WHO Europe, the European Public Health Alliance and the Dutch Permanent Representation to the European Union. Furthermore, close collaboration with dozens of host organisations for the B-EPH third year students doing placements gives valuable feedback on the content and methodology taught in B-EPH. Feedback from the Advisory Board and the host organisations confirms that the B-EPH study programme is unique in its scope and highly appreciated in the professional world.

Labour market developments

In Europe, there are three dominant trends in respect of the relationship between the health sector labour market and education: first, the diversification of the professional structure, expressed for example in considerable growth in the number of courses and the diversity in graduation options; second, the increased academic content of professions and disciplines; and finally, the internationalisation and individualisation of professions and professional fields within the public health sector.
The above-mentioned developments are associated with an increase in public health capacity within Europe. An increased demand for public health specialists is not only apparent in European institutions, but also in the many non-governmental organisations active in the field of public health at a European level. The enlargement of the EU in May 2004 brought in 10 new member states. In these countries progress towards a European “public health acquis communautaire” is ongoing. As of 2003 the EU actively supports this process within the public health field. However, most of the accession countries are facing limited human capacity in public health. In addition, there is a mounting need for graduates with an understanding of European health policy in other international agencies, such as WHO, the Council of Europe, and the investment banks such as the EIB and EBRD. We hold that our graduates, with specific training in European public health, will possess a significant competitive advantage in this expanding job market compared to traditionally recruited staff. Finally, decisions originating from an international or European level impact on national health policies (i.e. tobacco control or free movement of patients across borders). This impact is creating new demands on policy advisers, not only at national levels, but also increasingly at regional and municipal level, on health insurance companies, professional bodies and even universities, reflecting the growing representation of such bodies in the Brussels arena.

Examples of job perspectives for B-EPH graduates

International project managers prevention:

- Cross-border care organisations
- EU regional agencies
- National environment agencies

Public health advocates in NGOs:

- Food safety authorities
- European Public Health Alliance (EPHA)
- European Hospital and healthcare Federation (HOPE)
- European Health Management Association (EHMA)

International health consultants:

- Hospitals
- Public health services
- Private public health consultancy
- Ministries of health

Civil servants; EU health representative:

- EU in Brussels
- DG Sanco
- World Health Organisation
PART II: PROGRAMME REPORT
5. Report on the bachelor's programme European Public Health offered by Maastricht University

Administrative data

Bachelor's programme European Public Health:

Name of the programme: Bachelor of Science European Public Health
CROHO number: 50296
Level: bachelor
Orientation: academic
Number of EC: 180 EC
Degree: Bachelor of Science
Mode(s) of study: full time
Location(s): Maastricht
Expiration of accreditation: 25 October 2011

The site visit of the European Public Health assessment committee to the Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences of Maastricht University took place on 25 and 26 October 2010.

5.0. Structure and organization of the faculty

The Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences (hereinafter referred to as FHML) of Maastricht University is the result of a merger (as of 1 January 2007) between the former Faculty of Medicine and the Faculty of Health Sciences. The main motivations behind the merger were a shared vision on health and health care, the creation of a unit for strategic educational and research alliances, an effective internal organization, and the introduction of a strong academic component in Maastricht University Medical Centre (Maastricht UMC+), which was established in January 2008. Maastricht UMC+ is the result of a merger between FHML and the University Hospital of Maastricht (azM). Maastricht UMC+/FHML consists in total of 43 departments: organizational units focusing on a certain discipline, to which only academic staff is appointed. The departments’ task is to maintain and expand knowledge and expertise in their respective fields. Furthermore, the departments contribute to the conduct of all educational and research programmes within the faculty.

The programmes are organized within the Institute for Education (IfE) and five research schools. The IfE, headed by a scientific director, is responsible for the education of the entire Faculty, from the standpoint not only of educational content (quality and innovation), but also staffing, logistics, management and planning. The IfE offers a broad range of bachelor’s and master’s programmes. Its three major domains are Medicine, Health Sciences and Molecular Life Sciences.

The bachelor’s programme European Public Health is part of the domain of Health Sciences. The programme is headed by the programme coordinator who is in charge of and accountable for the management, structure, content objectives, and quality of the programme. The programme coordinator is supported by semester and module coordinators.
5.1. The assessment framework

5.1.1. Aims and objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S1: Subject-/discipline-specific requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The intended learning outcomes of the programme correspond with the requirements set by professional colleagues, both nationally and internationally and the relevant domain concerned (subject/discipline and/or professional practice).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

According to the self-evaluation report, the scientific domain of Public Health is described as: ‘The science and art of preventing diseases, prolonging life and promoting health through the organized efforts of society’. Within the programme, Public Health is defined from the perspective of New Public Health, namely collective action for sustained population-wide health improvement. It focuses on actions and interventions that require collective, collaborative or organized actions, highlighting the need to embed ‘healthy’ policies not only in the area of Health and Health Care policy making, but in other relevant policy fields as well (e.g. market, food, regional development), and identifying the goals of Public Health as population-wide health improvement and the reduction of health inequities. This general profile of the programme is specified on the basis of 6 general and 28 final learning outcomes, which are listed in Appendix A.

The European dimension within the programme places local, regional, national and global Public Health developments within a wider European perspective. The European agenda for Public Health is an essential and guiding concept within the course of studies, and reflects the outlines of thinking on Public Health in Europe. The programme also keeps track of the challenges and needs of the professional world, with its experienced teaching staff carrying out research and consultancy on the European Public Health stage and working in scientific associations such as the European Public Health Association (EUPHA), as well as holding positions in the Association of Schools of Public Health in the European Region (ASPhER). In addition, the Advisory Board of the programme, composed of representatives from the professional field, discusses meta-subjects touching upon the relation between the programme and the professional field, European added value and the inclusion of relevant developments emerging from the field of work, the labour market and the policy arena. Its involvement leads to changes in the curriculum (see standard 17).

Assessment

The committee studied the learning outcomes defined by the programme management and ascertained that they correspond to the requirements set by professional colleagues and by the relevant field. It also compared the programme with the domain-specific requirements (see Chapter 4) and found that the learning outcomes of the programme are aligned with them. On this basis, the committee concludes that the programme certainly meets the criteria for this standard.

The committee states that the focus of the programme is a fruitful combination of the European perspective, fields like hygiene, ecology, health promotion, mental and social health hygiene, and social sciences, organisation and administrative studies. The committee agrees with the programme management that there is no programme in the Netherlands that integrates these disciplines and the European perspective in the way this programme does. The committee argues that the European agenda for Public Health serves as a solid basis for this programme and guarantees the connection with current developments in the field of European Public Health. In addition, the committee appreciates that national and international colleagues were closely involved during the development of the bachelor's
programme. The programme's current policy is one in which stakeholders actively participate and influence its profile. The committee values this greatly. Because this is such a unique programme, the involvement of colleagues is crucial to warrant the connection with the requirements from the professional field.

The committee concluded that the learning outcomes of the programme correspond with the profile of the programme and the requirements set by professional colleagues. The learning outcomes are multidisciplinary and offer a broad perspective, which the committee finds relevant taking into account the domain concerned. In addition, sufficient attention is paid to academic skills. The committee is impressed by the statements and ambition of the programme, and finds the learning outcomes both promising and challenging. At first sight, the committee doubted the feasibility of such ambitious learning outcomes. As a result of the site visit, the committee is convinced that students are able to achieve the learning outcomes both in breadth and in depth (see standard 5) and are able to successfully complete the programme within the set time (see standard 7). Overall, the committee finds it very useful to have this unique and innovative programme in the Netherlands and believes it has a great future.

Bachelor's programme European Public Health: the committee assesses this standard as good.

### S2: Bachelor and master level

The intended learning outcomes of the programme correspond with the general, internationally accepted descriptions of a Bachelor's qualification or a Master's qualification.

#### Description

The self-evaluation report states that the learning outcomes of the programme correspond to internationally accepted learning outcomes for an academic bachelor's programme as specified in the Dublin descriptors. It relates the specified learning outcomes (see Appendix A) to the Dublin descriptors as shown in table 5.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dublin descriptor</th>
<th>Learning outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and understanding</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying knowledge and understanding</td>
<td>11,12,13,14,15,16,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making judgements</td>
<td>18,19,20,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>22,23,24,25,26,27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning skills</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.1. Dublin descriptors and learning outcomes of the bachelor's programme*

#### Assessment

The committee verified the relation between the learning outcomes and the Dublin descriptors, which are considered general, internationally accepted descriptions of a bachelor's programme. It observed that all of the Dublin descriptors are reflected in the learning outcomes. The Dublin descriptor for knowledge and understanding is reflected in the first ten learning outcomes, for example in learning outcome 1 (to have a robust disciplinary knowledge in public health issues). The Dublin descriptor for applying knowledge and understanding is reflected in learning outcomes 11 to 17, for example in learning outcome 15 (to be capable of analysing the consequences of scientific thinking and professional acting). Learning outcomes 18 to 21 mirror the Dublin descriptor for making judgements. Learning outcome 20, for example, states: to be capable when necessary of reviewing their own professional knowledge. The fourth Dublin descriptor, communication, is reflected in learning outcomes 22 to 27. Learning outcome 24, for example, refers to the competency to be able to debate about the field of study and the position of that field within society. The fifth Dublin descriptor, learning skills, is reflected in learning outcome 28, to
acquire an attitude of life-long learning and to be able to use the acquired skills throughout the graduate's professional life.

In addition, the committee concluded that the learning outcomes correspond with general, internationally accepted descriptions of a bachelor's programme. The committee even questions whether the programme is aiming too high. It argues that the Dublin descriptors are interpreted in such a way that the learning outcomes are almost formulated on a master's level. However, as stated before, the committee verified that students are able to achieve the learning outcomes (see standard 5). In addition, the management was able to pinpoint the differences between the bachelor's programme and a master's programme, for example the focus on breadth in the bachelor's programme and depth in the master's programme. Alumni confirmed this and stated that they clearly experienced the differences in level between the bachelor's programme and a master's programme. The committee advises considering the level a bachelor's student should acquire and if necessary adapting the learning outcomes to this level. In this way, the distinction between the bachelor's and master's programme will also be revealed in the learning outcomes. This, for example, could be a way to inform external stakeholders, such as supervisors during the placement period, on the level required.

Bachelor's programme European Public Health: the committee assesses this standard as satisfactory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S3: Academic orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The intended learning outcomes of the programme correspond with the following descriptions of a Bachelor's and a Master's qualification:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intended learning outcomes are derived from requirements set by the scientific discipline, the international scientific practice and, for programmes to which this applies, the practice in the relevant professional field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An academic bachelor (WO-bachelor) has the qualifications that allow access to at least one further programme at academic master's level (WO-master) and the option to enter the labour market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An academic master (WO-master) has the qualifications to conduct independent research or to solve multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary questions in a professional field for which academic higher education is required or useful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

According to the self-evaluation report, graduates are trained to become state-of-the-art, all-round specialists in European Public Health, capable of appreciating, analyzing and comprehending the impact of European and transnational integration on Public Health, health systems, health services, and the changing role of citizens, clients and patients. International experience and a European outlook within the programme are based on a contemporary and adaptive European agenda for Public Health, an international classroom, the possibility for students to opt for a semester of study abroad and, lastly, a placement within a relevant organization.

Graduates can build on their profile in European Public Health by continuing with the consecutive Master in European Public Health offered by Maastricht UMC/FHML that started starting in the 2009/10 academic year. Other Public Health/Health Sciences FHML master programmes are open to the graduates. Graduates are fully equipped to enter the labour market. Placement institutions’ interest in hosting bachelor students during their thesis writing phase along with the feedback of both students and hosts after the end of the placement period show that the programme provides students with learning outcomes that grant access to the relevant labour market.

Assessment

The committee examined the stated learning outcomes from the perspective of the required academic orientation. The committee noted that they correspond sufficiently to the requirements of the academic discipline (and of its practitioners) and of professional
The committee concludes that graduates of the programme acquire qualifications that allow access to at least one further programme at the academic master's level. It verified that the bachelor's programme provides qualifications for admission to the Master in European Public Health offered by Maastricht University and to other Public Health/Health Sciences master's programmes. The committee was able to assess that graduates in practice also continue their studies in other directions, for example Global Health, and feel well prepared to do so. The committee values the broad possibilities for graduates to enter multiple master's programmes. It states that the high level, multidisciplinary and broad scope of the learning outcomes add greatly to this possibility. In addition, the committee concludes that the programme provides graduates with a solid basis for a career. As this programme is still new, the committee is not able to draw valid conclusions concerning the options for graduates to enter different labour markets. It therefore supports the initiative of closely involving the professional field by means of the Advisory Board and analysing the position of alumni by means of the ‘labour market monitor’ (see standard 17). In this way, the learning outcomes of the programme in the future could possibly be tuned more precisely to the relevant professional field.

**Bachelor's programme European Public Health:** the committee assesses this standard as satisfactory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of the theme Aims and objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The committee comes to an overall assessment of the theme Aims and objectives on the basis of its assessments of the separate standards. In the case of the bachelor's programme European Public Health, it assesses this theme as satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.1.2. Curriculum

**Description of the curriculum of the programme**

The bachelor's programme consists of a total of six semesters, with each semester lasting 20 weeks and amounting to 30 EC. Each semester itself is broken down into sub-periods (modules) linked to the phases within the Active and Self-Directed Learning method (see standard 10). In **semester 1**, entitled *European Public Health Problems Today*, the so-called European Agenda for Public Health is introduced and outlined to the students. Furthermore, the angle of approach and problem definition per health sciences discipline are discussed, as is an outline of the contribution that the various disciplines can provide, both separately and jointly. *The Shape of Public Health Today* is the encompassing theme of the **second semester**. Building on the general introduction of the problem area presented in the first semester, students gain an in-depth perspective on Public Health institutions and frameworks in a globalizing world.

**Semester 3** is geared towards *European Public Health Objectives*, especially the “Health in All Policies” approach. In this semester, existing policy fields that are relevant to Public Health are compared. The minor period is scheduled in **semester 4**. In this semester students follow educational modules or units outside the programme. According to the Examination Rules, the students may select components of their own choice, within certain restrictions, with a minimum total study load of 30 EC. The student's choice needs to be approved by the
semester coordinator, in close collaboration with the Examination Board, to ensure that the student is deepening or broadening his or her European Public Health knowledge and skills base. The components that may be chosen are provided by the FHML (called International Classroom), by another faculty of Maastricht University, or by any other government-funded and previously selected or designated university (abroad).

Year three consists of semesters 5 and 6. Students within this final year are dedicated to acquiring knowledge of and applying strategies and instruments for planned change. Semester 5 is entitled Making Public Health Work in Europe. Here, strategies and instruments for planned change are explored, which are aimed at bridging or reducing the discrepancies between ‘dream and reality’ in the field of Public Health. The design of a specific planned change intervention or instrument for planned change in the form of a project or research at bachelor’s level completes the programme. Accordingly, in semester 6 students conduct research during the placement period and write their bachelor’s thesis. Preparations for the placement start already in the fifth semester: students then select a placement institution and project, either in or outside FHML. Moreover, they will have established contact with the placement coordinator, started a literature review and completed a research proposal. The first 16 weeks are spent in the placement institution collecting and analysing data and drafting the thesis. At the end of this period, the students must return to the University and present the draft thesis to peers and supervisors. Students then have four weeks to finalise the thesis.

Three horizontal trajectories run through the semesters of the programme, relating and integrating the content of the respective modules to the topic of the horizontal trajectory in question. The Methodology, Epidemiology and Statistics trajectory teaches the students all relevant research methods throughout the programme’s course, relating methodological questions to the content of the module. The Skills trajectory teaches and trains skills required by professionals (academics). The Academic Thinking trajectory asks the students to critically reflect on the concepts and content of the modules.

Maastricht UMC+/FHML offers four Honours programmes to bachelor students enrolled in Medicine, Health Sciences, Bio-medical Sciences and European Public Health (International Health, Governance of Health Care Innovation, Education and Research). Highly motivated students with excellent grades are given the opportunity to participate in small-scale, individually guided programmes. The Honours programmes run parallel to the regular curriculum during the second and third year of study. Each Honours programme has a total study load of 15 EC points. In year two the emphasis is put on orientation and further insight within the domain of study and in year three on the application by way of a thesis or research paper.

### S4: Requirements for academic orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposed curriculum meets the following criteria for an academic orientation:</td>
<td>The students develop their knowledge through the interaction between education and research within the relevant disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum corresponds with current developments in the relevant discipline(s) by verifiable links with current scientific theories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme ensures the development of competences in the field of research</td>
<td>Where appropriate, the curriculum has verifiable links with the current relevant professional practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description

According to the self-evaluation report, teaching staff and module coordinators of the bachelor’s programme conduct research in European projects within two of the Research Schools of the Maastricht UMC+/FHML. Many of their research activities are directly related to the topic of the modules. The self-evaluation report states that this guarantees that the
content of programme remains close to the cutting-edge of research in the field of European Public Health and that current research trends are transferred to bachelor-level teaching. In addition, students are invited to join research projects within the Department of International Health when writing their thesis and thus to contribute to larger research projects. When students decide to take that option, they can often combine this with an external placement, thus combining their thesis writing in the context of the research project with being placed at a professional institute outside of Maastricht University – e.g. at a research project partner institution (including local, regional, national health authorities, and NGOs). Links with the current relevant professional practice are ensured in the programme curriculum by inviting a number of guest lecturers from the field or visiting the professional practice in excursions to Brussels (first year) and Krakow (third year). Furthermore, students can do their research placements in professional organizations.

The horizontal trajectories ensure the gradual development of academic competences and skills, and the ability of students to reflect critically on the concepts and content of the modules. From the first year of study, students are introduced to various research methods from the social sciences including modern, practical research techniques. Throughout the course, the selected didactical method, including project-based education and a final bachelor study or project, encourages an investigative attitude. The course aims to enable its graduates to communicate at an academic level with the various players inside and outside the field of European Public Health. The selected didactical method and the way in which it is designed, for example in small teaching groups supervised by a content-expert tutor, make it common practice for students to communicate actively in both words and images with their fellow students and lecturers after only a short time. In a number of study components (practicals and project education), an academic form of presentation is also selected (presentation, poster, paper in article format). At the end of the third year, students are taught to transfer information, research results, ideas and solutions to a public made up of specialists and non-specialists. During the programme, attention is also focused on reading academic texts and placing the disciplinary thoughts and images identified in the academic literature in the context of other specializations. In this process, understanding the thought processes behind specific hypotheses or reasoning is essential. English language proficiency is supported and structured within the ‘skills trajectory’ in the first year.

Assessment
The committee assessed that the programme meets the requirements for an academic level and orientation. The committee observed that the interaction between teaching, research and the professional field is adequately ensured. It verified that the majority of lecturers are actively engaged in the research schools of Maastricht UMC+/FHML, a topic that is elaborated further under standard 12. It appreciates the fact that the programme thus assures that current scientific developments and theories permeate the curriculum. The committee verified that the relations between education and research are realized because lecturers inform students of their research project in their lecturers and while discussing the students’ work. The committee values the option for students to join research projects related to the programme when writing their bachelor’s thesis, although not all of them seem to be aware of this possibility or the research activities of their lectures. The committee suggests explicitly informing students of this option, because of the mutual advantages it brings: students can benefit from participating in embedded research, and lecturers can benefit from the input of the students to their research.

The committee established that, despite the fact that the main themes of the modules within the programme have not been updated in the past, the content of these modules is tuned to
the state of the art on a regular basis. For instance, the committee verified that students are informed about the status of the Mexican flu in a course based on the theme ‘tuberculosis’, and examples about tobacco are replaced by examples about alcohol. The committee finds this a good solution. It understands that it is not feasible to adapt the curriculum as a whole frequently to mirror the current situation. This guarantees the coherence and structure of the curriculum. In addition, the committee noted that interaction with practice and the state of the art is ensured by contact with the professional field. Experts are invited as guest lecturers, and discussion groups are set up to go over actual situations. As stated before, the committee values the involvement of the Advisory Board in this (see standard 3).

The committee is of the opinion that, apart from the interaction between teaching and research, the development of scientific research skills is adequately addressed within the programme. Students are stimulated to think academically and prepared for writing their thesis. The committee observed that academic activities relating to research, for example writing papers and conducting research individually, are clearly represented in the curriculum through the horizontal trajectories. It established that, especially at the end of the programme, students and alumni feel well prepared to conduct research and have acquired sufficient skills to enter a master’s programme or the professional field. The committee advises informing students of the value and importance of these skills at an early stage of the programme and are able to actively focus on them.

Bachelor’s programme European Public Health: the committee assesses this standard as satisfactory.

**S5: Correspondence between the aims and objectives and the curriculum**

The curriculum is an adequate realisation of the intended learning outcomes of the programme and this regards the level, the orientation and the subject-/discipline-specific requirements.
The intended learning outcomes are adequately transferred into the educational goals of the curriculum or parts thereof.
The contents of the curriculum ensure the students’ achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

**Description**

According to the self-evaluation report, the learning outcomes of the bachelor’s programme (see standard 1) are adequately addressed within the programme. Table 5.2 provides an overview of the relation between the modules and the learning outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Learning outcomes (arranged by Dublin descriptor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
<td>(1,2,3,4,5,8,9,10),(11,13,14,15,16,17),(18,19,20,21),(22,23,24,25,26,27),(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASDL</td>
<td>(2,10),(15,17),(22,23,24,25,26,27),(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work-related stress</td>
<td>(1,2,3,4,5,8,9,10),(11,13,14,15),(18,19,20,21),(22,23,24,25,26,27),(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Particulate matter</td>
<td>(1,2,3,4,5,10),(11,14,15),(18,19,20,21),(22,23,24,25,26,27),(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>(1,2,3,4,5,6,8,10),(11,14,16,17),(18,19,20,21),(22,23,24,25,26,27),(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>(1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10),(11,12,13,14,15,16,17),(18,19,20,21),(22,23,24,25,26,27),(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother and childcare</td>
<td>(1,2,3,4,5,8,10),(11,12,13,14,15,16,17),(18,19,20,21),(22,23,24,25,26,27),(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ageing in Europe</td>
<td>(1,2,3,4,5,8,9,10),(11,12,13,14,15,16,17),(18,19,20,21),(22,23,24,25,26,27),(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>(1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10),(11,13,16,17),(18,19,20,21),(22,23,24,25,26,27),(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alcohol and drug use</td>
<td>(1,2,3,4,5,10),(11,12,13,14,15,16,17),(18,19,20,21),(22,23,24,25,26,27),(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>(1,2,3,4,10),(11,12,13,14,15,16,17),(18,19,20,21),(22,23,24,25,26,27),(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life styles</td>
<td>(1,2,3,4,10),(11,17),(18,19,20,21),(17),(23,24,25,26,27),(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>(1,2,3,4,5,6,8,9,10),(11,14,17),(18,19,20,21),(22,23,24,25,26,27),(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Minor period</td>
<td>(2,17),(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Health systems</td>
<td>(1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10),(11,12,13,14,15,16,17),(18,19,20,21),(22,23,24,25,26,27),(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health strategies</td>
<td>(1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10),(11,12,13,14,15,16,17),(18,19,20,21),(22,23,24,25,26,27),(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excursion</td>
<td>(1,4,5,6,7,8,9),(12,13,15,16),(24,27),(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing proposal</td>
<td>(1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10),(11,12,13,16,17),(18,19,20,21),(22,23,24,25,26,27),(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>(1,2,3,4,5,10),(11,12,15,16,17),(18,19,20,21),(22,23,24,25,26,27),(28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment

The committee studied the correspondence between the learning outcomes and the curriculum and concluded that the programme is adequately designed to ensure that the students achieve the learning outcomes. It established that the table presented in the self-evaluation report reveals how the individual modules are systematically cross-matched with the learning outcomes. Judging by the table presented, the committee considers the number of learning outcomes cross-matched to each of the modules too ambitious. It suggests reducing this number in order to obtain a clear insight into the focus of each of the modules. Despite this suggestion, the committee is convinced that students are able to achieve the intended learning outcomes through the contents of the curriculum, and students feel well prepared to enter multiple master’s programmes (see standard 3).

The committee feels that the design of the modules facilitates the development of knowledge and skills at a high level and in both breadth and depth (see standard 10). Furthermore, it established that lecturers invite experts when this is needed to create more depth, and appreciates this. According to the committee, it sets a good example towards students. Because this programme is multidisciplinary, graduates should be able to recognize boundaries concerning their knowledge and skills of the different disciplines, and the point at which they should involve experts. The involvement of experts from the different departments within the modules also adds to the multidisciplinary character of the programme, according to the committee. It recommends arranging this valuable interaction also between students of different departments, in the same way as the Honours programmes are organized. This will provide students with knowledge and skills to communicate with experts of different disciplines and therefore prepare them for their future careers.

The committee values the fact that the minor and placement period are carefully tuned to the programme concerning number of EC, content and quality, to make sure all of the learning outcomes will be acquired adequately in breadth and in depth (see the description of the curriculum). During the site visit, it was even able to verify that some of the placements are not offered again to students, because they do not fit the aim of the programme completely. The committee states that because of this approach, the quality of placements offered to students will become increasingly more reliable.

Bachelor’s programme European Public Health: the committee assesses this standard as satisfactory.

S6: Consistency of the curriculum
The contents of the curriculum are internally consistent.

Description
Consistency in the curriculum is achieved through coordinated teaching of content and methods on several levels. On the semester level, a consistent and coherent subject structure is present on a macro-level. These subject structures follow the basic didactical approach of the programme: one first has to sensitise learners to a topic before exploring knowledge in greater depth (see standard 10). Once this has been achieved, students can integrate their knowledge and apply it. The ultimate application of their cumulated knowledge and skills comes in the writing of the bachelor thesis. At the module level, consistency and coherence are upheld in the sequence of modules and in the conduct of the individual modules, also based on the didactical approach, in which students start from previous knowledge when approaching new learning subjects. For example, students learn about the different
determinants of health in the first week of their studies. The semesters then focus on the different determinants in turn, thus acquainting students with the scope of New Public Health while exploring certain topics in depth. The following semesters and modules then approach European Public Health from different levels and angles.

Consistency is also maintained by the horizontal trajectories focused on competences in the field of research, each with its own coordinator, that run through the whole programme and relate methodology to module content. By interweaving trajectories horizontally in vertically sequential modules, internal coherence is ensured. Furthermore, consistency is assured by the programme coordinators liaising continuously with semester coordinators, and the semester coordinators meeting at least once per semester with the module coordinators of their semester and the trajectory coordinators.

**Assessment**

The committee studied the internal coherence of the programme, taking into account the way in which the different disciplines are integrated and consistency is realized. Based on the self-evaluation report and the site visit, the committee concluded that there is a strong sense of coherence in the curriculum, on both the semester and module level. The committee admires the fact that the consistency of the curriculum is based on the didactical approach and is clearly translated into different levels of the curriculum (see standard 10). Semesters and modules are logically built on each other; themes are introduced in a natural order, and modules elaborate on the terminology, knowledge and skills students acquired in an earlier phase. In addition, the skills trajectories are interwoven through all three years of the curriculum and relate methodology to module content on a permanent basis. The committee states that the trajectories are very successfully implemented within the curriculum. In addition, it values the benefits of choice offered to the students. They are able to emphasise their own interests (see description of the curriculum). Being exposed to this degree of freedom motivates them and prepares them to consider their own interests and make a well considered choice for a master's programme. The committee is convinced that, despite this freedom, the coherence of the programme is safeguarded through a set of restrictive rules (see the description of the curriculum).

Alignment within the programme and between semesters, modules and trajectories is safeguarded by the contact between programme, semester, module, placement and trajectory coordinators, who are well aware of the relationship between their activities according to the committee. This awareness is realized by meetings between those coordinators and by the small-scale organization, in which coordinators, lecturers and students meet regularly, also on an informal basis. According to the committee, this organization makes it possible to involve guest lecturers within the programme, without threatening its coherence.

**Bachelor's programme European Public Health:** the committee assesses this standard as good.

### S7: Workload

The curriculum can be successfully completed within the set time, as certain programme-related factors that may be an impediment in view of study progress are eliminated where possible.

### Description

The study load of the programme is 180 EC points, spread over three years, based on an average study load of 36 hours per week (1 EC point equals 28 hours). In the first year, teaching activities concentrate on two to three days per week, and each content-related module, except the introductory ones, is completed in 4-7 weeks and ends with an exam. The
students have about 12-15 contact hours per week; the rest of their time is dedicated to self-study.

During the first semester, students receive training in study/self-management skills. These skills include being able to collaborate effectively and efficiently in a tutorial group, to chair a group meeting, to evaluate and improve learning and group processes in the tutorial groups and to plan by means of time management. Skills relating to preparing for tests and performing well during tests, as well as presentation skills, are also taught. In addition, students are supervised while conducting their final research. Almost all students manage to finish their bachelor’s thesis on time. Reasons for any delay included unforeseen circumstances involving the placement institution or personal problems. In addition, time management consultancy is offered by the study advisors. Study advisors can join the Study Progress Committee – a committee established by the Exam Rules that brings the chair of the Examination Board and the programme coordinator together to discuss individual students’ challenges and solutions for them – and advocate the students’ perspectives. The committee then advises the Examination Board, which may decide, for instance, to appoint a mentor for a particular student. The Study Progress Committee also discusses requests and appeals by individual students regarding examinations (e.g. for exceptional resits and individual compensation for missed or insufficient achievement). The chair of the Examination Board can decide on individual cases.

Assessment
The committee considered whether or not the curriculum of the bachelor's programme can be successfully completed within the time nominally set and whether programme-related factors that may impede study progress are eliminated where possible. It concluded that the programme certainly fulfils the criteria specified for the relevant standard. According to the committee, the programme could be studied in 40 hours a week, despite the fact that the learning outcomes of the programme are quite ambitious and formulated on a high level (see standards 1 and 2). During the site visit, the committee verified that students assess the workload as quite acceptable, and the student advisor does not receive any complaints concerning workload. Alumni confirmed this. The committee concludes that problems faced by students are mainly organizational in nature (for example, the embedding of horizontal trajectories) and are eliminated adequately within this curriculum. The committee noticed that for students who need more challenge, there are Honours programmes on offer, and it appreciates this.

The committee established that the didactical approach makes a valuable contribution to the workload. Factors which could cause delay are eliminated where possible as a consequence of this didactical approach. Firstly, education is provided on a small-scale basis, and students, lecturers, and coordinators come into direct contact on a regular basis. Thus, students feel free to approach lecturers about a matter, and lecturers are able to offer suitable solutions for them quite quickly. Secondly, the didactical approach guarantees a spread of the workload. Especially in the first year of the curriculum, there are quite a lot of contact hours and tutorial groups. Because of the regular meetings and the social control this approach arranges, students are required to prepare well and therefore do not lag behind. In addition, the programme is very student-oriented, and coordinators adopt a rather flexible attitude in eliminating programme-related factors that may impede study progress. For example, when students are not able to be present because they return to their homeland for the holidays, they have the opportunity to catch up with an assignment. The committee greatly appreciates this solution, and the way the programme takes the situation of international students into account.
**Bachelor's programme European Public Health:** the committee assesses this standard as good.

### S8: Admission requirements
The structure and contents of the intended curriculum are in line with the qualifications of the incoming students:
- Academic bachelor's programme (WO-bachelor): VWO (pre-university education), propaedeutic certificate from a hogeschool (HBO) or similar qualifications, as demonstrated in the admission process.
- Master's programme (WO-master): a bachelor's degree and possibly a selection (with a view on the contents of the discipline).

### Description
Students who completed Dutch pre-university education (VWO) are admitted without further requirements: all VWO profiles are admissible. Students with a non-Dutch diploma equivalent to the Dutch VWO diploma are automatically admitted. A student who has obtained the first-year certificate (propadeuse) of either a degree programme in higher professional education (HBO) or university is admissible to the programme as well. Table 5.3 provides an overview of admitted students and their educational background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of diploma</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/9</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutch VWO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propadeuse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign diploma</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3. Overview of educational background of admitted students

Since the start of the programme, the objectives of marketing communications have focused on establishing the programme brand and positioning the bachelor’s programme as a leader in the international educational market. The use of various channels and activities of communication were oriented towards prospective students, key decision makers and people with influence. By developing and sustaining relationships, the goal was to recruit 75-100 bachelor students for the programme and generate a balance in national and international enrolment of students. Promotion and informing students created awareness amongst prospective students; commitment was also generated by focusing on customer service and guidance in the study choice process. For all marketing communication means, English was the main language used. Some of these means are: the website, brochures, presentations, information days, international and local student fairs.

As a result of the information activities, students were admitted from six different countries in 2006/07, ten in 2007/08, twelve in 2008/09, and nine in the current academic year 2009/10. The majority of EU/EEA students originate from Germany. Although Maastricht UMC/FHML welcomes the high-quality German students, the ratio does not reflect the aim of building an international student population within the programme and compromises one of the university’s competitive advantages. In cooperation with the university’s Student Recruitment Office, sustained efforts are being made to attract more undergraduates from the Netherlands and other European countries, starting with Belgium, the Scandinavian countries and the central European countries.

### Assessment
The committee examined the admission requirements for the programme and concluded that the qualifications of the incoming students are in line with the structure and contents of the proposed curriculum. The committee states that for several secondary school profiles, it is possible to enrol in the bachelor’s programme without restrictions. The committee noted with admiration that students deliberately choose to register for this degree programme. All students interviewed were found to be highly motivated and enthusiastic. Foreign students
can also enter the programme. The programme provides students of different backgrounds with adequate information and organizes this quite well. The committee is pleased with the efforts of the programme to recruit national and international students, and noticed that the students are coming from more and more countries. However, as described in the self-evaluation report, a majority of the international students originates from Germany. The committee advises the programme to ensure a stronger mix of nationalities, and supports the initiatives already undertaken. It expects that the growing international network of lecturers and the international reputation of the relative new programme will contribute to this (see standard 12). It states that attracting further nationalities will add to the multidisciplinary profile of the programme, because students will get used to sharing their perspectives and working within the international field.

The committee is satisfied with the average annual inflow of students. It noticed a once-only decrease of students, and concluded that this was probably due to troubles the programme experienced with the system of enrolment At the moment, the inflow of students corresponds to the programme's target (75-100 students). The committee argues that the programme, the didactical approach, staff, and facilities are perfectly tuned to this and therefore appreciates the fact that the programme sets a limit on the number of students (100). To prepare well for the future, the committee advises outlining a policy in case the number of students grows to exceed this limit, especially taking into account the students who originally applied for Medicine. For instance, applying students could be required to write a motivational essay.

*Bachelor's programme European Public Health:* the committee assesses this standard as satisfactory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S9: Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The programme meets the legal requirements regarding the range of EC:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic bachelor's programme (WO-bachelor): 180 EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic master's programme (WO-master): a minimum of 60 EC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

The curriculum of the bachelor's programme European Public Health comprises 180 EC and complies with the formal requirements with respect to the size of the curriculum.

**Assessment**

The bachelor's programme European Public Health complies with the formal requirements with respect to the range of EC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S10: Coherence of structure and contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The educational concept is in line with the aims and objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The study methods correspond with this educational concept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description
The Active and Self-Directed Learning method (ASDL), developed as a new learning method especially for this programme, stimulates an investigative attitude and the student's independence. A key feature of this model is that the students play an active role in their own learning process, which is focused specifically on meaningful learning that fosters the recognition of the coherence between concepts, and the ability to evaluate those concepts critically. ASDL involves students working on problems in small groups of ten, facilitated by a faculty tutor (see standard 16). The didactical approach emphasizes student progress through four learning phases:

- Sensitising: This phase is aimed at increasing the students’ awareness of existing (and future) problems in professional practice. The core of this first phase is for the students to become involved with the subject and for staff and students to determine what knowledge of the subject the students already have. This phase of ‘awareness’ and ‘ownership’ operates by having students identify problems in their own country and/or by confronting them explicitly with situations and problems within Europe.

- Exploration: Once students have become aware of the problems and feel the need to discover solutions to them, they are given the opportunity to identify the nature of the problems and to study relevant information and potential solutions. Students are expected to display an exploratory attitude when finding explanations and solutions, working from both a disciplinary and an interdisciplinary perspective.

- Integration: Once students have acquired relevant information to enable them to understand and solve identified problems – doing so from the perspective of various different disciplines and points of view – they are assisted in integrating the information. During this phase, it is important for the students to reflect critically and be creative with respect to the solutions presented. The students should be able to identify both the strengths and weaknesses of explanations and solutions. New options are presented that lead to improvements in those explanations and solutions.

- Application: During the final phase, the focus is on the application of what has been learned and on reflection by the student on the whole work cycle. Consideration is given to the extent to which problems can be solved effectively, how a solution can be applied and what progress has been made in absorbing/understanding information (from the point of view of both actual content and the process itself). Students consider what shortcomings may still exist and what area-specific problems still need to be solved.

The ASDL model with its four phases is fully implemented at both the semester level and the level of the full three-year curriculum. Each semester starts with a sensitising phase in which the semester topic is introduced and the first approach to the content of the modules is made. The main modules (4-8 weeks long) are the second phase in the ASDL cycle, as they explore topics and methods in further depth. In semester papers and cumulative tests, students then have the opportunity to integrate their knowledge and to apply it in the papers and the test. In the first semester, followed by a gradual decline, there are more options for collaborative work. The semester paper and module assignments can be written in pairs or bigger groups. Semester papers later in the curriculum have to be written individually, including the thesis at the end of the study.

Assessment
The committee studied the coherence of the structure and contents of the programme. It concluded that the concept of ASDL and working in groups perfectly fits the nature of the programme and has a lot of advantages. Students are stimulated to integrate disciplines and perspectives actively and collaboratively, which provides them with skills required by the professional field and aimed at by the programme, such as an investigative attitude and ability
to work collaboratively (see standard 4 and 20). In addition, the committee is deeply impressed by the way the structure of the programme guarantees the realisation of a broad range of the learning outcomes at a high level (see standard 2). According to the committee, this is possible because of two aspects of the didactical approach: (a) at the curriculum, semester and module levels, students are introduced to concepts and terms before they explore topics and methods in further depth, and (b) students are required to prepare well, through the social control and the regular meetings this approach arranges, and therefore have sufficient knowledge and skills by the time the teaching in depth starts. This was confirmed by students during the site visit.

The committee was able to establish that both staff members and students are very enthusiastic about the didactical approach and the opportunity it offers for working on problems in small groups. They stated that there is a variety in group composition and that there are good contacts between students of different nationalities. Students revealed that they are able to rely on each other and motivate one another in a positive way. Along with the mutual contact, students also feel free to approach lecturers when they experience problems. According to the committee, these contacts are very valuable and minimize the chance that programme-related factors form an impediment to study progress (see standard 7). In addition, study progress is monitored by the spread of the workload the ASDL method brings along. The committee also recognizes this spread in relation to assessments, and established that it was valued by students (see standard 11). In general, students are more than satisfied concerning the didactical approach and state that they identify the application of the approach in all of the modules and during the whole curriculum. The committee endorses this statement.

The committee concludes that the ASDL method, developed as a new learning method especially for this programme, works excellently in practice, but equally applauds the way in which it is embedded within the programme. The committee states that this is exemplary. The approach is implemented on the curriculum, semester and module levels, which strongly contributes to the coherence and structure of the programme (see standard 6). Students and staff members are explicitly provided with instructions about the approach and the way the programme is structured, which the committee greatly appreciates (see standards 14 and 16). It was able to observe that staff members feel well prepared to apply the study method, and students are satisfied with the didactical quality of their lecturers and tutors. As described under standard 13, the committee concludes that the quantity of teachers ensures small groups of students, so students play an active role in their own learning process. Finally, the committee was impressed by the facilities and the way they accord with the didactical approach. The building offers lecture rooms in different sizes, and students can easily work together on assignments in one of the many tutorial rooms (see standard 15).

Bachelor’s programme European Public Health: the committee assesses this standard as excellent.

S11: Learning assessment
By means of evaluations, tests and examinations, the students are assessed in an adequate and for them insightful way to determine whether they have achieved the intended learning outcomes of the programme or parts thereof.

Description
Students are evaluated in various ways, according to the self-evaluation report. The more traditional exam with open and multiple-choice questions is most frequently used, although other forms of assessment can also be used, such as presentations (mostly ungraded but with individual feedback) and written papers. Module exams are written by the specific module coordinators in consultation with the module planning group members, including the
trajectory coordinators. An exam usually takes place at the end of a module. In compliance with ASDL principles, in each semester there is an assessment of the integration and application of knowledge acquired. This is done through a cumulative test and a semester paper in the last four weeks of the semester. The integration of learning throughout the semester, integrating the content of each module including the horizontal trajectories, primarily takes place through a three-hour written cumulative test. There is a cumulative test at the end of semesters 1, 2, 3 and 5, and a semester paper at the end of semesters 1, 2 and 3.

Preparing their bachelor proposal and thesis, students work in thesis groups led by the thesis group supervisor (see standard 16). The thesis group supervisor grades a thesis proposal before students go on their placement. Students’ theses are then independently assessed on the basis of five subcategories by two assessors (the first one being the thesis group supervisor): formal aspects, form-content relation, definition of the problem under study and the research question, argumentation and mastering of study subject. A grade is given for each of the five dimensions by both assessors. Students must receive a mark of six or higher in each aspect in order to pass. The ten grades are then added up, and the sum is divided by ten for the final mark.

Any student complaints about the exam can be directed to the Examination Board (EB), which discusses the complaint with the module coordinator and then decides upon the steps to be taken. If a student is dissatisfied with a decision by the EB, the student can lodge an appeal with the Maastricht University Board of Appeal for Examinations (College van Beroep voor de Examens). The assessment of each module is described in the ‘Education and Examination Rules’ (EER) for the bachelor’s programme. Responsibility for the EER lies with the EB.

Assessment
The committee examined the learning assessment procedure and concludes that students are assessed adequately. A mix of evaluations, tests and examinations is used. From the EER and from information gained during the site visit, the committee noted that the examinations are a balanced reflection of the educational content. The committee established that examinations are of a rather high level, and thus tuned to the level of the learning outcomes (see standard 2). In addition, the committee concludes that the questions and assignments reflect the multidisciplinarity of the programme, and guarantee the evaluation of the intended learning outcomes and the horizontal trajectories. As a result of this didactical approach, students are assessed quite often (during and at the end of each module and semester). The committee wondered whether students experienced pressure because of this, but was able to verify that students feel comfortable with the frequent assessments. It motivates them to continually keep up, which results in a well-distributed workload (see standard 7). In addition, the committee verified that working in groups enhances continual evaluation and feedback between students and tutors. The final assessment is the bachelor’s thesis. The committee states that the general mechanisms and criteria to assess theses are adequate. It observed that supervisors are trained to assess theses, two supervisors are involved, and the EB will interfere in case of discrepancy between the supervisors.

The committee also verified improvement concerning the guidance of supervisors, based on the first theses of the relatively new programme, and appreciates this. Based on the theses the committee studied, it advises the supervisors to monitor students closely during the first phase of the research and guarantee the formulation of focused and restricted research questions (see standard 20). In addition, the committee suggests that experts, for example from the field of medicine, should be involved more often during guidance of the theses.
Because of the profile of the programme, multiple disciplines are integrated within the theses. The committee states it is not realistic to expect supervisors to be sufficiently acquainted with all of the content.

During the site visit, the committee established that the EB recently merged with the EB of Health Sciences, and appreciates this way of embedding the programme in the faculty. The committee is convinced that the EB has sufficient insight into the quality of the examinations and takes adequate measures as necessary. For example, the committee concluded that the EB takes appropriate steps to combat freeriding, which could be reinforced by working in groups. Despite the fact that this problem rarely occurs, the EB makes sure that module coordinator tutors are trained and feel responsible for preventing freeriding, and that the sanction of an extra assignment could be imposed. In addition, the committee established that the EB actively aims at preventing plagiarism.

*Bachelor’s programme European Public Health:* the committee assesses this standard as satisfactory.

### Assessment of the theme Curriculum

The committee comes to an overall assessment of the theme Curriculum on the basis of its assessments of the separate standards. In the case of the bachelor’s programme European Public Health, it assesses this theme as satisfactory.

5.1.3. Staff

#### S12: Requirements for academic orientation

The programme meets the following criteria for the deployment of staff for a programme with an academic orientation:

*Teaching is principally provided by researchers who contribute to the development of the subject/discipline.*

**Description**

The self-evaluation report states that all educational programmes must be rooted in externally recognized research programmes. The policy adopted by Maastricht UMC+/FHML targets high-quality multidisciplinary research in the Health Sciences, Life Sciences and Medicine. The FHML considers research as crucial, even indispensable to providing appropriate and up-to-date knowledge for educational activities. These two activities are therefore strongly interrelated, and all tenured staff have both educational and research tasks. Research has been structured in the form of schools, accredited by KNAW: the School for Public Health and Primary Care (CAPHRI) and the School for Nutrition, Toxicology and Metabolism (NUTRIM). The Schools are viewed as an organizational unit of substantial size, in which master’s students, PhD candidates and researchers work together. The academic input of the lecturing staff contributes substantially to the academic level of the programme. Consequently, the content of the programme is linked to a broad range of research programmes either within CAPHRI or NUTRIM. In addition, the programme coordinator and the semester coordinators are members of the Department of International Health of FHML. This department focusses on European Public Health research.

According to the self-evaluation report, the international nature of the programme is mirrored by the staff. Efforts have been made to attract highly qualified staff from outside the Netherlands. As a result, the share of international employees within FHML has increased, especially within the newly established Department of International Health. The results are reflected in the increasing percentage of foreign staff members actively involved in teaching within the programme.
During the three years that the bachelor's programme has been running, 14 departments have contributed to each programme. In principle, all tenured faculty must have obtained a PhD degree. Medical specialists and general practitioners may be exempt from this obligation. Medical specialists and general practitioners are given a maximum of six years to fulfill the PhD requirement. Table 5.4 provides an overview of the staff members in the bachelor's programme with a PhD degree in hours per academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Other staff (e.g. education and research staff, PhD students).</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>3,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>2,262</td>
<td>2,086</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>7,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,1668</td>
<td>2,382</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>9,466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4. FHML staff with a PhD degree in hours per academic year

Assessment
The committee studied the requirements for the academic orientation of staff members and concluded that the programme meets the criteria expected of a scientific degree programme. The committee recognises the staff's scientific quality, national and international academic reputation and teaching experience. A majority of the teaching staff holds a PhD and carries out research which contributes to the development of their discipline as well as to the other disciplines of the bachelor's programme. An equal division of research and education guarantees that the lecturers are actively involved in both, and recent developments from scientific research, as well as those from the professional field, are incorporated into the modules.

The academic staff originates from both the Netherlands and abroad. The committee established that staff members have contacts with various foreign universities, with other universities in the Netherlands, and with other faculties of Maastricht University, via formal and informal networks, and is capable of attracting relevant research projects because of these networks. The committee states that the composition of staff members could be developed further to expand the possibilities of this relatively new programme. Therefore, it values the fact that the programme is aiming at recruiting more international staff members. Although the committee understands how hard it is to attract the right international researchers for this bachelor's programme, it advises actively continuing this effort. The increased involvement of international staff members will enhance the department's network and thus will contribute to the international reputation of the bachelor's programme, the recruitment of international students and the number of options to follow the minor or conduct research abroad.

Bachelor's programme European Public Health: the committee assesses this standard as satisfactory.

S13: Quantity of staff
Sufficient staff are deployed to realise the desired quality of the programme.

Description
The self-evaluation report mentions that during the start-up phase, staff was allocated to develop the content and structure of education within the programme: two fte's from 2005 to 2008, and finally one fte in 2008/09. At the onset of the programme, so-called general roles were earmarked and filled according to FHML regulations: 0.2 fte's in 2006/07 and 0.4 fte's accordingly in the following years. General roles which are common to all educational programmes include Director of Education, Programme Coordinator, Staff, Education Committee, Board of Examination, PR and Marketing.
Since the start of the programme in September 2006, the number of fte’s allocated specifically for education has gradually risen in relation to the number of students (see table 5.4). The IfE bases the required volume of teaching input on the standard number of hours which are assigned to the various teaching roles that exist within the educational system. A teaching role equals the average number of hours spent on a particular task. Among others, the following teaching roles can be distinguished: designing, updating, and coordinating a teaching module, presenting a lecture, guiding a tutorial group, training a skills group, leading a workshop, assessing, and supervising an internship. The translation of the programme into teaching roles results in the total number of hours that are required to run the programme, taking into account the number of participating students. Table 5.5 provides an overview of the staff-student ratio per academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total fte of teaching staff</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-student ratio</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5. Staff-student ratio per academic year

Assessment
The committee studied the quantity of staff and concludes that there are enough staff members to assure the desired quality of the programme. It compliments the programme on the way in which it managed the increased inflow of students. The number of staff members was increased by basing the required volume on the various teaching roles that exist within the educational system. As a result, the student/staff ratio remained nearly unaffected. It was able to conclude that sufficient staff members are present to assure the desired quality. It established that the staff members find the size of their teaching load acceptable, and it did not receive any information which indicated that the amount of staff time available for the programme is insufficient. Students stated that they receive a lot of individual attention and have close contact with all of the staff members. The committee confirmed that the programme is able to educate students in small groups of eight to ten students, which contributes to the particular didactical approach. All lecturers are considered to be approachable, and the high level of interaction between staff and students is appreciated on both sides.

Bachelor’s programme European Public Health: the committee assesses this standard as satisfactory.

S14: Quality of staff
The staff deployed are sufficiently qualified to ensure that the aims and objectives regarding the content, didactics and organisation of the programme are achieved.

Description
The self-evaluation report states that the FHML established a Department of Education Development and Research, aimed at offering a structural contribution to the quality of education, by supporting educational development, offering educational training programmes and conducting educational research. All new staff members are required to follow a number of introductory modules on the educational approach. These modules aim to make teachers aware of the different roles of the tutor. In addition, a package of workshops is offered related to relevant educational aspects of the faculty, such as the assessment of student work, providing feedback on presentations and advanced PowerPoint techniques, lecturing skills, the computer as a teaching tool and as a learning tool, exam construction and training for trainers in skills education. Maastricht University also offers a teacher’s qualification project
(Basiskwalificatie Onderwijs - BKO) for all staff members. In light of Maastricht University’s policy to become a bilingual (Dutch and English) university and given the increasing number of programmes taught in English at the faculty, specific English language training programmes for staff have been developed in collaboration with the University Language Centre.

According to the self-evaluation report, each staff member has a job evaluation meeting at least once a year with his/her head of department to discuss their mutual functioning and cooperation. Information on the educational performance of staff members is retrieved from standard student questionnaires. The job evaluation meeting results in a written report, in which the head of department must give an opinion on the performance of the staff member in the fields of education, research and administration. This report is relevant for financial and career promotion. The report concludes with agreements reached during the meeting about development and improvement. These agreements provide a starting point for the next annual review.

**Assessment**

The committee assessed the quality of the staff and concluded that the staff employed is adequately qualified to ensure that learning outcomes regarding content, didactical quality and the organization of the programme are achieved. The committee verified that the didactical quality of the staff members is an important matter at UMC+/FHML and that facilities are present to foster the didactical standards of staff members. A number of introductory courses on the didactical approach is offered to all of the staff members. The committee appreciates the emphasis on these courses for new teaching staff because, especially for international staff members, it is important to get used to the university's unique education system. This ensures that staff members are able to provide education in accordance with the approach of the programme. Besides the introductory modules, staff members are offered a teacher’s qualification project (Basiskwalificatie Onderwijs, BKO). The committee established that the BKO training is being implemented slowly, because the programme mainly concentrates on the integration of new staff with the didactical approach. The committee agrees with this decision, but advises making sure that staff members do obtain the qualification. During the site visit, it was able to verify that most of the staff members are motivated to develop themselves further and willing to obtain the BKO qualification. As well as improving their general qualities, this will contribute to the possibilities of career development. The committee noted that students are fairly positive about the quality and educational competencies of their lecturers.

*Bachelor's programme European Public Health:* the committee assesses this standard as satisfactory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Assessment of the theme Staff</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The committee comes to an overall assessment of the theme Staff on the basis of its assessments of the separate standards. In the case of the bachelor's programme European Public Health, it assesses this theme as satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.1.4. Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S15: Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing and facilities are adequate to achieve the learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

The ASDL approach requires specific physical facilities: tutorial rooms, skills and teaching laboratories, library and computer facilities. For the FHML programmes, 12 communication
skills training rooms, 4 laboratories for educational use and 60 tutorial rooms are available. The rooms cater for tutorial groups of 10-14 students and are equipped with blackboards or whiteboards, a computer and a projector. All lecture and seminar halls are equipped with projection equipment. In addition to the laboratories, a computer room is available to supply students with direct access to computers for storing and modulating data.

The library is an academic library for education, research and health care. In addition, the Learning and Resource Centre houses books and other materials recommended by module coordinators and departments. Its opening hours are 8.30 to 22.00 on weekdays. On weekends, the library is open from 12.00 to 17.00, except on public holidays. The electronic library is continuously accessible via the internet (www.ub.unimaas.nl). UL Anywhere is a server-based computer system enabling students to use the library facilities from any PC with an internet connection. After logging in, students can access a virtual desktop fully adapted to their programme. From there they can access the University catalogues, electronic journals (e-journals) and databases.

Assessment
The committee received a guided tour to gain an impression of the available facilities. It concluded that the Maastricht UMC+/FHML facilities are suitable to achieve the learning outcomes and that close attention is paid to ensure that the facilities are available. The committee concluded that there are currently enough classrooms, computer rooms and study places available of sufficient quality. The committee also confirmed that there are adequate ICT facilities, including an electronic work environment. Students can use the computers and wireless internet during opening hours. During the site visit, it became clear to the committee that the students are very satisfied with the facilities and the number of computers and that reported complaints are taken care of. For instance, students indicated that the opening hours of the library were adapted at their request. They also referred to the fact that they experienced some problems with the new electronic system which was implemented, which were also fixed by the Maastricht UMC+/FHML.

The committee is impressed with the condition of the building and classrooms. All of the facilities are carefully maintained, which contributes to a culture of care for the students according to the committee. In accordance with the didactical approach, students are held responsible for the quality of the facilities, for example, they are allowed to bring food into some of the rooms. According to the committee this approach seems to bear fruit, taking into account that all of the rooms looked neat and tidy. Besides the culture of responsibility, the rooms available for students also fit the didactical approach of ASDL. The building offers lecture rooms in different sizes, and students can easily work together on assignments in one of the many rooms.

Bachelor’s programme European Public Health: the committee assesses this standard as good.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S16: Tutoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring and information provision for students are adequate in view of study progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring and information provision for students correspond with the students’ needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description
Students are offered both general and individual support and guidance during their studies. All information on education (including study guides, teaching schedules, exam regulations, study results, etc.) is posted on or linked to the electronic learning environment. Students can pose questions to the Education Office electronically using a standardized form. An electronic self-learning question-and-answer information system (eSC) is in place. Via the
Student Life-cycle Management (SLM) study and administration system, students can register for modules and view their study results. To provide students with guidance, three main sources of support are relevant: tutors, placement/thesis coordinator, and student advisors. In addition, the programme, semester, module, placement and trajectory coordinators also guide students during the programme.

The role of the tutor is to coach tutorial groups based on the ASDL approach by providing support to make student interaction productive and helping students to identify the knowledge and skills they need to obtain. Tutors also stimulate students to reflect on their problem-solving and professional behaviour. They are selected carefully by interviews and are trained and supervised. All of the tutors are easily accessible, and students can turn to them with their questions.

Student advisors monitor individual students’ exam results and save interview data on a computer-based student monitoring system, thus keeping an eye on students’ progress. If study progress is below par, the student advisors invite the students to discuss their results and possible causes for delay and if needed can refer them to secondary, central University-level facilities. Students can also seek student advisor guidance themselves for study-related problems or external problems which are influencing their studies negatively. Study advisors can join the Study Progress Committee, a committee established by the Exam Rules that brings the chair of the EB and the programme coordinator together to discuss individual students’ challenges and solutions and advocate students’ perspectives. The Committee advises the EB.

To avoid unnecessary study delays when writing the thesis, a programme placement coordinator is appointed who can be regarded as a coach for students in the early stages of preparing their thesis. If students cannot decide on a subject, do not know whom to approach as a supervisor or have any other questions related to their thesis, they may consult the placement coordinator. Once the subject has been chosen, a supervisor will take over from the placement coordinator to guide the student in elaborating and writing the thesis.

Assessment
The committee studied the ways in which the Maastricht UMC+ FHML takes care of tutoring and information provision for students. It concludes that the tutoring and information provision for students are adequate in view of study progress, and correspond to the students’ needs. In general, the committee learned that students are positive about the tutoring. The committee values the way tutors are selected and trained in order to fulfil this role adequately. As stated before, it also views favourably the efforts of lecturer, tutors and support staff to interact closely with students, and noted that students consider the staff very approachable for questions concerning the programmes. The committee also noted that some unmotivated students are referred to the student advisor by lecturers, and values this.

In addition, it established that when students fall behind, this is noticed by the study advisor and the Study Progress Committee. According to the committee, the study advisor is committed to the students from the start of the programme and aims at the best individual guidance. This proactive guidance mainly focuses on the first year of the bachelor's programme, as it is assumed that after this year students know where to turn when they have questions or experience problems. Information on what steps students should take is provided at the start of the programme. The committee agrees with this approach, and verified that students of different years do know whom they can turn to and feel free to do so. As described under standard 21, the committee noted that despite the proactive guidance
a relatively large proportion of students terminate their study after the first year; some of them are students who originally opted for a medical course. The committee values the attitude of the study advisor and the programme towards these students.

The committee studied the way in which students are guided while writing their thesis. It established that, in accordance with the didactical approach, students are expected to take the initiative and approves this aspect. In addition, there are regular moments of guidance, including the meetings of the thesis groups. These groups stimulate the exchange of information, experiences and perspectives between students and with the coordinator. The committee feels this approach reflects the multidisciplinary character of the programme and established that students benefit from the mutual contacts. In general, the committee concluded that students feel they have received good guidance, even when they conduct their research abroad. Students are provided with sufficient information on the different options and are able to contact their coordinator when they are abroad, for example by means of Skype. The coordinator contacts the placement coordinator and, if possible, even visits the student at his/her placement.

**Bachelor’s programme European Public Health:** the committee assesses this standard as satisfactory.

### Assessment of the theme Services

The committee comes to an overall assessment of the theme Services on the basis of its assessments of the separate standards. In the case of the bachelor’s programme European Public Health, it assesses this theme as satisfactory.

#### 5.1.5. Internal quality assurance system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S17: Periodical evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum is periodically evaluated in the light of verifiable objectives and other measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

The self-evaluation report mentions that data on the educational process, the course content, outcomes of education and facilities are collected and processed in a systematic and structured manner. The educational process is evaluated by students through questionnaires addressing the educational quality of each module, for example the quality of teaching, lectures, projects, tutorial meetings, assessment and the horizontal trajectories. The results are processed by the Quality Assurance Task Group. The evaluation indicates when action needs to be taken by the coordinator of the module, as the report by the task group is sent for review to the module coordinator and to the Education Committee. Any remarks and suggestions by the Education Committee are delivered to the programme coordinator, including the module reports and comments in the annual improvement report (see standard 18). General student satisfaction about ICT facilities, the university library, infrastructure, information provision and supervision is measured and reported annually by way of the so-called Flycatcher. Commissioned by the Executive Board of Maastricht University, the reports are made available to the IfE management team.

Course content is evaluated in two ways: internal curriculum evaluation and discussion of the curriculum within the programme’s external Advisory Board, as described under standard 3. The internal curriculum evaluation was organized in 2008. It is the intention of the programme coordinator to organize a curriculum evaluation at regular intervals. The minutes of the Advisory Board meeting are made available to the programme coordinator and the Education Committee. Drop-out and completion rates for all educational programmes are monitored structurally and made available at regular intervals to the IfE management for
evaluation and discussion; the identification of weaknesses will lead to changes in the curriculum. Once available, information from graduates regarding the labour market positions will be included in the evaluation of programme outcomes. The labour market entry and career development of Maastricht University graduates are monitored by way of the ‘labour market monitor’. The research data (from individuals at one, five and ten years after they graduate) are an indicator of the connection between graduates and the labour market, and are used to keep a close eye on job market developments for their graduates.

**Assessment**
The committee studied the periodic evaluations conducted and the system that leads to them. It concludes that the programme is evaluated periodically in the light of verifiable objectives, also reflecting on past measures. Evaluations take place regularly, with an acceptable response rate. The committee observed that whenever a problem is highlighted as a result of the evaluations, there is an adequate response. Feedback on the results of evaluations and measures for improvement are provided to lecturers and students. In addition, the results of evaluations are discussed in annual performance reviews with the lecturers (see standard 18).

According to the committee, the Education Committee is actively involved and influential in the quality assurance system. It advises the programme coordinator about educational issues of the programme and about the results of the module evaluations. The student members of the Education Committee have contact with their peers via the courses and classes. The committee verified that according to the Education Committee, they are able to bring up issues and problems if they occur, and recommendations are implemented (see standard 18). As stated before, the committee also values the involvement of the Advisory Board in quality assurance and the evaluation by means of the ‘labour market monitor’ (see standard 3).

*Bachelor's programme European Public Health:* the committee assesses this standard as satisfactory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S18: Measures for improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The outcomes of the evaluation form the basis of verifiable measures for improvement that contribute to the achievement of the objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**
According to the self-evaluation report, information from the operational level constitutes an important input that allows the IfE to secure, improve and monitor educational quality. In this process, the programme coordinator plays a key role by compiling the results from the available sources to form the basis for the programme’s improvement report. The improvement report is discussed in early spring of each year with relevant staff members active in the programme, during the so-called ‘Day at the Maas’. After this discussion and ensuing amendments, the improvement report is formally conveyed to the Education Committee to advise on improvements for the next academic year, as the Education Committee has a statutory role in which it monitors the quality of the structure and content of the programme.

All departments meet annually with the IfE Scientific Director to evaluate the past and look ahead to the coming year. This meeting focuses on the departments’ qualitative and quantitative input into the curriculum in terms of content, staff and finances. The IfE inventories the qualitative and quantitative data collected from the module and semester evaluations and stored by the Task Group Quality Assurance, and all departments receive an overview of their qualitative and quantitative input each year. Quantitative input concerns the number of hours spent on education tasks in relation to the teaching staff allocated. Qualitative data has to do with the assessments of teacher performance in the various roles;
these must be at least satisfactory. If the students repeatedly assess a teacher as inadequate (unsatisfactory), the department chair is asked about which improvement measures have been undertaken. The meeting also leaves room for other discussion points, and leads to a list of action points recorded in writing and approved by the department. Over the next year, department chair will verify how far the department and/or IfE has realized these action points.

Assessment
The committee studied the way in which suggested measures for improvement are dealt with by the programme. It concluded that the evaluation procedures form the basis for verifiable measures for improvement, contributing to the achievement of the learning outcomes. The outcomes of the evaluations are taken seriously and are communicated to lecturers and students. The committee suggests increasing the amount of information provided to students on Eleum, and adding suggested measures for improvement to the results of evaluations, which are only presented as figures currently. This will stimulate the students’ motivation to fill in the questionnaires. The commission appreciates the way measures for improvement are instigated, for example by the ‘Day at Maas’ and by involvement of the Advisory Board.

The committee is convinced that improvements are implemented as a result of the evaluation process. It took note of the self-evaluation report, which contains some examples of modules which were approved. During the site visit, the committee established that alumni, the Education Committee and students noticed the improvements as a consequence of their feedback, and most of the problems did not recur. Examples that the alumni came up with were mainly related to organizational aspects of the programme, for instance the integration of the horizontal trajectories within the curriculum. They stated that all of their suggestions have been implemented in the present curriculum. The Education Committee managed to achieve changes concerning the prescribed literature, the content of modules and the introduction of examples of examinations. The committee also noticed that when a lecturer performs inadequately, both the Education Committee and the programme management react properly.

Bachelor’s programme European Public Health: the committee assesses this standard as satisfactory.

S19: Involvement of staff, students, alumni and the professional field
Staff, students, alumni and the relevant professional field will be actively involved in the internal quality assurance system.

Description
Staff involvement in quality assurance is guaranteed and demonstrated by representatives on several academic and non-academic bodies (e.g. the IfE management, the Education Committee or the Faculty Council), according to the self-evaluation report. Furthermore, teaching staff are connected to the faculty’s quality assurance system, for instance through their interaction with students and programme directors and coordinators, and in module planning groups. Students are important sources of information on education quality. The programme evaluation data form the basis for discussion of the overall quality and future development of the programme. Moreover, students can express their opinions and ideas through their representation on the following bodies: the FHML Board of Management (1 student advisor), the IfE Management (3 student advisors), the Faculty Council (9 student members), and the Education Committee (50% students). In addition to the formal bodies which focus on the study programmes, the IfE stays informed about problems and questions relating to ICT, logistics and practical matters through the joint Student Discussion Body. It consists of four student members from each main domain within the FHML. The Dean, too, meets with students regularly to discuss topics relevant to them. This is formally laid down in
the faculty regulations. The meetings, however, are purely oriented towards information exchange and do not play a formal decision-making or advisory role.

Contact between the FHML and future programme alumni is maintained through the Maastricht University Alumni Association. The association has a website, publishes an address book and a magazine (ContinuUM), and organizes informal meetings in the Netherlands and abroad. In addition, information regarding the connection between graduates and the labour market is retrieved by the ‘labour market monitor’ (see standard 17). Alumni are approached at one, five and ten years after they graduate as part of this monitor. External stakeholders active in the European health policy and advisory world play a vital role in terms of ongoing programme development. Considerable emphasis is placed on their opinions and suggestions with a view to adapting our programme to foster European public health issues. To this end, the Advisory Board is actively involved in building bridges between academia and the professional field. Furthermore, the programme coordinators are in regular contact with the placement institutes as they provide breeding grounds for future careers in European public health for our students.

Assessment
The committee studied how staff, students, alumni and the professional field are involved within the FHML and its quality assurance system, and concludes that the programme fulfils the requirements concerning this standard. The committee established that the staff members and the students contribute to the internal quality assurance in the usual way, for example through questionnaires and the Education Committee, and directly by informal contacts. Contacts between the Education Committee and their student constituency run through their informal network. In addition, the committee noted that the students find the lecturers easy to approach, and that contact between students and lecturers occurs regularly. The committee appreciates this and emphasises that these informal contacts contribute to the quality of the programme.

The committee appreciates that the programme tries to stay in touch with its alumni through the Maastricht University Alumni Association, but it feels that the alumni are not involved with the quality assurance of this specific bachelor’s programme in a standardised way. Despite the fact that there are very few alumni at this point, the programme could make better use of its alumni in the committee's view. It advises expanding their role in quality assurance and ensuring that contact occurs regularly. Because they followed the programme and are connected with the professional field or a master’s programme, their contribution could be valuable. The committee concludes that the programme has sufficient contact with the professional field. It verified and approves the existence of the Advisory Board (see standard 3). In addition, the professional field is involved through placement institutes and guest lecturers, which the committee appreciates. It notes that the programme uses these contacts in an efficient way, which adds to its quality.

Bachelor’s programme European Public Health: the committee assesses this standard as satisfactory.

Assessment of the theme Internal quality assurance system
The committee comes to an overall assessment of the theme Internal quality assurance system on the basis of its assessments of the separate standards. In the case of the bachelor’s programme European Public Health, it assesses this theme is satisfactory.
5.1.6. Results

The achieved learning outcomes correspond with the aims and objectives regarding level, orientation and subject-/discipline-specific requirements.

Description
The overall aim of the programme is to provide students with cutting-edge knowledge, academic insights and entrepreneurial skills in the field of Public Health and Health Care systems within a broad international and European perspective. Pivotal in achieving this overall aim is the placement project and the writing of the bachelor’s thesis. To complete a bachelor’s thesis based on a final piece of research over a period of 20 weeks, students are required not only to obtain information from the scientific literature and other public sources, but also to interpret and use this information in postulating their own research hypothesis, which is subsequently assessed according to existing research material. In the case of a bachelor’s project, this is commonly a subject-directed task for the student. In this way, students not only learn to define research or design questions and write a proposal for a structured investigation into or solution to a question, but also to implement these proposals, in order to subsequently form a judgment on the conclusions drawn. The requirements for the bachelor’s thesis as well as the procedure and criteria for assessment are specified in standard 11.

As the programme started in September 2006, the first batch of students graduated in 2009. These students took up the following FHML programmes: the master’s programme European Public Health (n=4); specialisations within the master’s programme Public Health (n=7), and the Health Sciences Research Master (n=1). Three students enrolled successfully in the master’s programme on Public Policy and Human Development, offered by the Maastricht Graduate School of Governance. Furthermore, 6 students applied successfully for master’s programmes abroad, like the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. Finally, 3 students entered the labour market directly after graduation.

Assessment
The committee assessed the achieved learning outcomes by inspecting a selection of the final theses. It made a random selection of 15 from the list of the 25 most recently completed theses and also received the associated assessment forms. In selecting the theses, consideration was given to the grading (low, average and high grade). The committee members read the theses and assessed their presentation of the problem and review of the literature, methods and justification, conclusion and discussion, structure, legibility and verification. It found that almost all of the theses met the aims and objectives regarding level, orientation and subject/discipline-specific requirements.

In general, the committee agreed with the grades awarded by the supervisors. The grading of the theses was fair and reflected the differences in the dissertations. Some theses with high grades were of a quality comparable to a master’s thesis. These theses were based on relevant and interesting questions which were clearly formulated, contained an adequate frame of reference and were written in a structured and concise manner. The committee was quite impressed by the fact that bachelor students seem to be able to reach this level at the end of the programme. However, some of the theses with low grades tend to be graded too generously according to the committee. The committee feels this is caused by the fact that students were over enthusiastic and were aiming too high. The research questions stated by these students were too broad and did not contain enough focus.
As a result, the committee observed a discrepancy between these questions and the research methods applied: the methods applied are sufficient for a bachelor's thesis, but the research question should be more specific. In addition, these theses were less structured and concise because of the lack of focus. The committee advises the supervisors to monitor students closely in the first phase of the process and if necessary narrow the subject down. By ensuring focused and restricted research questions, the methods applied will be sufficient, and the results described more clearly. Furthermore, supervisors should inform placement supervisors clearly on the level required (see standard 2). This way, the chance they aim at a master's level is reduced.

Based on interviews with alumni, the committee concludes that graduates are well prepared for their professional career. For instance, they are able to take into account multiple perspectives and act as a mediator, and know when and where to consult different experts and sources. In addition, alumni stated that they gained access to the labour market, even without a master's diploma. The committee also interviewed alumni who chose to follow a master's programme, and verified that they feel well equipped. They stated that they are satisfied with the connection between the bachelor's and master's programmes and recognize a constructive structure concerning knowledge and level. As stated before, the committee recommends gaining more insight into the activities of students after graduation (see standard 3). These insights could contribute to setting aims and goals.

Bachelor's programme European Public Health: the committee assesses this standard as satisfactory.

**S21: Study progress**

Target figures that are comparable to other relevant programmes are formulated to express the expected success rate. The programme’s success rate complies with these target figures.

**Description**

The following table shows the annual student intake from 2006 to 2009, the completion rate, the number of students still engaged in the programme and student dropout numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Reregister after 1 year</th>
<th>Completion rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.6. Success rates and study progress in the programme per cohort.*

The Maastricht University Executive Board has set benchmarks of 75% for reregistering after one year and a 70% completion rate. One reason for the frequent termination of the programme after the first year is that students opting for a medical study use the first year programme as a waiting semester. It is also due to inadequate study results after the first year and a misfit between expectations and reality.

**Assessment**

The committee examined the students’ study progress. It concluded that the programme set a high target and succeeds in achieving it. Although the committee considers the programme too new to make a well-informed and valid judgement based on the available data, it finds that the success rates after three years are acceptable. It also noted that alumni and students confirm that it is feasible to finish the thesis within the set time (see standard 7). The committee assesses the drop-out rate after the first year as quite high. During the site visit, the
committee was informed that some of these students originally opted for a medical study. The committee appreciates that these students are also guided well and motivated to participate actively, despite the possibility that they will leave the programme early. Thus, the involvement of these students does not influence the general level and atmosphere of the programme, which the committee admires and considers crucial, taking into account the didactic approach of the programme geared towards working in groups. Students have to be able to rely on each other and motivate each other (see standard 10). The committee values the fact that some of the ‘medicine students’ even choose to stay after the first year. The programme does not have a clear view of the reasons other students have to quit after the first year. The committee advises recording their arguments and, if relevant, adapting the programme on the basis of this information. Perhaps the drop-out rate after the first year could be reduced.

*Bachelor’s programme European Public Health:* the committee assesses this standard as satisfactory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of the theme Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The committee comes to an overall assessment of the theme Results on the basis of its assessments of the separate standards. In the case of the bachelor’s programme European Public Health, it assesses this theme as satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Overview of the committee’s assessment

### Bachelor's programme European Public Health:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aims and objectives</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>1. Subject-/discipline-specific requirements</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bachelor and master level</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Academic orientation</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Curriculum</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>4. Requirements for academic orientation</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Correspondence between the aims and objectives and the curriculum</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Consistency of the curriculum</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Workload</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Admission requirements</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Credits</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Coherence of structure and contents</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Learning assessment</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>12. Requirements for academic orientation</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Quantity of staff</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Quality of staff</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Services</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>15. Facilities</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16. Tutoring</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Internal quality assurance system</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>17. Periodical evaluations</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18. Measures for improvement</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19. Involvement of staff, students, alumni and the professional field</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Results</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>20. Achieved learning outcomes</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21. Study progress</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The committee's overall assessment of the bachelor's programme European Public Health**

The committee concludes, on the basis of its assessments of the themes and standards from the assessment framework, that the bachelor's programme European Public Health fulfils the formal requirements which are a prerequisite for accreditation.
APPENDICES
Appendix A: Elaborated learning outcomes

General learning outcomes
A graduate of the bachelor’s programme:

1. acts and thinks according to the concept of New Public Health;
2. is conversant with the terms and key theories from the underlying basic disciplines and is able to place the concept of New Public Health in a European and international context;
3. is conversant with the most important current problems, questions and challenges in the field of European Public Health, and is able to interpret and explain these problems in theoretical-academic terminology;
4. is able to demonstrate academic-critical thinking and reasoning;
5. has broad knowledge and skills in social sciences research, is fully able to comply with the professional standards for practical action in the appropriate areas of application, and is able to express him- or herself excellently in both written and spoken language;
6. has developed an attitude of life-long learning.

Specific learning outcomes
The bachelor’s programme requires form graduates:

Knowledge and Insight
1. to have a robust disciplinary knowledge in public health issues;
2. to have the capacity to look beyond the boundaries of core disciplines;
3. to be able to analyse complex disciplinary, multi- and interdisciplinary public health problems, in terms of actors and factors;
4. to have knowledge and understanding of the interconnection between public health problems and solutions at a global, European, national, regional and local level;
5. to have knowledge and understanding of public health analyses and interventions, including a serious understanding of research methods and techniques;
6. to be capable of understanding and interpreting the historic background of the field of study, including the history of public health ideas and concepts;
7. to be capable of understanding and interpreting the historic international and European background in the field of study;
8. to have knowledge and understanding of the relation between cultural backgrounds on the one hand and the perception and framing of public health problems and solutions on the other;
9. to have knowledge and understanding of the structure and practice of international institutions, i.e. European institutions, including regulations and incentives, as political and economic mechanisms;
10. to have knowledge and understanding of the potential benefits of research, academic research methods and techniques;

Applying Knowledge and Insight
11. to have experience with public health analysis and interventions including research methods and techniques;
12. to have experience with regulations and incentives as the core basic political and economic mechanisms;
13. to be able to critically reflect on the field of study and its relation to other fields of study and the social environment;
14. to be capable of analysing the ethical and normative aspects of the consequences of scientific thinking and acting and discussing them with confreres and non-confreres and
integrate these aspects into their own scientific work;
15. to be capable of analysing the consequences of scientific thinking and professional acting;
16. to be capable of analysing the social consequences (economic, social, political, cultural) of new developments in the field of study and discussing them with confreres and non-confreres and integrating these consequences into the scientific work.
17. to be able to critically reflect (independently) on their own thinking, decisions and actions and adjust them;

Formation of a Judgement
18. to acquire an original and critical style of scientific thinking and analysis and professional intervening;
19. to be capable of anticipating and analysing the consequences of one's own professional decisions and actions;
20. to be capable when necessary of reviewing their own professional knowledge;
21. to be able to choose a place as a professional in society;

Communication
22. to be able to critically use the Internet for literature research, publishing drafts, interacting with on-line peer review systems, and empirical research;
23. to have excellent writing and communication skills (in English) by being capable of communicating about research and problem solutions with confreres, stakeholders, and non-colleagues;
24. to be able to debate about the field of study and the position of that field within society;
25. to be able to work in a team, to be able to create partnerships, and to be able to participate in professional networks;
26. to be able to act as a (project)leader or use leadership skills;
27. to be flexible and have the capacity to work under pressure;

Learning Attitude and Skills
28. to acquire an attitude of life-long learning and to be able to use the acquired skills throughout professional life.
Appendix B: Curricula vitae of the committee members

Prof. dr. J. De Maeseneer is a Belgian physician and professor of family medicine at the University of Ghent. He was born in Ghent. In 1977, he graduated as a medical doctor at the University of Ghent and since 1978 works as a family physician at the Wijkgezondheitscentrum Botermarkt in Ledeberg (Ghent). In 1981, he started working as a part-time assistant at the Department of Family Medicine and Primary Health Care at Ghent University. In 1989 he obtained a PhD. with the thesis ‘The functioning of 94 GP trainers at the State University of Ghent: an explorative research’. His research at the university focuses on Health Services Research. Since 1996 he is a member of the editorial board of the European Journal of General Practice, of the Wonca International Classification Committee (WICC), which produced the International Classification of Primary Care, and of the Research Committee of the World Organization of Family Doctors. He is also a member of the Advisory Committee on Medical Training of the EU and of the Scientific Advisory Board of the "Organisation for Accreditation and Quality Assurance" in Switzerland. He wrote articles in several journals on health education, epidemiology, medical decision making, medical education, quality of care, community oriented primary care, interdisciplinary team work, training in general practice, health and poverty, health in developing countries. He is chairman of the Interuniversity Flemish Consortium for vocational training of family medicine.

Dr. Dineke Zeegers Paget, LLM., PhD, executive director of European Public Health Association (EUPHA) for twelve years, has extensive experience in public health in Europe, through the EUPHA international scientific conferences, collaborative international projects, membership of international committees (including DG Sanco Health Policy Forum) and coordination with other international organisations and NGOs. In 1988, she obtained a master's degree in Law at the Rijksuniversiteit Groningen. In 1996 she got a PhD, with her thesis titled “AIDS and public health measures: a global survey of the activities of legislatures 1983 - 1993”. From 1988 to 1989 she worked for the World Health Organization in Geneva as a Technical Officer at the Health Legislation Unit. After that, she was scientific researcher at Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, mainly working on legal aspects of AIDS and human rights in a comparative context. From 1993 to 1999, she worked for the Swiss Federal Office of Public Health. After having worked as public health consultant for amongst others the European Health Association and project manager at the Netherlands School for Public Health, she is now Executive director of the European Public Health Association in Bern (until 2000) and Utrecht.

Prof. dr. W.L.J.M. (Walter) Devillé, MD, PhD, holds a Special Chair "Refugees and Health" with the department of Medical Anthropology, Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, University of Amsterdam. He is also senior program officer of International and Migrant health at the Netherlands Institute of Health Systems Research (NIVEL) in Utrecht. He worked as Public health officer and epidemiologist in Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia and with the Royal Tropical Institute in Amsterdam. His actual main interests are in the fields of migrant health, cultural competent health care, epidemiology, public health, health systems research, operational and participatory health systems research. The focal points of his research actually are accessibility of health care for vulnerable groups (regular migrants, asylum seekers & refugees, UDM, deprived areas) and cultural competent health care (cultural validation of instruments, health care provider / client encounter).
**Prof. dr. M. Wieringa-de Waard** is professor, Department of General Practice/Family Medicine, Academic Medical Center, University of Amsterdam. Prof. dr. Margreet Wieringa-de Waard is professor of General Practice, Department of General Practice/Family Medicine, Academic Medical Center, University of Amsterdam. In 2002 she got a PhD with her thesis “Bleeding in the first trimester of pregnancy”. In 2005 she obtained a master’s degree of Management in Education at TIAS Business School Tilburg. From 2000 till 2010 she was head of the GP Specialty Training Institute at the AMC. Her research focus is the quality of the GP specialty training and of medical education.

**A. van der Star**, student of the bachelor’s programme Health Sciences, Institute of Health Policy & Management, Erasmus University of Rotterdam. From 2009 to 2010 he joined the board of the study association for students in Health Sciences as the Commissioner of Study Affairs. Within this position he was the president of the Education Council, an independent committee for the evaluation of courses. Besides that he is a member of the Education Committee and the Faculty Council. He also joins many project groups for quality improvement of education as a student representative and he is specialised in quality assurance of education.
Appendix C: Programme of the site visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October 24th</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrival of the committee members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October 25th</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:30 – 11:00</td>
<td>Installation committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 14:00</td>
<td>Preparatory meeting of the committee: discussing the self-evaluation report and the theses; studying documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 – 15:00</td>
<td>Introductory meeting with the responsible persons (programme directors, professor, writers of the self-evaluation report, programme coordinators, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 – 16:00</td>
<td>Meeting with students of the bachelor's programme EPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 – 16:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15 – 17:15</td>
<td>Meeting with lecturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15 – 18:00</td>
<td>Meeting with alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:30 – 21:30</td>
<td>Working dinner committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October 26th</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 – 09:45</td>
<td>Meeting with students of the programme committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:45 – 10:15</td>
<td>Meeting with lecturers of the programme committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 10:45</td>
<td>Meeting with members of the exam committees and study advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 – 11:15</td>
<td>Campus tour and consultation hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 – 11:45</td>
<td>Review and preparation for concluding meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 – 12:45</td>
<td>Concluding meeting with formally responsible persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 – 13:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30 – 16:00</td>
<td>Review meeting committee, draft of preliminary results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 – 16:30</td>
<td>Oral presentation of preliminary results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30 – 17:00</td>
<td>Reception</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>