

Assessment report

# Maastricht University



Certificate for Quality in Internationalisation



European consortium for accreditation



Assessment report

# Maastricht University

Copyright © 2019  
ECA OCCASIONAL PAPER

**European Consortium for Accreditation in Higher Education**



All rights reserved. This information may be shared, copied and redistributed for non-commercial purposes, provided that the source is duly acknowledged. Derivatives of this material are however not allowed. Additional copies of this publication are available via [www.ecahe.eu](http://www.ecahe.eu).

Cover art: David Goehring (CC. by)

**e | c | a |**

## Table of content

<b>1. Executive summary</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>2. The assessment procedure</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>3. Basic information</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>4. Assessment scale</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>5. Assessment criteria</b> .....	<b>14</b>
Standard 1: Intended internationalisation .....	14
Standard 2: Action plans .....	19
Standard 3: Implementation .....	23
Standard 4: Enhancement .....	27
Standard 5: Governance .....	32
<b>6. Overview of assessments</b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b>Annex 1. Composition of the panel</b> .....	<b>39</b>
<b>Annex 2. Documents reviewed</b> .....	<b>41</b>
<b>Annex 3. Site visit programme</b> .....	<b>43</b>



## 1. Executive summary

This report contains an assessment of the quality of internationalisation at Maastricht University. The audit was performed by an international panel, convened by the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders, during a site visit to Maastricht from 22 to 26 October 2018. The panel's findings, considerations and conclusions are based on a dedicated self-evaluation report, additional materials illustrating Maastricht's performance on internationalisation and a series of vivid discussions with different stakeholders, notably but not exclusively from the Faculty of Law.

According to the panel, Maastricht University fulfils the standards of the CeQuInt evaluation framework up to a level which systematically surpasses the generic quality that can be reasonably expected from an international perspective. In terms of intended internationalisation, the panel considers that internationalisation is embedded in the history, culture, spirit and identity of UM. As internationalisation is a fundamental constituent component of the university's *raison d'être*, there is a strong match between the educational vision of the university, UM's current Strategic Programme and its strategy on internationalisation. The internationalisation plans are not only well documented, but have been developed jointly and are now supported enthusiastically by all stakeholders within and outside UM. The plans contain clear goals and actions on a range of themes that befit the overall strategy on internationalisation. These goals are realistically ambitious, broken down in verifiable actions and impact on the quality of teaching and learning at UM. Hence, the panel assesses 'intended internationalisation' to be excellent.

In terms of action plans, the panel considers that the internationalisation goals and objectives of Maastricht University are translated in adequate action plans and measures. These plans are relevant for the development of the entire university as internationalisation in its different dimensions has been, is, and continues to be an integral part of everyday life at UM. There is a clear link between the themes addressed in the internationalisation strategy and the university's goal to increase the quality of its education. The panel thinks highly of the way in which several policies are pursued, for instance on the international classroom, the language policy, student recruitment and student mobility opportunities. Moreover, the university has put in place adequate structures and resources to ensure that internationalisation policies are executed effectively. Hence, the panel assesses 'action plans' to be excellent.

In terms of implementation, the panel considers that the university has a strong system in place to monitor and evaluate the quality of its education in general and the provisions of its internationalisation plans in particular. Data on internationalisation actions are gathered in a management information system that produces relevant quantitative data and qualitative reports. If anything, the university could formulate more precisely the internationalisation activities in the Strategic Programme and define exactly what is needed to monitor and evaluate these measures. Nonetheless, the university - both at central level and within the faculties - makes very good use of the data it collects because this information allows responsible bodies to take appropriate action. Moreover, the entire review process is documented carefully. Hence, the panel assesses 'implementation' to be good.

In terms of enhancement, the panel considers that UM has a comprehensive quality assurance system that pays particular attention to enhancement in terms of both systematic improvement and development. Since internationalisation is embedded across the university, there are many instruments and procedures in place to monitor the internationalisation actions, evaluate their execution and decide on their improvement. Moreover, the quality system relies on a strong commitment of both internal and external stakeholders. The university makes very good use of its 'in-house' expertise, but could benefit from gathering in a more systematic way input from stakeholders that are genuinely external to the university. Nonetheless, the panel is impressed by the many initiatives to enhance the quality of education following the results of both internal and external evaluations, as well as by the breadth of the activities and the depth with which reported flaws are taken up and communicated. Hence, the panel assesses 'enhancement' to be good.

In terms of governance, the panel considers that the new structure for internationalisation is strong and befits the organisational culture of the university, which thrives on participation in jointly set and centrally validated frameworks. This set-up is particularly suitable to gather timely input on internationalisation actions and goals from all levels of the organisation, as well as from external stakeholders. Moreover, the allocation of the internationalisation portfolio to the university President demonstrates that internationalisation is of very high importance to Maastricht, and this all the more so given the President's strong track-record in internationalisation. Hence, the panel assesses 'governance' to be excellent.

Based on the written materials, the interviews on site and its internal deliberations, the panel considers Maastricht University in many respects as a 'best-practice' in internationalisation. According to the panel, the university is an example of what John Hudzik calls comprehensive





internationalisation: “a commitment confirmed through action to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research and service missions of higher education. It shapes institutional ethos and values and touches the entire higher education enterprise. It is essential that it be embraced by institutional leadership, governance, faculty, students, and all academic service and support units. Comprehensive internationalisation influences all of campus life, as well as the institution’s external frames of reference, partnerships and relations.”

In sum, the panel considers that Maastricht University fulfils each of the five standards of the CeQuInt assessment framework. Its overall judgement on the quality of internationalisation at Maastricht University is therefore **positive**.

## 2. The assessment procedure

The assessment procedure was organised as laid down in the Frameworks for the Assessment of Quality in Internationalisation (Frameworks) published by the European Consortium for Accreditation (ECA).

A panel of experts was convened and consisted of the following members:

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

The panel was assisted by:

- Mark Delmartino MA, secretary
- Frank Wamelink, NVAO policy advisor and process coordinator

The composition of the panel reflects the expertise deemed necessary by the Frameworks. The individual panel members' expertise and experience can be found in [Annex 1: Composition of the assessment panel](#). All panel members signed a statement of independence and confidentiality. These signed statements are available from NVAO upon simple request. The procedure was coordinated by Frank Wamelink, policy advisor at NVAO.

The assessment panel studied the self-evaluation report and annexed documentation explicitly related to the ECA standards and provided by the institution before the site visit. ([Annex 2: Documents reviewed](#)) The panel held a preparatory meeting on 17 October 2018 where it exchanged its initial impressions and listed the issues that required clarification. The

site visit took place from 22 until 26 October 2018 at Maastricht University. The sessions focusing on internationalisation were held at the Faculty of Law on Thursday 25 October. (*Annex 3: Site visit programme*) The panel formulated its preliminary assessments per standards immediately after the site visit. These were based on the findings of the site visit which built upon the review of the self-evaluation report and annexed documentation.

The panel finalised the draft report on 18th November 2018. It was then sent to Maastricht University to review the report for factual mistakes. The remarks made by the university **have been** taken into account in the final version of the report, which the panel approved on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2019.

### 3. Basic information

**Institution: Maastricht  
University**

---

Type of institution: Publicly funded institution

---

**Status:** Publicly funded institution

---

QA / accreditation agency: NVAO

---

Status period: Positive audit outcome, valid until May 2019

## 4. Assessment scale

The assessment-scale relates to the assessments at the level of the standards and is based on the definitions given below. Through the underlying criteria, each of the standards describes the level of quality or attainment required for a satisfactory assessment. The starting point of the assessment scale is however not threshold quality but generic quality. Generic quality is defined as *the quality that can reasonably be expected from an international perspective*.

### Unsatisfactory

The institution does not meet the current generic quality for this standard.

The institution does not attain an acceptable level across the standard's entire spectrum. One or more of the underlying criteria shows a meaningful shortcoming.

---

### Satisfactory

The institution meets the current generic quality for this standard.

The institution shows an acceptable level of attainment across the standard's entire spectrum. If any of the underlying criteria show a shortcoming, that shortcoming is not meaningful.

---

### Good

The institution surpasses the current generic quality for this standard.

The institution clearly goes beyond the acceptable level of attainment across the standard's entire spectrum. None of the underlying criteria have any shortcomings.

---

### Excellent

The institution systematically and substantially surpasses the current generic quality for this standard.

The institution excels across the standard's entire spectrum. This extraordinary level of attainment is explicitly demonstrated through exemplary or good practices in all the underlying criteria. The programme can be regarded as an international example for this standard.

## 5. Assessment criteria

### Standard 1: Intended internationalisation

---

#### Criterion 1a: Supported goals

*The internationalisation goals for the institution are documented and these are shared and supported by stakeholders within and outside the institution.*

Maastricht University (UM) was founded in 1976 as the eighth medical faculty in the Netherlands. For more than 20 years, the university has addressed internationalisation as a means to impact the quality of its education. Over the years, UM has continued to evolve and grow while it remained focused on and committed to its distinctive educational approach (problem-based learning) and to internationalisation. UM now counts more than 17000 students and over 4000 staff: about 58% of the students and more than 40% of the staff are non-Dutch; 53 out of 69 degree programmes which UM is offering in six faculties are taught in English.

The educational vision of the university is to educate resilient, highly-skilled graduates who are prepared for the regional, national and international labour market and who can make a meaningful contribution to society. To achieve this, UM relies on four pillars: problem-based learning (PBL), internationalisation, research education, and meaningful student experiences. Each pillar constitutes in itself a strategic element in the development of the university. UM has a dedicated internationalisation strategy, which forms an integral part of the university's Strategic Programme 2017-2021. In this Strategic Programme, goals for internationalisation focus among others on student recruitment, mobility, UM as network university, the International Classroom, UM's campus in Brussels, and regional developments with opportunities for further internationalisation in research and education.

Its current internationalisation strategy 2017-2019 is built on two approaches: enhancing internationalisation at home and developing a European university with a global outlook. Both components already featured in previous strategies; now they are the key focus for the university in so far as internationalisation is concerned and set a framework for the different university-wide internationalisation goals and actions. Internationalisation at home focuses on enhancing the quality of education by including international themes as well as international and intercultural learning outcomes in the programmes; it also looks at problem-based learning in the context of the International Classroom to develop an integrated, international

learning experience for all students. The strategy to develop as a European university with a global outlook focuses on UM's position and engagement with other partners in Europe and beyond; it also explores the theme of Europe in its education programmes and in its longstanding research theme 'Europe and the globalising world'.

The panel gathered from the discussions on site that internationalisation is more than a fashionable 'buzzword' and that the strategy on internationalisation is much more than a construct on paper. In fact, several interviewees emphasised that the Strategic Programme and the self-evaluation reports for CeQuInt, as well as for the Institutional Audit and the Quality Agreements, have been developed in a very comprehensive and inclusive manner: the university is successful in bringing together management, faculties and services, staff and students, alumni and professionals around a common vision for the development of the university. Hence, it comes as no surprise to the panel that all interviewees were knowledgeable about the educational vision of UM and invariably subscribed to the values of the university. Moreover, they were enthusiastic about the current internationalisation policies of the university and the plans that are envisaged for the near future. Management, staff, students and external representatives at the Faculty of Law explained in a very convincing way how their approach to internationalisation does not only align with the university's overall strategy but is also particularly fit for purpose for the academic legal community at Maastricht.

Based on the written materials and the discussions on site, the panel **considers** that internationalisation is in the genes of the university: it is embedded in the history, culture, spirit and identity of UM. The panel sees three pieces of compelling evidence for this consideration: first of all, the strong match between the educational vision of the university, UM's current Strategic Programme and its strategy on internationalisation; secondly, the observation that across faculties and services, there is an enthusiastic commitment to 'all things international'; and thirdly, the key figures on non-Dutch students and staff and on English language programmes demonstrate that the university community in Maastricht is truly international.

The panel **concludes** that the internationalisation goals for the institution are well documented. The goals are shared and supported by stakeholders within and outside the institution which was confirmed in the interviews during the site visit.

**Criterion 1b: Verifiable objectives**

*The institution has formulated verifiable objectives that enable it to monitor the achievement of its internationalisation goals.*

UM's internationalisation strategy is documented in the internationalisation plans, which set targets and priorities towards reaching the strategic goals and review the progress and success of implementation. The plans are developed every two years. The central internationalisation policy team gathers input from the faculties and their implementation plans, as well as from other sources and stakeholders. The draft plans are shared with relevant university bodies and stakeholders for input and feedback.

The panel studied both the previous (2015-2017) and current (2017-2019) internationalisation plans which were added to the self-evaluation report. The priorities of the previous plan are linked to UM's Strategic Programme 2012-2016 and addressed four themes: international marketing and recruitment, network university, internationalisation at home, and global engagement/capacity building. Similarly, the internationalisation plan 2017-2019 has been developed based on UM's Strategic Programme 2017-2021. The current goals, plans and activities are clustered around two focus areas: enhancing internationalisation at home and developing a European university with a global outlook. Within these two focus areas, a number of specific themes are addressed: recruitment, rankings, international classroom, international programmes, scholarships, language policy, networks, partnerships, mobility, EU-regional engagement, campus Brussels, global engagement.

At the end of each internationalisation plan, a review session is organised to see which objectives have been achieved and which topics require further attention under the next plan. In this way, the current internationalisation plan reviews and continues the work that has been done in 2015-2017. The panel observed that in the 2017-2019 internationalisation plan each theme features an outline of the current situation of the topic as well as a description of the concrete actions for the period 2017-2019. These actions are formulated in such a way that their development and realisation can be monitored.

The internationalisation plans and goals are set at central university level and are then 'translated' in concrete actions per faculty and/or service. The discussions on site gave the panel a clear insight in how overall goals and plans are reflected in the internationalisation policy at the Faculty of Law.

Based on the written materials and the discussions on site, the panel **considers** that there is a strong link between the university's (long-term) strategy on internationalisation and the (short-term) plans, goals and activities of the respective faculties and services. It is good practice, according to the panel, that the actions and goals are not necessarily limited to one



planning period but where needed are incorporated in future plans and strategies. Furthermore, the panel has noticed with satisfaction that these goals are broken down in verifiable actions: services and faculties - and at an aggregate level also the university as a whole - are in a position to monitor the progress made on each action and theme, and establish at the end of the two-year planning period if actions are fully realised.

The panel **concludes** that in terms of internationalisation, clear goals and actions have been formulated on a range of themes that befit the overall strategy on internationalisation. These goals are realistically ambitious and broken down in verifiable actions. In this way, both the university as a whole and the respective services and faculties can monitor the progress made on the different themes and actions and eventually evaluate the achievement of the goals that were set at central or decentral level.

#### **Criterion 1c: Impact on education**

*The internationalisation goals explicitly include measures that contribute to the overall quality of teaching and learning.*

UM regards internationalisation as a means to strengthen its curriculum, create mobility opportunities, and foster cooperation locally, regionally and globally. The focus area 'internationalisation at home' features several policy initiatives to improve the educational offering to students. First and foremost, UM is committed to the educational pedagogy of problem-based learning. PBL's emphasis on learning in small group tutorials with much interaction among students and between students and tutors has provided a good basis for developing the International Classroom. The ICR is explicitly mentioned in the Strategic Programme and the internationalisation plans of the university. It promotes a culture of inclusion, prepares students for the global labour market and supports the development of intercultural communication skills of staff and students. In this way, ICR constitutes an integrated approach to teaching and learning as well as a mind-set of both students and staff.

Furthermore, the impact of internationalisation on education is facilitated by offering programmes that focus on international topics, set international and intercultural learning outcomes, include study abroad elements and are based on educational collaborations with foreign partners. In fact, the panel observed that the majority of degree programmes at UM are international and that all programmes reflect at least some of the above-mentioned international(isation) features.

Several interviewees – students, staff and management alike - indicated to the panel that the international topics and focus areas in the degree programmes do prepare students for the international labour market. They also mentioned that the international composition of the tutorial groups enhance the capability of students and staff to work in multicultural teams, and that the cultural backgrounds of international students are used to enhance problem-solving capabilities in the International Classroom. Furthermore, the international dimension of programmes does stimulate students to search for international literature and encourage alumni to look for the international context when solving work-related issues in their professional environment. The high share of International students at UM also indirectly stimulate students attending Dutch-language programmes: interviewees from the Faculty of Law mentioned that this international atmosphere is very much present in what they call the 'international corridors' of their faculty building.

Based on the written materials and the discussions on site, the panel **considers** that by bringing staff and students together in degree programmes with a considerable international component that are delivered through problem-based learning and (increasingly often) in an International Classroom context, internationalisation does have a considerable impact on the quality of teaching and learning at Maastricht University. According to the panel, the extent of this impact both in depth and in width across the university is due to the specific attention paid to internationalisation at strategic level and to translating this strategy in concrete ambitions on teaching and learning that are feasible and relevant.

The panel **concludes** that the internationalisation strategy, its goals, plans and actions explicitly relate to the quality of teaching and learning at UM. This is a logical consequence of the fact that internationalisation is a fundamental constituent component at Maastricht with a direct relevance for the achievement of the university's goals and thus for the provision of excellent quality of education. Moreover, offering problem-based learning in an International Classroom context is an excellent practice in terms of enhancing the impact of internationalisation on the educational experience.

#### **Overall conclusion**

The panel deems that in all the underlying criteria of this standard UM systematically and substantially surpasses the current generic quality for this standard. In terms of intended internationalisation, the panel judges that Maastricht University excels on all accounts: first and foremost, internationalisation is embedded in the history, culture, spirit and identity of UM. Internationalisation is a fundamental constituent component of the university's *raison d'être*:

hence, there is a strong match between the educational vision of the university, UM's current Strategic Programme and its strategy on internationalisation. Secondly, the internationalisation plans are not only well documented, but have been developed jointly and are now supported enthusiastically by all stakeholders within and outside UM. Thirdly, the internationalisation plans contain clear goals and actions on a range of themes that befit the overall strategy on internationalisation. These goals are realistically ambitious, broken down in verifiable actions and impact on the quality of teaching and learning at UM.

Based on the presented documentation as well as the observations and discussions during the site visit and the evidences found, the panel assesses *standard 1. Intended internationalisation* as **excellent**.

## Standard 2: Action plans

---

### Criterion 2a: Fitness for purpose

*The institution's internationalisation plans ensure the achievement of its internationalisation goals.*

The internationalisation strategy of Maastricht University consists of specific objectives and actions. The strategy consists of two focus areas - strengthening internationalisation at home and developing a European university with a global outlook - with their own goals on a number of themes such as student recruitment, international classroom, international networks or global engagement. The internationalisation plan lists the goals and the concrete actions envisaged to realise these goals. The panel understood from reading the previous and the current internationalisation plans that the respective themes contribute to the overall strategy and that the actions planned per theme contribute to reaching the overall goals per focus area.

In addition to setting new internationalisation goals and addressing new actions in line with UM's Strategic Programme 2017-2021, the current internationalisation plan 2017-2019 continues the work that has been done in the previous period 2015-2017. The panel observed that there is a logical continuation in the themes that goes beyond the individual plans. In fact, all themes that are central to the current internationalisation plan were also addressed in the previous plan.

Internationalisation being a fundamental component of UM's vision and strategy, the plans, goals and actions are an integral part of the overall policy plans of the university. In this

respect, policies on internationalisation follow the same cycle of creation, implementation, verification and improvement as other policies.

Furthermore, the panel looked into a number of action plans on specific UM policies with a direct bearing on internationalisation. For instance, the action plan for International and Intercultural Intended Learning Outcomes describes the past, present and future actions on how IILO's are developed and applied in a PBL and ICR context across the university. The panel gathered from the documents and the discussions that the university wants to stimulate the development and uptake of IILO's within faculties and programmes. While the action plan sets out the overall trajectory across the university, it is up to the faculties to include this topic in their own plans. Given that certain faculties have advanced more than others – some 'only' need to engage in finetuning their IILOs to distinguish between intercultural and international learning outcomes, while other faculties are yet to embed IILOs in their programmes - the attention to this particular policy issue and the pace of development and realisation will differ in the respective faculties.

While the self-evaluation report provided an extensive description of the internationalisation strategy and how this strategy is incorporated in the quality assurance system of Maastricht University, the discussions on site focused on how the provisions of this strategy are finetuned in the specific case of the Faculty of Law. The interviewees explained how their faculty is doing on each of the internationalisation themes. The panel gathered from the discussions that there is a close alignment between the objectives of the themes university-wide and the plans of the Faculty of Law on each of the topics.

Based on the written materials and the discussions on site, the panel **considers** that the internationalisation goals and objectives of Maastricht University are translated in adequate action plans and measures. These plans are relevant for the entire university as internationalisation in its different dimensions has been, is, and continues to be an integral part of everyday life at the university.

The panel **concludes** that the internationalisation plans of Maastricht University ensure the achievement of its internationalisation goals. Moreover, the implementation of these plans contributes considerably to the realisation of the overall institutional strategy.

**Criterion 2b: Dimensions**

*The institution's internationalisation plans appropriately include at least the following dimensions: "international and intercultural learning outcomes", "teaching, learning and research", "staff" and "students".*

Further to what has been stated in previous sections, internationalisation is an integral part of the university and therefore there is a strong match between the overall ambitions of the university and its plans with regard to internationalisation. Because internationalisation contributes to reaching the educational vision of the university, the goals, plans and actions on internationalisation impact on ILOs, on teaching, learning and research, on staff and on students.

In order to establish in more concrete terms how internationalisation contributes to these dimensions, a group of internal stakeholders reflected on how the nine key internationalisation themes impact on each of the four dimensions. The results of the exercise were presented in the self-evaluation report: overall UM is performing (very) well and the four dimensions are sufficiently covered in all themes. The panel noticed that the individual appreciations (36 judgements, i.e. 9 themes x 4 dimensions) are properly motivated. Taken all together the internationalisation themes seem to have most impact on students and on teaching, learning and research. The international classroom and the language policy are two themes that are strongly present in each of the four dimensions. According to the panel, these results confirm the impressions it gained from the discussions: a lot of action was already undertaken between 2015 and 2018 by the university-wide International Classroom taskforce to further enhance the International Classroom concept for students and staff. Moreover, UM has an integrative and pragmatic approach to language. By setting clear rules for the use of language and by providing opportunities for language proficiency development, the UM language policy supports high quality education, personal and professional growth and ensures that all members of the UM community can participate in its activities and tasks without facing language barriers.

Based on the written materials and the discussions on site, the panel **considers** that there is a clear link between the themes addressed in the internationalisation strategy and the university's goal to increase the quality of its education. The internal exercise confirms this connection. The panel acknowledges that two themes stand out in this regard: international classroom and language policy. The panel thinks highly of the way in which these policies are pursued and commends the university to move ahead in the same direction in the future.

The panel **concludes** that the institution's internationalisation plans cover a comprehensive range of domains, including the dimensions put forward by this framework: students, staff, teaching and learning, research, and international and intercultural competences.

**Criterion 2c: Support**

*The institution's internationalisation plans are complemented by specific institution-wide instruments and adequate resources.*

Since internationalisation is embedded across the university, there are instruments and resources in place to help implement the internationalisation plans and carry out the university-wide activities.

In order to bring the internationalisation strategy and goals to life, UM counts first and foremost on a central dedicated internationalisation unit consisting of 4 FTE. This unit operates within the Academic Affairs department of the university and is responsible for the development and implementation of UM's strategic vision on internationalisation. It has a policy advisory function and reports directly to the UM President, who is the portfolio holder internationalisation within the Executive Board.

This core group works closely with the various departments and faculty contacts for internationalisation to ensure the strategic goals are delivered in practice. Information about the internationalisation activities at UM is presented in a dedicated sub-section of the UM website.

The panel gathered from the discussions that in addition to bilateral contacts between the central service and the faculty representatives, there are also regular meetings of the international relations officers. Moreover, the panel understood from the self-evaluation report that – apart from dedicated units such as the international students desk – there are many services and bodies across the university whose activities have an impact on the international dimension of the university. Examples include the Maastricht Housing Services, the Knowledge Centre for international staff support or the UM Language Centre.

Based on the written materials and the discussions on site, the panel **considers** that UM has put in place adequate instruments that directly impact on the internationalisation dimension of the university and the quality of its education. The panel also considers that these instruments come with adequate resources to make them effective.

The panel **concludes** that the internationalisation plans of Maastricht University are supported by a broad range of specific institution-wide instruments and adequate resources. The instruments are clearly linked to the plans and in this way particularly suitable to enhance the internationalisation efforts of UM.

**Overall conclusion**

The panel deems that in all the underlying criteria of this standard UM systematically and substantially surpasses the current generic quality for this standard. In terms of action plans, the panel judges that Maastricht University excels on all accounts: first and foremost, the internationalisation goals and objectives of the university are translated in adequate action plans and measures. These plans are relevant for the entire university as internationalisation in its different dimensions has been, is, and continues to be an integral part of everyday life at the university. Secondly, there is a clear link between the themes addressed in the internationalisation strategy and the university’s goal to increase the quality of its education. The panel thinks highly of the way in which several policies – notably but not exclusively on the international classroom, the language policy, student recruitment and student mobility opportunities - are pursued. Thirdly, the university has put in place adequate structures and resources to ensure that internationalisation policies are executed effectively.

Based on the presented documentation as well as the observations and discussions during the site visit and the evidences found, the panel assesses *standard 2. Action plans* as **excellent**.

**Standard 3: Implementation**

---

**Criterion 3a: Information system**

*The institution has a functional management information system which enables it to collect and process relevant information regarding internationalisation.*

During the visit, the panel was shown the management information system ‘Be Informed’, a central data warehouse in which information from difference source systems is gathered. It collects information on operational activities and reports on indicators such as students, human resource management, education, finance and alumni. Some of these indicators are of direct importance for internationalisation themes. In the case of the strategic theme recruitment, for instance, Be Informed is used to monitor the nationalities of current student

registrations as well as new applications. This applications and admissions process is monitored weekly and reported to all relevant stakeholders.

In order to retrieve more accessible and easy-to-use information, the system has been expanded recently with a dashboard that generates data sets following very specific UM-wide definitions on education, study success, research, human resources, valorisation, strategy, finance and facilities. The panel noticed, moreover, that UM is using a Balanced Scorecard with commonly agreed key performance indicators to measure the situation both at faculty and at central university level in certain areas for the time period corresponding to the Strategic Programme. Current indicators with a focus on internationalisation include student satisfaction with degree programme contents, admission numbers in the different degree programmes, international diversity of the student population and of the scientific staff, and the percentage of alumni who feel (very) well prepared for the labour market.

Based on the written materials and the discussions on site, the panel **considers** that the university collects relevant information on specific aspects of internationalisation issues. A considerable part of this information consists of data that are collected both internally and through external surveys and are gathered within the university's management information system. The panel considers that this management information system functions adequately at this moment in so far as internationalisation themes are concerned. The panel is aware that 'Be Informed' will be expanded in the near future. It welcomes this upgrade because it will make the data gathering process (even) more comprehensive and more effective within the entire quality assurance system. In line with its considerations in the Institutional Audit report, the panel sees room for improvement in the way the internationalisation actions in the Strategic Programme have been formulated and suggests that the university defines more clearly what is needed to monitor and evaluate these particular actions.

The panel **concludes** that the university collects at very regular intervals information that is relevant to inform its internationalisation policy in general and to monitor its strategic actions in particular. These data are systematically assembled and stored within a management information system that is currently operational and set to expand in the near future.

**Criterion 3b: Information driven management**

*The institution makes use of processed information for the effective management of its internationalisation activities.*



Quality assurance at Maastricht University consists of an interlinked system which is structured according to the Deming cycle plan-do-check-act and is present at various levels: institutional, faculty, programme and course. According to the panel, UM is aware of the importance of evaluation and evaluation tools as it is using various instruments to check progress and results. The outcomes are discussed and used to improve the policy and process, where needed.

The panel noticed that processed information on internationalisation is reported in a number of ways. The management information system provides reports to analyse and evaluate the internationalisation activities. The Executive Board and the Management Team receive and discuss student satisfaction data on a regular basis. Also UM's ranking performance is widely communicated to internal stakeholders. These performances are then translated into specific actions.

The Executive Board meets formally with every Faculty Board and each service centre director twice a year (in autumn and spring): internationalisation is always a topic on the agenda, whereby the internationalisation strategy of the university as a whole is discussed in relationship to faculty-specific questions and developments. The faculty presents progress updates of its internationalisation plans in line with the central overarching strategic plans. Examples of topics on the agenda regarding internationalisation are student recruitment, language policy, mobility performance and partnerships.

The discussions at the Faculty of Law revealed that this faculty is monitoring the realisation of its internationalisation plans systematically and in line with the provisions described above. In so far as the International Classroom is concerned, for instance, the Faculty of Law starts from the UM-wide strategy on ICR and its own faculty plan on this topic. It then looks into the systematically collected education evaluation results from students and staff, and complements this with informal feedback students and staff provide in gatherings such as focus group meetings. Other sources to inform its performance are the discussions with peers and experts in the ICR task force. Finally, the faculty also takes on board its own perceptions and experiences gathered through informal contacts with students, e.g. as part of dedicated cohort management by the respective programme directors and coordinators or the messages from tutors and student counsellors on stress levels among (first-year) students.

Based on the materials and the discussions on site, the panel **considers** that the university has a strong system in place to monitor and evaluate the quality of its education in general

and the provisions of its internationalisation activities in particular. The university - both at central level and within the faculties - makes very good use of the data it collects because this information allows the dedicated bodies to take appropriate action.

The panel **concludes** that Maastricht University has a strong quality assurance system in place which makes good use of the processed information for the management of its internationalisation activities.

### **Criterion 3c: Realisations**

*The institution can demonstrate the extent to which its internationalisation plans are realised through documented outcomes and results.*

The panel gathered from the materials and the discussions that Maastricht University has a quality assurance system that operates at different levels and that ensures that the collected and processed information is shared with all relevant stakeholders across the (different layers of the) institution. Hence, the outcomes and realisation of the internationalisation plans are monitored and evaluated on several levels, and the results of these exercises at course, programme, faculty or UM-wide levels are communicated to the relevant bodies.

Quality assurance for internationalisation is embedded in the UM-wide quality assurance plan. The UM quality cycle for internationalisation is present at four (course, programme, faculty and institutional) levels. By having internationalisation as a recurring topic on the agendas of the relevant bodies and by actively evaluating the internationalisation goals and objectives as stated in the internationalisation plan, quality checks are embedded in the system. The panel learned from the document 'quality checks for internationalisation' what measures are in place to check the quality and monitor the progress on the different internationalisation themes: student recruitment and admissions, scholarships, rankings, international networks, partnerships, participation in Erasmus+, international and joint and double degree programmes, international classroom, language policy.

Furthermore, the panel learned that in so far as internationalisation is concerned, the university keeps track of progress made through a Table of Goals and Realisations. Taking as a basis the goals of the 2015-2017 internationalisation plan, the table presents for each theme (8 in total) the respective goals (37 in total), and indicates their degree of achievement (achieved, partly achieved, not achieved) with dedicated comments which motivate the level of achievement reached.

Based on the written materials and the discussions on site, the panel **considers** that the quality assurance system of Maastricht University allows to monitor and evaluate the progress, outcomes and results of the internationalisation plans. The document on quality checks and the table of goals and realisations demonstrate according to the panel that the internationalisation plans are monitored properly and that this review process is documented carefully.

The panel **concludes** that Maastricht University has documented outcomes and results, which are indicative for the degree of success with which the internationalisation plans are eventually realised.

### **Overall conclusion**

The panel deems that in all the underlying criteria of this standard UM surpasses the current generic quality for this standard. In terms of implementation, the panel judges that Maastricht University goes clearly beyond the acceptable level of attainment across the standard's entire spectrum: first and foremost, the university has a strong system in place to monitor and evaluate the quality of its education in general and the provisions of its internationalisation plans in particular. Furthermore, the panel considers that data on internationalisation actions are gathered in a management information system that produces relevant quantitative data and qualitative reports. If anything, the university could formulate more precisely the internationalisation activities in the Strategic Programme and define exactly what is needed to monitor and evaluate these measures. Nonetheless, the university - both at central level and within the faculties - makes very good use of the data it collects because this information allows responsible bodies to take appropriate action. Finally, the panel considers that the entire review process is documented carefully.

Based on the presented documentation as well as the observations and discussions during the site visit and the evidences found, the panel assesses *Standard 3. Implementation* as **good**.

## **Standard 4: Enhancement**

---

### **Criterion 4a: Measures for enhancement**

*As a result of periodic evaluations of all internationalisation dimensions and activities, the successful implementation of measures for enhancement can be demonstrated.*

Further to its findings in previous sections, the panel acknowledges that Maastricht University has an adequate system of quality assurance in place that pays proper attention to the actions and goals set out in the internationalisation plan. In fact, internationalisation is embedded in the university's quality assurance system, which consists of a structured cycle of review and evaluation of the objectives and actions associated with the university goals as described in the Strategic Programme and the internationalisation plan.

After formal approval of the internationalisation plans, the plan's goals are reviewed once a year. These evaluations, which include measures for enhancement related to the various dimensions of internationalisation, are then shared with the specific units of the university responsible for their execution, such as the International Relations Offices in the faculties.

The panel learned from the document 'quality checks for internationalisation' what measures are in place to monitor the progress on the different internationalisation themes. Moreover, the panel gathered from another document 'summary of recent evaluation results' what progress has been made over the past years on the respective internationalisation themes and what evaluations have been done to establish this progress on student recruitment and admissions, scholarships, rankings, international networks, partnerships, participation in Erasmus+, international and joint and double degree programmes, international classroom, language policy.

Interviewees from the Faculty of Law provided several relevant examples of how provisions on internationalisation in general and the International Classroom in particular are evaluated and eventually enhanced within the faculty: starting from the university strategy and the faculty plan, there is systematic input both from internal stakeholders such as staff and students and from external stakeholders like alumni and employers. Moreover, there are curriculum meetings with staff to discuss performance and experiences with teaching in an International Classroom context; where needed, staff can follow training on teaching in an international and intercultural dimension. Interviewees also pointed to a recent improvement in one of the international programmes: combining data from student feedback and exam scores, the programme coordinator identified which questions on a given exam had been answered systematically better or worse by a certain group of students. As a result, some questions were re-formulated more clearly and students (in this case of francophone origin) received additional mentoring on language to prepare them properly for the forthcoming exams.

Based on the materials and the discussions on site, the panel **considers** that Maastricht University has a strong and comprehensive quality assurance system that also addresses issues of internationalisation and pays particular attention to enhancement. In fact, the panel established in the Institutional Audit report that UM is doing very well in terms of both systematic improvement and development. In this regard, the panel thinks highly of the many small-scale and large-scale initiatives across the university to enhance the quality of education following the results of both internal and external evaluations. The sessions on internationalisation confirmed moreover that some of these initiatives have a direct bearing on (the quality of) internationalisation.

The panel **concludes** that quality assurance at Maastricht University is structured in such a way that it encompasses the provisions on internationalisation as an integral part of the system.

**Criterion 4b: Enhancing education**

*The institution utilises internationalisation approaches as part of its regular quality assurance activities in order to enhance the quality of its education.*

The panel gathered from the different self-evaluation reports and the five days of discussion that the university is taking the same quality assurance approach – using qualitative and quantitative results to guide measures for improvement - for all strategies and policies of Maastricht University. This approach also includes the university’s efforts to enhance the quality of internationalisation.

Since internationalisation is embedded across the university, there are instruments and procedures in place to monitor the internationalisation actions, evaluate their execution and decide on their improvement. The university’s approach to evaluation and enhancement of its internationalisation goals varies depending on the nature of the particular goal, the dimensions of internationalisation to which the goals and plans relate, as well as on external factors such as (inter)national trends within the higher education landscape.

The panel has read and heard about many small-scale and comprehensive initiatives to enhance the quality of education following the results of both internal and external evaluations. In this regard, the panel thinks highly of the comprehensive quality assurance system at the School of Business and Economics. In addition to internal processes, SBE is regularly peer reviewed by both national (NVAO) and international (AACSB, EQUIS, AMBA) accreditation bodies and incorporates their respective requirements in a comprehensive

quality assurance system featuring internal elements such as the assurance of education, assurance of learning and assurance of assessment, and external signals such as surveys, rankings and changes in legislation.

Moreover, the panel gathered from discussions with representatives of the Faculty of Law and from the documents 'quality checks for internationalisation' and 'summary of recent evaluation results' how the university at central, faculty, programme and course level strives to enhance the quality of internationalisation through systematic monitoring and evaluation.

Based on the written materials and the discussions on site, the panel **considers** that UM's institutional quality assurance system focuses effectively on the enhancement of quality and that internationalisation forms an integral part of the improvement strategy that is in place at institutional, faculty and programme level. The panel considers that UM is doing very well in terms of both systematic improvement and development. The panel is impressed by the many initiatives to enhance the quality of education following the results of both internal and external evaluations, as well as by the breadth of the activities and the depth with which reported flaws are taken up and communicated.

The panel **concludes** that Maastricht University is using internationalisation approaches in its regular quality assurance and enhancement activities.

#### **Criterion 4c: Stakeholders involvement**

*The institution actively involves its internal and external stakeholders in its quality assurance and enhancement activities regarding internationalisation.*

The panel observed that Maastricht University involves a broad range of stakeholders in measuring the quality of its education and services at different levels: students, staff, alumni and in many cases also the professional field are consulted in a systematic way. These stakeholders are involved in different formal and less formal ways and their quantitative and qualitative feedback is collected and used among others to enhance the internationalisation goals and actions.

Students and staff are active participants in the quality assurance and governance systems of the university through the Education Programme Committees, Faculty Councils and the University Council. The panel thinks highly of the contribution of both staff and students in developing policies and implementing actions and processes. While Dutch law stipulates the formal involvement of both staff and students in participatory bodies, the sheer enthusiasm of

the interviewees demonstrates according to the panel that their commitment goes well beyond the minimal requirements of formal involvement.

Throughout the five-day visit, interviewees have provided several examples of how they contribute to designing, implementing, monitoring and enhancing internationalisation actions: the International Classroom task force, the platform of international relations officers, the student advisors to the faculty boards are but a few strong examples.

Furthermore several programmes have (international) advisory boards which also include external stakeholders such as alumni and corporate contacts that provide regular feedback on the internationalisation goals and plans on an institutional level as well as within the faculties. Alumni serve both as ambassadors for the university and as a source of knowledge for current students. Other examples of stakeholders are the local government, the province, local enterprises, international partners, associations and organisations.

Based on the written materials and the discussions on site, the panel **considers** that Maastricht University adopts a well-established quality assurance system that implies a strong commitment of all internal stakeholders, as well as an appropriate involvement of external stakeholders. In line with its consideration in the Institutional Audit report, the panel considers that within its community UM has at disposition an enormous wealth of expertise and experience. While the university makes very good use of this 'in-house' expertise, it would benefit according to the panel from gathering in a more systematic way input from stakeholders that are genuinely external to the university.

The panel **concludes** that Maastricht University actively involves its internal and external stakeholders in the quality assurance and enhancement activities on internationalisation.

### **Overall conclusion**

The panel deems that in all the underlying criteria of this standard, UM surpasses the current generic quality for this standard. In terms of enhancement, the panel judges that Maastricht University clearly goes beyond the acceptable level of attainment across the standard's entire spectrum: first and foremost, UM has a comprehensive quality assurance system that pays particular attention to enhancement in terms of both systematic improvement and development. Since internationalisation is embedded across the university, there are many adequate instruments and procedures in place to monitor the internationalisation actions, evaluate their execution and decide on their improvement. The quality system, moreover,

relies on a strong commitment of all stakeholders. If anything, the panel considers that the university makes very good use of its 'in-house' expertise, but could benefit from gathering in a more systematic way input from stakeholders that are genuinely external to the university.

Based on the presented documentation as well as the observations and discussions during the site visit and the evidences found, the panel assesses *Standard 4. Enhancement* as **good**.

## **Standard 5: Governance**

---

### **Criterion 5a: Responsibilities**

*The responsibilities regarding the institution's internationalisation (goals, plans, implementation and enhancement) are clearly defined and allocated.*

The governance structure of internationalisation at UM involves stakeholders at many levels from across the institution. Since internationalisation is a core characteristic of UM's mission, the final executive responsibility lies with the Executive Board, where the President has the primary mandate to formulate and implement the internationalisation strategy. President and Executive Board are supported by a team of internationalisation experts at central level who are closely linked to the faculty representatives. Each faculty board has assigned a primary responsible person for internationalisation at faculty level.

Even though internationalisation is embedded in the ordinary decision structure of UM at all levels, UM has chosen to have a specific Board and an operational platform for internationalisation in order to guarantee that the internationalisation efforts across the University as well as learning opportunities across faculties, are given special attention. The Strategic Board for Internationalisation (SBI) and the Operational Platform for internationalisation (OPI) consist of key representatives for internationalisation at central and decentral levels in the university. Board and Platform coordinate strategic alignment, implementation and monitoring of the internationalisation goals. Through this structure the vertical and horizontal interaction with all stakeholders is strengthened. Due to its embedded nature, internationalisation is addressed as a regular dimension of teaching and research in the meetings and on the agendas of the faculty boards, committees and other structures.

The discussion at the Faculty of Law learned that at faculty level the governance of internationalisation is organised as follows: the Faculty Board holds primary responsibility for internationalisation policy. The faculty rules and regulations contain decision and co-decision



procedures that govern all policies including internationalisation. An international relations officer follows up the actions of the faculty on internationalisation, while internationalisation topics are discussed across faculties with peers in SBI and OPI meetings, which influences the decisions of the faculty boards and Executive Board.

Based on the written materials and the discussions on site, the panel **considers** that the governance structure for internationalisation is particularly well developed since the former assessment (Distinctive Feature Internationalisation) in 2013. Because internationalisation has been an integral part of the university's vision and mission for decades, it is firmly embedded in the institution's structure with clear definitions of roles and responsibilities. Moreover, the panel thinks highly of the way in which responsibilities for internationalisation have been defined and organised at different levels: strategic and operational, horizontal and vertical alignment, central and decentral implementation.

The panel **concludes** that the responsibilities regarding the institution's internationalisation goals, plans, implementation and enhancement are clearly defined and allocated.

#### **Criterion 5b: Effectiveness**

*The organisational structure, decision-making processes and leadership (regarding internationalisation) support the realisation of the institution's internationalisation goals and action plans.*

As internationalisation is an integral and constituent component of the university's vision, mission and strategy for decades, it is firmly embedded in the overall governance of Maastricht University. The panel noticed that the structure for internationalisation has been thoroughly reviewed and a new structure was developed with the President of UM assuming the role as portfolio holder, the main responsible person for internationalisation at the university. Moreover, a strategic and operational support structure has been established to carry out the strategic programme and the internationalisation plans. Both the Strategic Board and the Operational Platform meet on a regular basis to discuss and review the university's internationalisation strategy and implementation. The embedding of internationalisation structures at operational level in the faculties is supported by the network of International Relations Officers, the International Classroom task force, the Erasmus+ programme task force, as well as the respective Marketing & Communications departments.

Internationalisation is a topic of discussion and decision-making at various levels. It is a standing item on the agenda of the weekly Executive Board meetings where strategic

decisions are taken and the underlying documents are presented. The ensuing decisions are adequately documented and consequently discussed at the level of the Management Team, as well as within SBI, OPI and the faculties. It is also a standing topic in the Strategy and Internationalisation Committee of the University Council and in the Supervisory Board. These mechanisms ensure that the internationalisation strategy and its implementation are widely discussed with all internal stakeholders including the participatory and supervisory bodies, as well as at central and faculty level. Decisions are documented and communicated within the defined horizontal and vertical structures.

Based on the written materials and the discussions on site, the panel **considers** that the new governance structure for internationalisation is strong and befits the organisational culture of the university. Moreover, the allocation of the internationalisation portfolio to the university President demonstrates that internationalisation is of very high level importance to Maastricht. According to the panel, this decision is all the more effective given that the President has a strong track-record in internationalisation and assumes different leadership positions in international networks, higher education associations and (national) policy bodies.

The panel **concludes** that the organisational structure of Maastricht University, its decision-making processes and its leadership are a very effective support for the realisation of the internationalisation goals and action plans.

#### **Criterion 5c: Responsiveness**

*The institution can demonstrate that it readily reacts to input from within and outside the institution regarding internationalisation activities.*

The combination of central and faculty-led structures allows to gather input from all levels of the organisation with a focus on implementing the internationalisation goals. Outside information from (inter)national agencies is monitored on a continuous basis by Academic Affairs policy staff. Opportunities offered by funding schemes are used to fund activities that fit internationalisation goals to realise UM's ambitions in education and research.

The quantitative and qualitative aspects of internationalisation are discussed on many levels of the organisation. Members of the university community can request information or give input and advice through the Strategy and Internationalisation Committee of the University Council. The international dimension is a topic in staff performance reviews, in the spring and fall reviews of the Executive Board with the Faculty Boards as well as in the meetings of the Supervisory Board and the participatory bodies.

The panel gathered from the discussions on site that students and staff play an important and active role within the university. UM does not only stimulate student and staff involvement in the participatory bodies but also welcomes their advice and concerns in less formal settings. Students and staff alike feel that UM is putting in practice the idea of an open and inclusive UM community, while from their side students and staff can express their commitment to UM through enthusiastic engagement and constructive debate. This approach ensures according to the panel that experiences and practices – both positive and less positive – do not remain 'hidden' within the walls of the programme, department or faculty, but are shared and disseminated across the university.

In terms of the external input on the international profile of the university, UM is participating in a number of networks and collaborating with organisations where it can receive and give input on internationalisation such as the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU), the Dutch organisation for internationalisation in education NUFFIC, the European Association of International Education, the Netherlands Platform for International Education, and the European University Association. Two other University platforms also give considerable input of ideas: YERUN with 18 universities under 50 years of age, and WUN with 23 universities spread over six continents with research themes in global challenges.

Based on the written materials and the discussions on site, the panel **considers** that the set-up of the university is particularly suitable to gather timely input on internationalisation actions and goals from all levels of the organisation, as well as from external stakeholders. Moreover, the panel thinks very highly of the open atmosphere within the university, which stimulates involvement and transparency and triggers enthusiasm and commitment, also on more challenging issues.

The panel **concludes** that Maastricht University is very responsive to input from within and outside the institution regarding internationalisation activities.

#### **Overall conclusion**

The panel deems that in all the underlying criteria of this standard UM systematically and substantially surpasses the current generic quality for this standard. In terms of governance, the panel judges that Maastricht University excels on all accounts: first and foremost, the new governance structure for internationalisation is strong and befits the organisational culture of the university, which thrives on participation in jointly set and centrally validated frameworks.

This set-up is particularly suitable to gather timely input on internationalisation actions and goals from all levels of the organisation, as well as from external stakeholders. Moreover, the allocation of the internationalisation portfolio to the university President demonstrates that internationalisation is of very high importance to Maastricht, and this all the more so given the President's strong track-record in internationalisation.

Based on the presented documentation as well as the observations and discussions during the site visit and the evidences found, the panel assesses *standard 5. Governance* as **excellent**.

## Conclusion

---

In the previous sections, the panel has argued that Maastricht University fulfils the standards of the CeQuInt evaluation framework up to a level which systematically surpasses the generic quality that can be expected from an international perspective. According to the panel:

- internationalisation is embedded in the history, culture, spirit and identity of UM;
- there is a strong match between the educational vision of the university, its current Strategic Programme and the internationalisation plans;
- the internationalisation goals and objectives are translated in adequate action plans and measures which are relevant for the entire university;
- the university has a strong system in place to monitor and evaluate the provisions of its internationalisation plans;
- UM relies on timely input on internationalisation actions and a strong commitment to internationalisation of both internal and external stakeholders;
- the governance structure for internationalisation is strong and befits the organisational culture of the university.

Based on the written materials, the interviews on site and its internal deliberations, the panel considers Maastricht University in many respects as a 'best-practice' in internationalisation. According to the panel, the university is an example of what John Hudzik calls 'comprehensive internationalisation': a commitment confirmed through action to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research and service missions of higher education. It shapes institutional ethos and values and touches the entire higher education enterprise. It is essential that it be embraced by institutional leadership, governance, faculty, students, and all academic service and support units. Comprehensive internationalisation influences all of campus life, as well as the institution's external frames of reference,



partnerships and relations. (J.K. Hudzik, *Comprehensive Internationalization. Institutional pathways to success*, New York: Routledge 2015)

In sum, the panel considers that Maastricht University fulfils each of the five standards of the CeQuInt assessment framework. Its overall judgement on the quality of internationalisation at Maastricht University is therefore **positive**.

## 6. Overview of assessments

Standard	Criterion	Level of fulfilment
1. Intended internationalisation	1a. Supported goals	Excellent
	1b. Verifiable objectives	
	1c. Measures for improvement	
2. Action plans	2a. Fitness for purpose	Excellent
	2b. Dimensions	
	2c. Instruments and resources	
3. Implementation	3a. Information system	Good
	3b. Information-driven management	
	3c. Realisations	
4. Enhancement	4a. Internal quality assurance	Good
	4b. Approaches for enhancement	
	4c. Stakeholders involvement	
5. Governance	5a. Responsibilities	Excellent
	5b. Effectiveness	
	5c. Responsiveness	

## Annex 1. Composition of the panel

### Overview panel requirements

<i>Panel member</i>	<i>Man.</i>	<i>Internat.</i>	<i>Educat.</i>	<i>QA</i>	<i>Student</i>
• Janke Cohen-Schotanus	X		X	X	
• Agneta Bladh	X	X	X	X	
• Ramses Wessel	X	X	X	X	
• Jeroen Huisman	X	X	X	X	
• Jan Zuidam	X	X		X	
• Laura Schu		X		X	X

Man.: Management experience

Internat.: International expertise, preferably expertise in internationalisation

Educat.: Relevant experience in teaching or educational development

QA: Relevant experience in quality assurance or auditing; or experience as student auditor

Student: Student with international or internationalisation experience

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

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

### Dr. Agneta Bladh (member)

Agneta Bladh is currently an independent consultant in the field of higher education and research. She holds a PhD in Political Science from Stockholm University. Dr Bladh served as State Secretary at the Swedish Ministry of Education and Science and was Rector of the University of Kalmar (now part of Linnaeus University). Dr Bladh is chair of the Board of the Swedish Research Council, Vice-President of the Magna Charta Observatory Council and member of the Swedish Entrepreneurship Forum. Dr Bladh has been member of the governing boards of several universities in Sweden and Norway and commissions and evaluations in several European countries. During 2017-2018, she was appointed by the Swedish government as special examiner of Internationalisation at Swedish Higher Education Institutions. Agneta Bladh is an expert in CeQulnt evaluations of both programmes and institutions.

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

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

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

Jeroen Huisman is professor of Higher Education and director of the Centre for Higher Education Governance Ghent (CHEGG). He studied Educational Science at Groningen University and obtained his PhD at University of Twente. In 2005 he became professor of Higher Education Management at the University of Bath in the UK. In 2013 Professor Huisman joined the University of Ghent.

**Mr. Jan Zuidam (member)**

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

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

Lara Schu studied two bachelor degrees, in Mathematics and Computer Science and since October 2015 is enrolled in the MSc programme Computer Science at the Technical University of Kaiserslautern in Germany. Lara has been student assistant, research assistant and teaching assistant and throughout her studies is active in students unions and university committees. She also represented students in a variety of issues and committee nationwide during the restructuring of the German accreditation system and has been student-member in several expert panels in Germany and the Netherlands. She is certified by the European Consortium for Accreditation (ECA) to assess the quality of internationalization of programmes and institutions who apply for CeQulnt.

**Coordinator:** Frank Wamelink, policy advisor NVAO

**Secretary:** Mark Delmartino (certified by NVAO and ECA)



## Annex 2. Documents reviewed

### *Audit trail Internationalisation (CeQuint )*

- Self-evaluation report 2018. Certificate for Quality in Internationalisation, October 2018
- Appendices to self-evaluation report:
  - Table of Goals and Realisations
  - Explanation of self-evaluation table
  - Language policy and code of conduct
  - An overview of the International Classroom 2015-2018
- Mandatory documents for ECA
  - Internationalisation goals
  - Internationalisation plans
  - Action plan for Intercultural and International Learning Outcomes
  - Overview of international collaboration
  - Table of incoming and outgoing students
  - Example of Diploma Supplement
  - Organisational chart showing internationalisation in the university structure
  - Policy and services for international staff
  - Quality checks for internationalisation
  - Summary of recent evaluation results
- Introductory presentation: CeQuInt audit trail at Faculty of Law

### *Other documents*

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



## Annex 3. Site visit programme

### Overview

<b>Date:</b>	22-26 October 2018
<b>Institution:</b>	Maastricht University
<b>Location:</b>	Maastricht (NL)

### Programme audit trail Internationalisation

#### Day 4 – Thursday 25 October 2018

Location: Faculty of Law (FoL), Maastricht

14.00 Internal panel meeting

#### 14.45 Session 23 – CeQulnt Standard 1

- Prof. dr. Jan Smits, Dean Faculty of Law
- Prof. dr. Bram van Hofstraeten, teaching staff and chair FC
- Dr. Sascha Hardt, teaching staff and chair EPC
- Prof. dr. Mariolina Eliantonio, teaching staff
- Prof. dr. Aalt-Willem Heringa, teaching staff
- Dr. Mark Kawakami, teaching staff
- Dr. Christina Peristeridou, teaching staff
- Laura Aade, bachelor student European Law School
- Aisling Tiernan MA, policy advisor internationalization (MUO)
- Nadine Burquel, Director BCS Higher Education Consultancy (Luxembourg) and EFMD Business School Services and EU policies in higher education

#### 15.45 Session 24 – CeQulnt standards 2-3-4

- Dr. Sjoerd Claessens, director of studies
- Dr. Bram Akkermans, coordinator Bachelor European Law School
- Dr. Kai Jonas, teaching staff and expert International Classroom
- Dr. Anke Moerland, coordinator M Intellectual Property Law and Knowledge Mgt
- Dr. Sander Jansen, teaching staff and chair BoE
- Bert Brookfield-Hird, bachelor student European Law School
- Viivi Varakas LLM, Alumna European Law School and M Globalisation and Law
- Meredith Bradt, Associate Director Marketing and Communications

#### 16.45 Session 25 – CeQulnt standard 5

- Prof. dr. Martin Paul, President
- Prof. dr. Jos Hamers, Vice-Dean Education
- Dr. Roland Moerland, teaching staff and vice-chair FC

- Dr. Nicole Kornet, teaching staff
- Dr. William Bull, teaching staff
- Dr. Marcel Schaper, teaching staff
- Marieke Hopman MA, teaching staff
- Dr. Thomas Biermeyer, attorney and teaching staff
- Thijs Mijnhout, bachelor student European Law School

17.30 Internal panel meeting (until 18.30)

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

Location: Central University Building, Minderbroedersberg, Maastricht

09.00 Co-creation session discussing findings CeQulnt trail (until 09.30)

- Prof. dr. Martin Paul, President
- Prof. dr. Jan Smits, Dean FoL
- Prof. dr. Jos Hamers, Vice-Dean Education FoL
- Prof. dr. Tom van Veen, teaching staff SBE and former Vice-Dean Internationalisation

15.00 Plenary feedback on all three audits: ITK, CeQulnt and Quality Agreements

15.30 End of site visit



**e | c | a**

european consortium for accreditation

[www.ecahe.eu](http://www.ecahe.eu)