

MASTER'S PROGRAMME
CLASSICS AND ANCIENT CIVILIZATIONS
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
LEIDEN UNIVERSITY

QANU
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

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

Project number: Q0725
© 2020 QANU

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



CONTENTS

REPORT ON THE MASTER’S PROGRAMME CLASSICS AND ANCIENT CIVILIZATIONS OF LEIDEN UNIVERSITY	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME.....	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION.....	5
COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	5
WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	6
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	11
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENTS.....	15
APPENDICES	31
APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES	33
APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM	35
APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT	37
APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL	38

This report was finalised on 5 March 2020



REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME CLASSICS AND ANCIENT CIVILIZATIONS OF LEIDEN UNIVERSITY

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

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

Master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations

Name of the programme:	Oudheidstudies
International name:	Classics and Ancient Civilizations
CROHO number:	60821
Level of the programme:	master's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	60 EC
Specialisations or tracks:	Assyriology Classics Egyptology Hebrew and Aramaic Studies
Location:	Leiden
Mode of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	English
Submission deadline NVAO:	01/05/2020

The visit of the assessment panel Region Studies to the Faculty of Humanities of Leiden University took place on 5, 6 and 7 June 2019.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

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

COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The NVAO has approved the composition of the panel on 4 March 2019. The panel that assessed the master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations consisted of:

- Prof. dr. P. (Peter) Van Nuffelen, research professor Cultural History of the Ancient World at Ghent University (Belgium) [chair];
- Prof. dr. D.M. (Diederik) Oostdijk, professor in English Literature at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam;
- Prof. dr. E.J.C. (Eibert) Tigchelaar, research professor of the research unit Biblical Studies, Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies at KU Leuven (Belgium);
- Dr. D. (Diana Bullen) Presciutti, senior lecturer in Art History, director of Global Studies and director of the Interdisciplinary Studies Centre at the University of Essex (United Kingdom);
- Prof. dr. A. (Axel) Holvoet, professor at the Institute of the Languages and Cultures of the Baltic of Vilnius University (Lithuania);
- Prof. dr. E.M.H. (Helena) Houvenaghel, professor in Spanish Language and Culture at Utrecht University;
- Prof. dr. J. (John) Nawas, professor in Arabic and Islamic Studies at KU Leuven (Belgium);



- L. (Lara) van Lookeren Campagne, bachelor's student in Middle Eastern Studies at the University of Amsterdam [student member];
- Prof. dr. L.P. (Lars) Rensmann, professor in European Politics and Society at University of Groningen [referee International Studies];
- Prof. dr. H. (Harco) Willems, professor in Egyptology at KU Leuven (Belgium) and director of the excavation in Dayr al-Barshā (Egypt) [referee Ancient Near East Studies].

The panel was supported by dr. E. (Els) Schröder and drs. E.G.M. (Mariette) Huisjes, who acted as secretaries.

WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations at the Faculty of Humanities of Leiden University was part of the cluster assessment Region Studies. Between March 2019 and November 2019 the panel assessed 38 programmes at five universities: Radboud University, Leiden University, University of Amsterdam, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and the University of Groningen.

Leiden University has 19 programmes in the cluster Region Studies. To ensure that the workload for panel members was evenly distributed and all programmes were properly assessed, two site visits were planned (in June and November 2019).

Panel members

The panel consisted of the following members:

- Prof. dr. P. (Peter) Van Nuffelen, research professor Cultural History of the Ancient World at Ghent University (Belgium) [chair];
- Prof. dr. D.M. (Diederik) Oostdijk, professor in English Literature at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam;
- Prof. dr. A. (Umar) Ryad, professor in Arabic and Islamic Studies at KU Leuven (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. E.J.C. (Eibert) Tigchelaar, research professor of the research unit Biblical Studies, Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies at KU Leuven (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. G. (Gunnar) De Boel, professor in (Greek) Linguistics and Modern Greek and Byzantine Literature (Department of Literary Studies) at Ghent University (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. I. (Inge) Brinkman, professor in African Studies at Ghent University (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. G. (Gert) Buelens, professor in English and American Literature at Ghent University (Belgium);
- Dr. D. (Diana Bullen) Presciutti, senior lecturer in Art History, director of Global Studies and director of the Interdisciplinary Studies Centre at the University of Essex (United Kingdom);
- R.A. (Rianne) Clerc-de Groot MA, teacher in Classics at the Cygnus Gymnasium in Amsterdam;
- Dr. D. (Dario) Fazzi, lecturer in North American Studies and International Studies at Leiden University;
- Prof. dr. A.F.R. (Ann) Heirman, professor in Chinese Language and Culture at Ghent University (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. A. (Axel) Holvoet, professor at the Institute of the Languages and Cultures of the Baltic of Vilnius University (Lithuania);
- Prof. dr. V. (Vincent) Houben, professor Geschichte und Gesellschaft Südostasiens at Humboldt Universität Berlin (Germany);
- Prof. dr. E.M.H. (Helena) Houvenaghel, professor in Spanish Language and Culture at Utrecht University;
- Prof. dr. D. (Daeyeol) Kim, professor at the Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales (INaLCO) of the Université Sorbonne Paris Cité (France);
- L. (Lotte) Metz MA, teacher in Greek and Latin at the Stedelijk Gymnasium Nijmegen;
- Prof. dr. J. (John) Nawas, professor in Arabic and Islamic Studies at KU Leuven (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. A. (Andreas) Niehaus, professor in Japanese Language and Culture at Ghent University (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. J.L.M. (Jan) Papy, professor in Latin Literature at KU Leuven (Belgium);

- Dr. N.A. (Nicolet) Boekhoff-van der Voort, teacher Islam studies and coordinator Graduate School for Humanities at Radboud University;
- C. (Charlotte) van der Voort, bachelor's student in Greek and Latin Language and Culture, and pre-master's student Dutch Language and Culture at Leiden University [student member];
- L. (Lara) van Lookeren Campagne, bachelor's student in Middle Eastern Studies at the University of Amsterdam [student member];
- G.M. (Gerieke) Prins, bachelor's student in Social and Migration History with a minor in Latin American Studies at Leiden University [student member];
- E.L. (Emma) Mendez Correa, bachelor's student in Greek and Latin Language and Culture at Leiden University [student member];
- Prof. dr. L.P. (Lars) Rensmann, professor in European Politics and Society at University of Groningen [referee International Studies at Leiden University];
- Em. prof. dr. C.H.M. (Kees) Versteegh, emeritus professor in Arabic and Islam at Radboud University [referee Arabic and Middle Eastern Studies at University of Amsterdam];
- Prof. dr. H. (Harco) Willems, professor in Egyptology at KU Leuven (Belgium) and director of the excavation in Dayr al-Barshā (Egypt) [referee Ancient Near East Studies at Leiden University];
- Prof. dr. J. (Jaap) Wisse, professor in Latin Language & Literature at Newcastle University (United Kingdom) [referee Greek, Latin and Classics at the University of Amsterdam and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam].

For each site visit, assessment panel members were selected based on their expertise, availability and independence.

The QANU project manager for the cluster assessment was dr. Els Schröder. She acted as secretary in the site visit to Radboud University and in the first site visit to Leiden University. In order to assure the consistency of assessment within the cluster, the project manager was present at the start of the site visits as well as the panel discussion leading to the preliminary findings at the other site visits and reviewed the draft reports. During her leave of absence, she was replaced by her colleagues at QANU. Dr. Irene Conradie acted as project manager in the combined site visit to the University of Amsterdam and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and in the second site visit to Leiden University. Dr. Anna Sparreboom acted as project manager in the site visit to the University of Groningen.

Several secretaries assisted in this cluster assessment: drs. Trees Graas, employee of QANU, also acted as secretary in the site visit to Radboud University; drs. Mariette Huisjes, freelance secretary for QANU, also acted as secretary in the first site visit to Leiden University and in the site visit to the University of Groningen; drs. Erik van der Spek, freelance secretary for QANU, acted as secretary in the second site visit to Leiden University; drs. Mariëlle Klerks, freelance secretary for QANU, acted as secretary in the combined site visit to the University of Amsterdam and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. The QANU project managers and the secretaries regularly discussed the assessment process and outcomes.

Preparation

On 22 November 2018, the panel chair was briefed by the project manager on the tasks and working method of the assessment panel and more specifically his role, as well as use of the assessment framework. Prior to the site visit, the panel members received instruction by telephone and e-mail on the tasks and working method and the use of the assessment framework. A schedule for the site visit was composed. Prior to the site visit, representative partners for the various interviews were selected. See Appendix 3 for the final schedule.

Before the site visit, the programmes wrote self-evaluation reports of the programmes and sent these to the project manager. She checked these on quality and completeness, and sent them to the panel members. The panel members studied the self-evaluation reports and formulated initial questions and remarks, as well as positive aspects of the programmes.



The panel also studied a selection of theses and their assessment forms, based on a provided list of graduates between 2016-2018 (see Appendix 4).

Site visit

The site visit to Leiden University took place on 5, 6 and 7 June 2019.

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

During the site visit, the panel studied additional materials about the programmes and exams, as well as minutes of the Programme Committee and the Board of Examiners. An overview of these materials can be found in Appendix 4. The panel conducted interviews with representatives of the programmes: students and staff members, the programme's management, alumni and representatives of the Board of Examiners. Members of the Programme Committee were included as part of the interviews with staff and students. It also offered students and staff members an opportunity for confidential discussion during a consultation hour. No requests for private consultation were received concerning this programme.

The panel used the final part of the site visit to discuss its findings in an internal meeting. Afterwards, the panel chair publicly presented the panel's preliminary findings and general observations. The visit concluded with a development dialogue, held in parallel sessions, in which panel members and representatives of the programme discussed various development routes for the programmes. The results of this conversation are summarised in a separate report, harmonised with the panel, which will be published through the programmes' communication channels.

Report

After the site visit, the secretary wrote a draft report based on the panel's findings and submitted it to the project manager for peer assessment. Subsequently, the secretary sent the report to the panel. After processing the panel members' feedback, the project manager sent the draft reports to the faculty in order to have it/these checked for factual irregularities. The project manager discussed the ensuing comments with the panel's chair and changes were implemented accordingly. The report was then finalised and sent to the Faculty of Humanities and University Board.

Definition of judgements standards

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

Generic quality

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

Meets the standard

The programme meets the generic quality standard.

Partially meets the standard

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

Does not meet the standard

The programme does not meet the generic quality standard.

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

Positive

The programme meets all the standards.

Conditionally positive

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

Negative

In the following situations:

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

SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

In fostering the knowledge of many cultures, Leiden University has a longstanding tradition; it is an essential part of its identity and gives the university a unique position in the Netherlands. The Faculty is committed to keep this tradition alive and protect small fields like those represented within the master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations (CAC). The panel wholeheartedly supports this ambition, in the interest of Dutch society as a whole. It commends the programme for the way in which its profile has been redefined in the period under review. It considers the programme's focus on interdisciplinarity combined with specialisation in some rare and unique research fields as a strength that may be even further cultivated and communicated to prospective students. A self-confident interdisciplinary perspective is, in the panel's view, also key to the way in which the programme could more explicitly define its connection to the labour market in terms of the achievement of an interdisciplinary approach and mindset.

The panel verified that the intended learning outcomes (hereafter: ILOs) of the master's programme CAC tie in with the level, profile and orientation of the programme. They have been related to the Dublin Descriptors in a clear and concise manner and thus meet international requirements. They also pay implicit attention to the expectations of the professional field for humanities graduates. The panel would advise making this connection more explicit by adding an ILO specifically describing the lifelong learning skills aimed for in the programme. Another recommendation concerns the harmonisation of the ILOs between the tracks, taking the detailed track-specific ILOs for Classics as a potential starting point. The panel advises the Faculty of Humanities to check any reformulation in terms of terminology and categorisation to other programmes within the Faculty, to enhance transparency.

Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

The panel ascertained that the master's programme CAC offers clearly distinguished tracks of which the content results in stimulating and high quality courses. Although the student intake is varied and strongly international in orientation, good (individual) support and guidance prepares all incoming students for the various tracks. The panel is impressed that the programme in this way creates a level playing field amongst a diversified group of students, resulting in a good teaching-learning environment that allows students to finish their degree within the set time period. Thesis guidance is of high quality and students are supported by an adequate methodological training prior to the thesis trajectory. The panel verified that the internal control cycle of the programme is adequate and very responsive to signals that may suggest a need for change.

In its assessment of the programme's curriculum and modules, the panel identified certain areas in which improvement could be strived for. It suggests looking into the way in which the tracks in Assyriology and Hebrew and Aramaic Studies currently contribute to the content of the MA Seminar to engage the students from these two tracks more efficiently while also challenging students from the tracks in Classics and Egyptology with new horizons derived from these fields. In general, the panel suggests looking at improving the integration of the various tracks in the MA seminar. The panel ascertained that the programme is fully aware of the current students' concerns regarding the MA Seminar and is already looking into ways to address these; it therefore trusts the programme to find an appropriate reaction.

The panel concludes that the curriculum and the teaching-learning environment of the master's programme is designed and implemented in a way that enables students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The design of the programmes is conducive to their feasibility, and students clearly receive sufficient support and guidance. Teaching is characterised by a small scale learning environment, which allows to include personal interests and preferred learning styles during the runtime of a course. The panel is pleased with the quality of the teaching and support staff and praises the staff members' commitment to the students. It noticed that the staff would like to expand its teaching methods beyond the current range, and it encourages them to look for ways in which



the desired innovations can be accommodated with the support of the Programme Board and Faculty. In addition, work load monitoring needs continuous attention at Faculty level, just as a fair distribution of allocated hours for certain tasks. The panel commends the Faculty for its directive and supportive approach in these matters.

Standard 3: Student assessment

According to the panel, the assurance and monitoring of the quality of assessment is sufficiently guaranteed at the master’s programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations. The assessment policies and protocols used in the programme are well designed and extensive, resulting in a regulated system of assessment. The Board of Examiners in the CAC unit is well supported by the Faculty in the development and professionalisation of its assessment practices. The panel welcomes the notable tendency towards standardisation of evaluations and feedback practices. It underscores that to advance further along this road, the Board members need to be structurally reinforced and compensated to allow for exchange and communication with staff members in order to achieve full support for further changes. In addition, it advises to clearly communicate the faculty guidelines regarding fraud amongst all various boards of examiners within the Faculty, and to adjust these if and where necessary to avoid diversity of practice amongst programmes.

The panel observed that the types of assessment used in the programme are fit for purpose and allow demonstration of the attainment of the relevant learning outcomes at an adequate level.. The panel found some potential room for improvement in the variation of assessment. It recommends looking into the use of more creative formative forms of assessment as building blocks for part of the entertained summative methods. Thesis assessment at CAC is done by two assessors who fill out the assessment form independently. In case of discrepancies, doubts, or high or low grades, a third assessor is involved. The panel recommends keeping an eye on documenting a clear argumentation of the assessment and the ways in which the various subcriteria weigh into the final grade. In order to further raise the objectivity of grading, to regularly check the quality of programme grading and to avoid fixed assessment pairs within small specialisations, it advises mixing up examiners across the CAC tracks and other programmes within the Faculty. The panel is pleased with the proactive role of the Board of Examiners CAC in monitoring and promoting the quality of assessment and concludes that the Board is in control.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The theses of the master’s programme CAC are of an adequate to very high level. They demonstrate the realisation of the intended learning outcomes more than sufficiently. Many graduates of the programme manage to find a position within academia or move on to a teaching career, testifying to the good quality of the master’s programme. The panel encourages widening alumni’s perspectives beyond these career paths and welcomes the programme’s initial steps to do so.

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

Master’s programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations

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

The chair of the panel, prof. dr. Peter Van Nuffelen, and the secretary, dr. Els Schröder, hereby declare that all panel members have studied this report and that they agree with the judgements laid down in the report. They confirm that the assessment has been conducted in accordance with the demands relating to independence.

Date: 5 March 2020

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

Context

The master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations (hereafter: CAC) is one of 18 master's programmes offered by the Faculty of Humanities at Leiden University. The faculty is designed as a matrix of study programmes and institutes. Teaching staff of the master's programme CAC are based at LUCAS (Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society), LIAS (Leiden Institute of Area Studies), LUCL (Leiden University Centre for Linguistics), LUIH (Leiden University Institute for History) and LUIP (Leiden University Institute for Philosophy). The institutes harbour research and appoint academic staff members. The study programmes are the units in which teaching is organised.

The master's programme CAC is led by a Programme Board, which falls under immediate responsibility of the Faculty Board. It consists of a head of department from the academic staff and a student. The Programme Board is advised by a Programme Committee, consisting of equal numbers of lecturers and students. Apart from the meetings of the Programme Board and Programme Committee, there are regular meetings of the four track leaders of Assyriology, Classics, Egyptology and Hebrew and Aramaic Studies; these track leaders are also members of the Board of Admissions. Assessment at CAC is monitored and assured by the Board of Examiners Classics and Ancient Civilizations. This Board also safeguards the quality of assessment at two bachelor's programmes (Classics; Ancient Near Eastern Studies), a research master's programme (Classics and Ancient Civilizations) and a minor (Rhetoric).

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

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

Findings

Profile

Since 2012, the master's programme CAC offers students the opportunity to acquire expertise of the languages and cultures of the ancient Mediterranean region and the Near East. In geographical terms, the programme covers the areas of Egypt, Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, Greece and the Roman Empire. In chronological terms, the programme covers thousands of years: from the early origins of Egyptian and Sumerian societies down to the world of Greece and Rome, including its modern reception from the Renaissance to the twenty-first century. The programme has four separate tracks: Assyriology, Classics, Egyptology, and Hebrew and Aramaic Studies. It is unique in the Netherlands for the breadth of the expertise on offer on the ancient Near East. Across the world, only four other master's programmes come close to offering a similar curriculum, two of which are taught in German.

In general, the panel is impressed by the diversity and depth of the faculty's cultural profile, to which the master's programme CAC contributes. CAC, and especially the exceptional expertise found under its umbrella, testifies to Leiden's commitment to adopt a diverse profile which gives a prominent role to the study of languages, cultures and societies in their multifaceted contexts. A small programme like this is vulnerable, because it is relatively expensive to maintain. On the other hand, the panel strongly emphasises that such programmes are of vital importance, not only to Leiden University but to the Netherlands as a whole. If academic research is no longer done in certain specialised subfields of the humanities, the university can no longer offer broad programmes with sufficient depth, nor electives to students in other programmes. Also, academics from other faculties and universities in the Netherlands will be deprived of this specialised knowledge. And if expertise in 'small' languages and cultures is no longer passed on from one generation to the next, the Netherlands will weaken its international position.



In response to recommendations from external assessors during the previous accreditation procedure and midterm, CAC developed since its creation from four *de facto* separate master's programmes into one coherent programme with a more unified profile, in which the various tracks work closely together in teaching and administration. The tracks now share programme components providing cohesion and exchange, while preserving a balance between multidisciplinary collaboration and disciplinary specialisation on a certain region with its own specific culture(s) and language(s). In this way, the programme challenges both staff and students to look beyond the limits of their own research expertise, placing multidisciplinary at the basis of its profile including considerable attention to interdisciplinary methods and approaches. The panel considers the diversity and breadth a strong point of the programme and rates the move towards a more multi- and interdisciplinary approach wise and well-chosen.

Naturally, the move towards greater uniformity has posed challenges regarding the desired achievement level at each individual specialisation. This is reflected in the curriculum design of the various tracks, which is discussed under Standard 2. The panel verified during the site visit that the management of the master's programme is aware of the still existing differences between the track-specific accents in their profiling to students. All staff members are aware of the shifts that have been taking place to bring the various tracks more in line with the programme's general aim of being multidisciplinary in approach, while reserving room for track-specific specialisation and the preservation of rare expertise (for example linguistic expertise).

Based on its discussions during the site visit, the panel concluded that what may have started as a marriage of convenience to safeguard the existence of some unique yet small expertise areas has now grown into a functional and even, in some tracks, blossoming relationship. The programme seems to have found a first balance between integration and specialisation in the way in which it presents its profile, and in which the various tracks currently fit this profile. For some tracks, the redefinition is not fully completed, for example for the track Hebrew and Aramaic Studies. Yet, the panel found sufficient evidence that the programme is working towards further integration and adjustment. It encourages the programme to continue on the chosen route.

The panel advises the programme to present itself in a more self-confident way about the level of integration already achieved. In its view, CAC may truly advocate its multi- and interdisciplinary perspective, matched to specialised expertise and combined with the wealth of Leiden resources, as an asset. This was also acknowledged by students and graduates of the programme, who added that the possibility to follow crash courses in rarely taught languages in the Netherlands, which brought them up to speed at a respectable working level, is a true strength of the programme. This could also be made more explicit in the programme's presentation. A more pronounced self-confident interdisciplinary angle combined with the strong multidisciplinary approach is, in the panel's view, also key to the way in which the programme could present its connection to the labour market more explicitly. Interdisciplinarity and the unique skills and mindset deriving from an interdisciplinary approach could be a way to open up and broaden the relation between the programme and job market.

Intended learning outcomes

The panel studied the intended learning outcomes (hereafter: ILOs) which have been formulated in a concise and accessible manner, listed according to the relevant Dublin Descriptors (the acquisition and application of knowledge and understanding; development of judgment, communication and learning skills). The ILOs are presented in two parts: the first part is applicable to all four specialisations and recognisably encompasses the interdisciplinary aspect of the programme (ILO 1.b). The second part is specialisation-specific, defining per track which aspects of the chosen field are being achieved by the programme's graduates. The panel also found the supplementary information provided in the self-study report regarding lifelong learning skills helpful for weighing the way in which the ILOs connect to demands of the labour market. It suggests synthesising this information into a clearly formulated ILO that could be added to the shared ILOs. Such an addition

would more explicitly connect the acquired skills and the demands posed by the professional field on humanities' graduates.

The ILOs are also geared towards the appropriate master's degree level. This follows, for example, from the emphasis in the shared ILOs on the use of analytical research skills (ILO 2.b) and on the acquisition of learning skills at a self-determined or autonomous nature (ILO 5.a). This advanced level is even more clearly specified in terms of the complexity of the problems encountered, the integration of various approaches and the reflection skills involved in some of the track-specific ILOs. In the specialisation Classics, for example, students are expected to reach a diverse and well-balanced view of Greco-Roman antiquity on the basis of an integrated linguistic, literary, cultural-historical approach, including reflection on and interpretation of the reception of ancient culture (ILO Classics 1.b/2.d).

The panel found, however, that the ILOs of this particular specialisation are more detailed and specific than those of the other specialisations, both in the way in which they address the anticipated degree level and the acquisition of knowledge and skills. Hence, it encourages the master's programme to take these track-specific ILOs as a point of departure to enhance the ILOs of the other specialisations. This observation ties in with a general observation regarding the various ILOs defined by programmes at the Faculty of Humanities. Many different forms and styles in formulation were encountered by the panel in its preparation for the Region Studies site visit. The panel recommends to harmonise the ILOs of different programmes within the Faculty. Obviously they will differ in terms of field and envisioned skills and level, but it would enhance transparency if all programmes use the same terminology and categorisation.

Considerations

In fostering the knowledge of many cultures, Leiden University has a longstanding tradition; it is an essential part of its identity and gives the university a unique position in the Netherlands. The Faculty is committed to keep this tradition alive and protect small fields like those represented within the master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations. The panel wholeheartedly supports this ambition, in the interest of Dutch society as a whole. It commends the programme for the way in which its profile has been redefined in the period under review. It considers the programme's focus on interdisciplinarity combined with specialisation in some rare and unique research fields as a strength that may be even further cultivated and communicated to prospective students. A self-confident interdisciplinary perspective is, in the panel's view, also key to the way in which the programme could more explicitly define its connection to the labour market in terms of the achievement of an interdisciplinary approach and mindset.

The panel verified that the intended learning outcomes (hereafter: ILOs) of the master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations tie in with the level, profile and orientation of the programme. They have been related to the Dublin Descriptors in a clear and concise manner and thus meet international requirements. They also pay implicit attention to the expectations of the professional field for humanities graduates. The panel would advise making this connection more explicit by adding an ILO specifically describing the lifelong learning skills aimed for in the programme. Another panel recommendation concerns the harmonisation of the ILOs between the tracks, taking the detailed track-specific ILOs for Classics as a potential starting point. The panel advises the Faculty of Humanities to check any reformulation in terms of terminology and categorisation to other programmes within the Faculty, to enhance transparency.

Conclusion

Master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations: the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'meets the standard'.



Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

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

Findings*Programme language and name*

In principle, Leiden University offers its master's programmes in English. The decision to do so was based on three arguments. Firstly, English is the lingua franca of international science to which the master's programmes intend to connect. Secondly, graduates are increasingly active in the international labour market. Thirdly, Leiden University wants to attract international students because an international classroom enriches the students' perspective. The master's programme CAC is very successful in its international admissions: on average, the annual international student intake over the last three years has been 32%. In addition, several staff members have an international profile, bringing in their international expertise to enrich students' classroom experience. The students commented on the good support system at the programme for international students and considered their study environment truly international. According to the panel, the choice for English as the programme's official language of instruction and communication, and for a programme name in English, is fully justified. The programme has a strong international profile and a regular and consistent international intake, is committed to the concept of an international classroom and fully prepared to tailor to international students' needs.

Curriculum and didactic principle

The structure of the educational programme is based on the Leiden 100-600 level structure. In the master's programme, only modules are offered at the 400, 500 and 600 level. In practical terms, these levels translate as a specialist course (400), an advanced course with a clear academic and research focus (500) and a very specialist course and/or master thesis project, demanding from students also autonomy and independency in the applied research methods and skills (600). Specialist courses at 400-level in the CAC programme concern intensive language courses, like 'Tutorial Akkadian', 'The Sumerian Language' or 'Demotic Papyrology'. In the panel's view, this course level structure reflects and safeguards the level requirements for a master's degree.

Next to this level structure, the curriculum and teaching programme at the master's programme CAC is based on five didactical principles:

1. Ancient civilisations are studied primarily through texts, which are read in the original languages for which a specialisation in one of the four fields of study (Assyriology, Egyptology, Classics, or Hebrew and Aramaic Studies) is necessary;
2. Students broaden their perspective on their chosen field of specialisation by following compulsory core courses that are multidisciplinary, and sometimes interdisciplinary, in focus;
3. The programme has adopted a multidisciplinary approach, including linguistics, philosophy, literary theory, material culture, archaeology, economic, social and legal history, and reception studies;
4. Inquiry-based learning is the primary method of education;
5. Oral and written communications skills take a central position in the teaching methods.

These principles feed into a curriculum with both a shared and a specialised component over the four specialisation tracks. For an overview of the curriculum of the programme and its specialisations, see Appendix 2. All students follow a core course, 'Classics and Ancient Civilizations MA Seminar (5 EC)', and write a master thesis (15 EC). In addition, students in all four tracks follow specialisation-specific seminars (40 EC in total), of which 10 EC are dedicated to mandatory language acquisition. The specialisations also have some track-specific requirements, which differ slightly. These curriculum choices reflect subtle differences in the profiles of the four tracks, which originally derive from their historic status as once being separate master's programmes.

The Assyriology track enables students to study three of the most prominent language areas of the Mesopotamian region: Sumerian, Akkadian and Hittite. Historically, the period of interest stretches the vast era of the last quarter of the third millennium to the end of the first millennium BC. Assyriology has no mandatory tracks, but offers students the opportunity to add an additional language course in Akkadian, Sumerian and/or Hittite (10 EC). The curriculum is revised every year, partly based on the educational preparation and interests of the students entering the programme, who usually have widely varied backgrounds due to the exceptional rare expertise taught in the track. The seminar programme ranges from seminars like 'Old Assyrian Archives', 'The Aramaization of Assyria' to 'The Written Legacy of Hittite Anatolia'.

Classics primarily focuses on Greek and Latin literature and linguistics, with an added pronounced interest in Ancient Philosophy and reception history. In addition, students are welcome to select courses from neighbouring areas like Ancient History, Papyrology, Palaeography and Numismatics. They also follow a mandatory course 'Classics Now!' (5 EC), which places their classical studies in a more contemporary perspective. A lively community of (international) exchange exists: students are regularly invited to attend the *Forum Antiquum*, in which international scholars present their research, and guest lecturers regularly contribute to the track's teaching programme. Students also have the option of following courses in the Masterlanguage programme. Masterlanguage is a range of MA courses for language students jointly provided by several Dutch universities. This opens up, for example, the option to follow a module on Greek and Latin Epigraphy that proves to be regularly elected by students.

Students enrolling in the Egyptology track study ancient Egyptian documentation from the earliest written sources around 3200 BC up to the Coptic sources of the early Islamic period. Modules typically address topics such as temple inscriptions of the Graeco-Roman period or Demotic or Coptic Papyrology, in which literary and linguistic training is discussed and placed in its appropriate historical context. Students also spend eight consecutive weeks in Egypt for a mandatory field course 'Egyptology in the Field' (15 EC) taught at the Netherlands-Flemish Institute in Cairo (Nederlands-Vlaamse Instituut in Cairo). This course enriches students' experience with archaeological fieldwork and connects the track's historic and linguistic orientation solidly to material culture.

The Hebrew and Aramaic Studies track focuses mostly on ancient Syria-Palestine between ca. 1200 BC and 600 AD, i.e. between the emergence of the linguistic and cultural context of the Hebrew Bible and Old Testament and the dissemination of Islam. Students follow a mandatory course introducing the philological-historical approach of this specialisation, with a focus on pre-Modern Hebrew and Aramaic called 'Historical Grammar of Hebrew and Aramaic' (10 EC). Primary source texts in Hebrew and Aramaic take centre stage throughout the modules, but every year language training is supplemented with varying courses on rarely taught languages such as Ugaritic and Phoenician. Students are also invited to follow courses in neighbouring disciplines, including Biblical scholarship, Semitic linguistics, the history of the Mediterranean, ancient Judaism and Christianity. Whereas this track is more philologically oriented than the other tracks at CAC, the combined philological-historical method connects the track to the general approach of the programme and to the other tracks.

The panel considers the curriculum for all four tracks appropriate and conducive to the achievement of the ILOs of the programme. The students were very positive regarding the programme, offering several examples of the ways in which the programme brought them to a notably higher level than in the corresponding bachelor's degree. The staff members explained the ways in which their research fed into their teaching and also pointed out several extra-curricular options for students to engage in research. In the past, this has resulted in several student publications in peer-reviewed journals. Based on these testimonies and a study of the curriculum and some modules, the panel considers the programme's teaching curriculum of the appropriate master's level, as well as offering sufficient choices to students to develop their own interests and accents.



There are also sufficient options to branch out beyond the remit of the CAC programme. Talented master's students with the ambition to take up management positions in the private sector are given the opportunity to follow the Leiden Leadership Programme, organised for students from Leiden University, Delft University of Technology and Erasmus University Rotterdam. Through assessments, training sessions delivered by professionals and practical assignment, they learn to apply their own qualities.

Content and orientation

During the site visit, some students remarked that the MA Seminar is not working as well as it could be. They considered several of the disciplinary aspects of the course often too easy, whereas they found the general knowledge component very theoretical and difficult. The panel acknowledges that getting the level right is the hardest part of creating an interdisciplinary course for students with widely different backgrounds and language skills. This was confirmed by the Programme Board and staff members, who all actively engaged in discussions with the panel regarding the question of where improvements could be made. The MA Seminar aims to bring students from the various tracks together; more collaborative projects and tasks have been introduced in the last years, which really challenge the disciplinary outlook of students.

The panel was positively struck by the staff's engagement with this issue and their ideas to address the raised concerns. Hence, it trusts these to be in capable hands. Studying the MA Seminar's module, the panel noted that students from the Assyriology and Hebrew and Aramaic tracks were less well served regarding a diversity of disciplinary texts and methods than those of Egyptology and Classics. It therefore invites these disciplines, and consequently all students in the programme, to prioritise the Assyriology and Hebrew and Aramaic tracks when making changes to the MA Seminar's content, with the goal of moving students in these areas of expertise more out of their comfort zone.

This observation is linked to a finding regarding the content of the modules in the Hebrew and Aramaic Studies track. The panel has the impression that this particular track could be more creative in embedding and connecting its linguistic approach to other disciplinary approaches than only a historical one to bring out the multidisciplinary approach of the CAC programme in their modules. Staff and management explained that they are aware of this need and that steps have been taken, but also pointed out that the road to more integration takes time: too much change in too short a period is not necessarily conducive to the teaching-learning environment for students. The panel accepts this argument, but asks the programme and staff members to remain attentive to the need for (eventual) change. It was pleased to note that recently a module had been run in collaboration with the track Assyriology. Combined efforts like this may be helpful in diversifying the current module offering and furthering the cohesion of the entire programme.

The panel was very enthusiastic about the design of the 'Classics Now!' course, which it considered engaging, interesting and very relevant for the overall aims of the programme. Even though it is currently only aimed at students of the track Classics, the panel observed elements in this course that could be very relevant for students in the other tracks as well, especially in the way in which this course connected the classical context via reception history to current events and social tendencies. It would welcome incorporating some of the elements of this course into the shared MA seminar for all four tracks, again to bring out even more the multi- and interdisciplinary aspect of the programme. In addition, the panel wants to compliment the programme on the way in which they have included skills training in their MA Seminar in recent years in reaction to student requests, observations regarding study delays and earlier recommendations by external reviewers during the previous site visit. The panel considers the skills and methodological training within CAC to be of good quality.

Teaching methods

In line with the programme's didactical principles of creating an interactive and research-led classroom, teaching is done in small, interactive groups using various approaches in an international

setting. This small-scale setting allows for intensive contact and exchange among students and between students and lecturers. Teaching mainly takes the form of seminars, in which students actively participate. The students are challenged to reflect critically on the texts they read and to express their ideas to peers and professors. On a regular basis they give presentations, moderate discussions and present topics in class. They are also encouraged, and taken along, to visit some of the artefacts and texts held at the relevant Leiden institutes and museums for their area of studies. In the Egyptology track, students engage in fieldwork at various Egyptian archaeological digs, giving them contacts at the relevant archaeological sites. The panel considers the used teaching methods appropriate for a master's degree programme and sufficiently varied and engaging. There is room of improvement for further diversification but this is mainly linked to the used assessment methods, as will be discussed under Standard 3.

Study guidance, success and support

The programme's Coordinator of Studies also serves as Study Advisor. In that capacity, (s)he is responsible for guiding and advising students during their studies. The study advisor is available to provide individual guidance for study choices, answer study-related questions, discuss study-related problems and present possible solutions. Furthermore, the study advisor also serves as the contact for students who study abroad. To monitor their study progress, students draw up an individual study plan, which they discuss.

In 2017, the programme looked into study delays as students seemed to take longer for finishing their one-year degree than they used to do. A survey under students and graduates suggested that delays were often self-induced. The students concerned decided to follow additional courses, within the CAC programme or beyond the programme, to enrol in a second master's programme or they balanced their studies with a part-time job due to financial constraints, resulting in delays. A cause of concern, according to the Programme Board, was the fact that some students revealed struggles with the writing of their master's thesis. This was confirmed by a separate study of the Programme Committee, which found that diverse backgrounds of the international student intake also played into this matter, suggesting a partly compromised teaching-learning environment.

Hence, the programme decided to reduce the study load of the master's thesis from 20 to 15 EC and it added a clear academic writing component to the newly introduced Classics and Ancient Civilizations MA Seminar. As mentioned above, the panel considers skills and methodological training and preparation for the thesis trajectory now to be of good quality. In addition, the panel considers the thesis supervision at the programme well organised. The students are encouraged to choose a topic early in their master's year. They choose their own supervisors and are redirected if a potential supervisor considers a student's topic matched a colleague's interest or expertise better. Student and supervisor always sign a supervision agreement, which lists arrangements including the thesis topic, research questions and deadlines. These agreements are studied and approved by the Board of Examiners in order to control and safeguard the master's level of the suggested research. Current students and recent alumni confirmed these procedures during the site visit and added that they feel well supported and guided throughout the process.

During the site visit, the management confirmed that since the introduction of the new methodological and academic training concept, the negative trend in study success had subsided. International students and alumni also mentioned the good support system for international students and the short lines of communication. Directly upon enrolment, they felt properly overseen by the programme and Admission Committee. They felt that the programme took their previous training into account. This individual attention also translated itself in suitable tailor-made solutions for addressing individual study needs and deficiencies, in particular with respect to skills training and language acquisition courses. All students, both national and international, considered that while the programme was very challenging and of a high level, it was also achievable within one year for a fully committed student.



Based on its findings and the interviews conducted during the site visit, the panel thus concludes that the programme addressed the noted drop in study success very successfully and now offers a good guidance and support system for all students. It acted appropriately and adequately, putting its trust in the programme's control mechanisms and involvement of the various programme bodies involved in the programme's control cycle.

Labour market orientation

Improving the labour market orientation of curricula is one of the challenges currently addressed by both the programme and the Faculty. Some students still lack confidence in their professional abilities and chances, and have trouble in finding their way after graduation, as alumni told the panel. The Faculty organises events offering students perspectives on their possibilities on the labour market. There is, for instance, the annual Humanities Career Event, where potential employers such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Google, publisher Das Mag and the General Intelligence and Security Service offer workshops. The Humanities Career Service supports students with their internships and job application procedures.

In addition to these faculty initiatives, the programme reacted to recommendations in earlier reviews regarding the improvement of students' preparation for the job market. It created an alumni network, organised a career day and an alumni day, introduced job market sessions as part of its MA Seminar and established connections with institutions and companies (Rijksmuseum voor Oudheden; Brill Publishers; Uitgeverij LAMBO) for internship opportunities. Although the programme's job market outlook is still closely linked to careers in teaching and academia, the panel acknowledges that steps have been taken to broaden the perspective. Its suggestions regarding the incorporation of lifelong learning skills and the interdisciplinary approach, as offered under Standard 1, may further set the programme up to diversify its labour market outlook. This is a line of diversification also advocated by alumni and students met during the site visit.

Staff

The combined expertise represented by staff members of the programme is unique in the Netherlands, and also extremely rare world-wide. Many staff members have been recipients of highly competitive research grants, which allows them to integrate their high quality research directly in their teaching. This reinforces research-led teaching in the master's programme. In addition to having excellent academic and research qualifications, staff members are also well prepared for teaching. The lecturers have the appropriate teaching qualifications, or are obtaining them if recently hired. The level of English of all staff members is assessed and monitored prior to their participation in the programme. Students speak highly of their teachers, calling them very approachable and knowledgeable; they feel fully supported throughout their studies and feel taken seriously as emerging scholars in their own right. Based on their credentials and the good reports by their students, the panel considers the staff as of excellent quality.

The Faculty stimulates lecturers in their professional development by offering workshops for staff members at the university's teachers training centre ICLON and expert meetings with other lecturers. In the faculty-wide Expertise Centre Online Learning, they can share best practices, and in the university-wide Leiden Teacher's Academy, they can work out innovative didactic tools. Nevertheless, this support is not always sufficient. Discussions during the site visit highlighted the ambition of the staff to further innovate their teaching methods, which would also allow for further diversification of their assessment methods. Several staff members would like to advance their digital humanities knowledge and skills, reflecting on the direct benefits of this area of study for the creation of a more interactive and engaging study environment for students. Time constraints and shortage of places for professional advancement often interfered with these ambitions. The panel has noted this staff drive towards teaching innovation and encourages the Programme Board and Faculty to take note of this and to support staff in their training wishes to their best abilities.

The panel noticed that keeping the work load within limits is a continuous challenge, for the CAC programme as well as for other programmes in the Humanities. The limited budget of relatively small programmes combined with the intensity in contact hours required for acquiring language skills and for writing theses that are up to the mark threaten to overburden staff members, especially when combined with challenging tasks such as the redefinition of a track's profile. The issue is complicated by the fact that the teaching staff is allocated by the Faculty's Research Institutes and centres. Therefore the institutes, not the Programme Board or Faculty, are directly responsible for personnel management. This may get in the way of a fair division of labour amongst members of staff across Institutes, especially for those members of the staff taking up tasks in several of the gremia, such as the Programme Committee and Boards of Examiners.

For instance, some institutes allocate more hours to certain tasks than others. The panel fully supports the Faculty's attempts to harmonise this, and calls on the Institutes to stick to the list of compensation hours per task that is provided by the Faculty Management. It considers workload a serious challenge, but also found that the Faculty Management is strongly aware of this problem and does the utmost to tackle it. This was confirmed by staff members at the master's programme CAC, who emphasised that they felt supported within the programme and the Faculty and who identified threats to their teaching and research in terms of 'external' pressure (national cuts on the university budget, resulting in redistributions of research and teaching resources across the various disciplines, with the Humanities usually missing out). The panel applauds and encourages the Faculty's awareness and decisiveness in this respect, both to protect their staff and to safeguard the connection between education and research, which is crucial for the quality of the existing teaching-learning environment for students.

Considerations

The panel ascertained that the master's programme CAC offers clearly distinguished tracks of which the content results in stimulating and high quality courses. Although the student intake is varied and strongly international in orientation, good (individual) support and guidance prepares all incoming students for the various tracks. The panel is impressed that the programme in this way creates a level playing field amongst a diversified group of students, resulting in a good teaching-learning environment that allows students to finish their degree within the set time period. Thesis guidance is of high quality and students are supported by an adequate methodological training prior to the thesis trajectory. The panel verified that the internal control cycle of the programme is adequate and very responsive to signals that may suggest a need for change.

In its assessment of the programme's curriculum and modules, the panel identified certain areas in which improvement could be strived for. It suggests looking into the way in which the tracks in Assyriology and Hebrew and Aramaic Studies currently contribute to the content of the MA Seminar to engage the students from these two tracks more efficiently while also challenging students from the tracks in Classics and Egyptology with new horizons derived from these fields. In general, the panel suggests looking at improving the integration of the various tracks in the MA seminar. Naturally, this proposal is only offered in the form of a suggestion. The panel ascertained that the programme is fully aware of the current students' concerns regarding the MA Seminar and is already looking into ways to address these; it therefore trusts the programme to find an appropriate reaction.

The panel concludes that the curriculum and the teaching-learning environment of the master's programme is designed and implemented in a way that enables students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The design of the programmes is conducive to their feasibility, and students clearly receive sufficient support and guidance. Teaching is characterised by a small scale learning environment, which allows students to include personal interests and preferred learning styles during the runtime of a course. The panel is pleased with the quality of the teaching and support staff and praises the staff members' commitment to the students. It noticed that the staff would like to expand its teaching methods beyond current range, and it encourages them to look for ways in which the desired innovations can be accommodated with the support of the Programme Board and Faculty. In addition, work load monitoring needs continuous attention at Faculty level, just as a fair distribution



of allocated hours for certain tasks. The panel commends the Faculty for its directive and supportive approach in these matters.

Conclusion

Master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations: the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 3: Student assessment

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

Findings

System of assessment

The Faculty of Humanities safeguards the system of assessment for all programmes in the Region Studies cluster at Leiden University. It drafted a general assessment policy, which is shared amongst the programmes. In it, teachers are assigned a central role in assuring the quality of assessment; as content experts they know the requirements of the relevant fields. The various Boards of Examiners active within the Faculty are expected to closely monitor academic integrity.

Assessment in the programmes is structured according to shared principles. The design of all forms of assessment is peer-reviewed: tests and exams are checked on their validity and coherence prior to being taken. Also, the exams are designed in such a way that students are invited to continuously enhance their skills and broaden their knowledge, based on the principles of structural alignment. In this way, they develop their knowledge and skills from a basic to a more advanced level, appropriate for their degree level. Knowledge acquisition and application are continuously tested, along with academic and communication skills. The students are preferably tested multiple times within a course, allowing for a diversity of testing forms and methods. At least two independent examiners are involved in the assessment of theses or final projects.

The Faculty has formulated various guidelines and materials to support the Boards of Examiners, the programmes and their staff in order to enhance their assessment practices and design. Most notably, the panel has observed that a newly developed *Manual for Boards of Examiners* is proving helpful to align assessment practices across the various programmes. It also considered the support materials available to staff very useful, with advice regarding the quality assurance of testing and practical tips and suggestions regarding exam design. These guidelines currently exist only in Dutch; an English version may be useful for international staff members. This applies especially to master's programmes with a high number of international specialists, such as CAC. In addition, the Faculty recently introduced a standard evaluation form for thesis assessment to enhance the transparency across all programmes under its remit.

The panel is pleased with the increased uniformity of assessment procedures which adds to the transparency and clarity of assessment in all programmes. It approves the Faculty's efforts in response to recommendations regarding its assessment level, resulting in a good support system for all programmes within the Region Studies cluster. During the site visit, it found the various Boards of Examination engaged and in line with Faculty policies and principles. It noted, however, that not all Boards interpreted the Faculty's guidelines regarding the handling of fraud cases in a similar way. In some programmes, staff members still seemed to deal with individual occurrences on a case-by-case basis. While the panel has no concerns regarding the staff members' integrity in these matters, it still advocates that the Boards and Faculty step in. In its opinion, fraud cases should always be handled by the responsible Board of Examiners. It advises clearly communicating the faculty guidelines regarding fraud, and adjusting them if and where necessary.

Board of Examiners Classics and Ancient Civilizations

In addition to the Faculty guidelines, the panel studied the programme's Course and Examinations Regulations (in Dutch: Onderwijs- en Examenregeling) and its assessment plan along with the rules and regulations of the responsible Board of Examiners Classics and Ancient Civilizations (hereafter: BoE CAC). This Board also safeguards the quality of assessment at two bachelor programmes (Classics; Ancient Near Eastern Studies), a research master's programme (Classics and Ancient Civilizations) and a faculty minor (Rhetoric). The BoE CAC consists of four representatives of the programmes and an external member and closely collaborates with both programme directors and study advisors. It is supported by a secretary. Over the last years, all members of the BoE CAC have invested in the further professionalisation of their assessment practices and knowledge about testing methods.

The BoE CAC is responsible for guaranteeing the quality and standard of examinations and degrees in all four programmes under its responsibility. In order to do so, it appoints examiners for all courses, sets ECs for individual internships prior to their approval as part of a student's study programme and ratifies every student's full dossier with testing results before they receive their diploma, including decisions regarding honours (*cum laude*; *summa cum laude*). Additionally, the BoE CAC advises the programme boards and directors on matters regarding assessment and is involved in the further development of teaching staff's assessment practices. To guarantee the quality of course assessment, every course and its assessment are reviewed at least once every six years by the BoE CAC. Recommendations and actions following from these reviews are passed on to the responsible Programme Board and monitored.

The BoE CAC also monitors first-year study progress and approves individual curricula (at both entry level and during the studies), especially if they deviate from the standard. For the master's programme CAC, the latter task mainly holds true for the tracks in Assyriology, Egyptology, and Hebrew and Aramaic Studies due to their unique status. As world-wide only a handful of programmes exist that prepare students for master's degrees in these fields, students with a great variety of backgrounds and resulting deficiencies apply to enrol in the Leiden master's programme. For these students, individual curricula need to be developed to ensure obtainment of the ILOs within the master's programme.

The panel acknowledges that the system of assessment has improved over the period under review at the master's programme CAC, benefiting from the advancement and professionalisation of the Faculty's system of assessment. Teachers and members of the BoE CAC confirmed to the panel that they felt well supported in this respect, benefiting from a range of supporting materials and guidelines to further develop their assessment practices. They also mentioned that communication regarding testing methods and practices had been intensified. Nevertheless, the panel also noted in communication with teachers and staff members of the programme that not all of them were fully convinced by the need for further standardisation. Some teachers considered the increased attention to monitoring as (unnecessarily) adding to their work load and as a vote of no-confidence on their integrity and autonomy as educational professionals. According to BoE CAC members, these teachers' reservations resulted in a form of silent resistance. The BoE CAC mostly observed it in incomplete and disorganised dossiers that impeded its own task in safeguarding the achievement level.

In addition, the BoE CAC mentioned that great differences exist in the compensation of members of boards of examination across the Faculty due to a variety in research institutes' policies regarding this matter. The members of BoE CAC, and in particular the chair, felt under-rewarded for their efforts and time input. They emphasised that the Faculty was stepping in and was trying to introduce a standard compensation model for all various boards of examiners. This was confirmed by the Faculty management, which added that a more realistic compensation for their investment had been scheduled for the upcoming academic year. The committee suggests that this policy be pursued in the coming years.



These assurances addressed some of the panel concerns regarding this matter. Nevertheless, the panel underscores the importance of a standard compensation model that allows for a sufficient time investment of members of the BoE CAC and all of its fellow board members within the Faculty. In its view, the Board's compensation is directly linked to the noted teachers' reluctance at CAC to embrace standardisation of assessment practices. When Board members are pressed for time, they cannot invest in communication with their colleagues regarding the need and advantages of standard practices. A lack of communication also infringes on the ways in which teachers can add to the development of (best) assessment practices, reducing teachers' feelings of control and support. The panel therefore strongly supports the Faculty and BoE CAC in their wish for a standard compensation model that allows for sufficient time investment in the development of assessment practices. According to the panel, this will pay itself out: in advancement and innovation, but also in efficiency and support.

Test and examination practices at Classics and Ancient Civilizations

The programme has a transparent assessment plan, which systematically shows how the learning outcomes of the programme are linked to the assessment of the various courses. For CAC, clearly defined test matrices have been developed per specialisation track. Course coordinators are responsible for the design and quality of assessment for their modules. Tests and examinations are peer-reviewed, as are the answer models. Student dossiers comprise information on all used assessment methods; they include written assessments, such as graded translations, and written evaluation forms for essays and presentations. In some cases, annotated papers are still accepted as evidence of grading and evaluation, although the BoE CAC tries to eliminate these practices and to move on to more standardised protocols and evaluation forms to increase uniformity and transparency for students. The panel verified that the chosen methods of assessment guarantee that the obtainment of the intended learning outcomes could be monitored by the BoE CAC. Hence, if all programme components have been realised with a positive result, the achievement of all ILOs upon graduation is traceable and therefore safeguarded.

During the site visit, students commented on the change in marking practices and the perceived level of transparency of assessment. In general, they felt that written assessment at the Classics-track was more developed and transparent than at the other three tracks of the programme. In the Assyriology, Egyptology, and Hebrew and Aramaic tracks, evaluation more often took the form of annotation rather than a developed argumentation and/or form. Students stressed that in those cases in which they felt that written feedback had fallen short, they had always been able to approach teachers on an individual basis for oral feedback. Overall, they praised their teachers for their willingness to elaborate on results, which addressed any potential concerns regarding feedback levels. Nevertheless, the students' experiences confirm the need for further transparency of feedback and grading practices, and the panel fully supports the BoE CAC's move towards further standardisation. The panel also believes that these forms of standardisation, when developed and introduced, will eventually result in a reduced work load for teachers as well as further transparency.

In its self-evaluation report, the programme defined two challenges to the creation of variety of assessment in the master's degree: the two annual entry moments (resulting in a September and February cohort of students) and the large number of electives. Both challenges result in a wish to align assessment practices as much as possible across all various modules in order to ensure that all students are tested in similar ways. These arguments ring true, but the panel believes that assessment at the programme could be more diverse than currently is the case. Many courses now rely on an essay combined with a participation grade or presentation as its assessment forms. After studying the assessment of a selection of courses, the panel considers these forms reliable but also slightly traditional and uninventive in its design. A positive exception to this observation is the module 'Classics Now!'. After closer study of this particular course, the panel noted some added variety in the shape of more creative and formative assessment moments that called upon the use of skills. These moments all fed into the students' participation mark. The panel upholds this module therefore as an inspiration, and potential solution, for the challenges defined by the programme.

Thesis assessment Classics and Ancient Civilizations

Thesis assessment at the master's programme follows faculty policy. Every thesis is assessed by two readers, who fill in a digital assessment form individually and independently. In case of discrepancies between the two assessments, with a 1.0 grade point difference as cap point, the BoE CAC steps in. After research, often involving a third reader, a final mark is decided upon, taking into account all various viewpoints in these cases. Examiners are officially appointed by the BoE CAC, which tries to avoid standard pairs as far as possible (as some tracks have a limited number of staff). The panel approves of this practice in principle, which demonstrates awareness of the potential dangers involved with allowing fixed assessment pairs. It would advise, however, to allow for the appointment of second examiners across tracks, and even programmes, to further diversify assessment pairs. This would allow for exchange of examination practices, while simultaneously introducing an additional element of objectivity to thesis grading that would be very valuable for small(er) programmes with a limited student intake.

The panel studied a sample of eight theses for the master's programme CAC, including their accompanying assessment forms. In general, it considered the assessment of theses of satisfactory quality although it noted that it was not clear in all cases how a final grade had been reached based on the assessment of the various subcategories. The panel would advise to state clearly on the forms how the various subcategories have been weighted into the final grade to increase transparency for both students and independent observers. It also found some of the gradings too generous. The BoE responded to this panel observation during the site visit by explaining that they had also looked into the high amount of honour degrees awarded at the programme. Members of the BoE CAC had studied some of the highly rewarded theses; they reached the conclusion that most honours had been awarded rightfully and that the high grading in these cases was fully justified. Even though the panel's findings deviated from this conclusion, the panel was pleased to hear that the BoE CAC proactively looked into the matter. Its advice regarding mixing up pairs across tracks in programmes may be a good way to allow for a level of added objectivity regarding this matter, that may weed out any current panel hesitations.

Considerations

According to the panel, the assurance and monitoring of the quality of assessment is sufficiently guaranteed at the master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations. The assessment policies and protocols used in the programme are well designed and extensive, resulting in a regulated system of assessment. The Board of Examiners in the CAC unit is well supported by the Faculty in the development and professionalisation of its assessment practices. The panel welcomes the notable tendency towards standardisation of evaluations and feedback practices. It underscores that to advance further along this road, the Board members need to be structurally reinforced and compensated to allow for exchange and communication with staff members in order to achieve full support for further changes. In addition, it advises to clearly communicate the faculty guidelines regarding fraud amongst all various boards of examiners within the Faculty, and to adjust these if and where necessary to avoid diversity of practice amongst programmes.

The panel observed that the types of assessment used in the programme are fit for purpose and allow demonstration of the attainment of the relevant learning outcomes at an adequate level. The panel found some potential room for improvement in the variation of assessment. It recommends looking into the use of more creative formative forms of assessment as building blocks for part of the entertained summative methods. Thesis assessment at CAC is done by two assessors who fill out the assessment form independently. In case of discrepancies, doubts, or high or low grades, a third assessor is involved. The panel recommends keeping an eye on documenting a clear argumentation of the assessment and the ways in which the various subcriteria weigh into the final grade. In order to further raise the objectivity of grading, to regularly check the quality of programme grading and to avoid fixed assessment pairs within small specialisations, it advises mixing up examiners across the CAC tracks and other programmes within the Faculty. The panel is pleased with the proactive role of the Board of Examiners CAC in monitoring and promoting the quality of assessment and concludes that the Board is in control.



Conclusion

Master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations: the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

Thesis quality

The panel studied eight theses for the master's programme CAC and considered that all meet the standards for a master's degree. The scope, approach and strong points varied per thesis. In general, the extensive use of primary source material seemed to be shared amongst all theses as a positive aspect, demonstrating the centrality of original texts in their original languages within the degree programme. The panel also read several theses in which the methodology was connected to a broader cultural analysis in innovative and creative ways, showing that the programme succeeds in training students' multidisciplinary, and sometimes interdisciplinary, skills. Panel critique mostly focused on the presentation level: either a weaker setup, a slightly distorted positioning of the argument or stylistic offences resulting in a less readable study. These remarks did not, however, result in a generally negatively impact on the panel's assessment of the theses. In all, the panel found all studied theses as of adequate to very good level for a master's degree, which substantially underscores to the high level achieved by both the students and the programme.

Position of graduates

The performance of the alumni of the programme seems positive. Experiences and career choices vary, mostly due to the chosen specialisation. The alumni of the tracks focussing on the Ancient Near East often opt for an academic career. They seem to the panel to be relatively successful in securing positions. This observation was confirmed by staff members teaching in the programme, who emphasised that, according to them, graduates of the one-year master's programme were well qualified and prepared for an academic career and should be able to compete with research master students within the same field. Those graduating from the specialisation in Classics often embark on a teaching career at secondary school level after obtaining a teaching qualification. Naturally, some graduates of CAC move to other careers and professions, often in the cultural field or in positions that ask for good textual or analytical skills.

The panel agreed with graduates and students of the programme that more could be done to improve the outlook of new alumni. They felt that career advice was often somewhat one-sided and aimed at the obvious career routes (academia and/or teaching). The programme could draw more extensively on its older alumni to show different perspectives and build networks for new alumni. The panel was pleased to note that the programme already improved its alumni contacts in the last couple of years and also tried to stay in contact with its international alumni. It encourages all involved to continue on the taken path to further diversify the programme's career information and perspective.

Considerations

The theses of the master's programme CAC are of an adequate to very high level. They demonstrate the realisation of the intended learning outcomes more than sufficiently. Many graduates of the programme manage to find a position within academia or move on to a teaching career, testifying to the good quality of the master's programme. The panel encourages widening alumni's perspectives beyond these career paths and welcomes the programme's initial steps to do so.

Conclusion

Master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'meets the standard'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The panel assessed standards 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations as 'meets the standard'. Based on the NVAO decision rules regarding limited programme assessments, the panel therefore assesses the programmes as 'positive'.

Conclusion

The panel assesses the *master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations* as 'positive'.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

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

1. Knowledge and understanding

- a. Knowledge and understanding of one of the following fields of study: Assyriology, Classics, Egyptology or Hebrew and Aramaic Studies, and its principal concepts, heuristic instruments, research methods and techniques;
- b. Knowledge and understanding of interdisciplinary aspects of the specialisation, such as connections with the other specialisations within the programme and connections with other disciplines, including philology, linguistics, material culture, economic, social and legal history, and reception studies.

2. Applying knowledge and understanding

- a. The ability to apply different methodologies relevant to the specialisation;
- b. The ability to analyse a problem and formulate a research question, under expert supervision;
- c. The ability to take on a research topic of moderate size and bring it to a conclusion under expert supervision.

3. Judgement

- a. The ability to critically select and assess relevant primary source material;
- b. The ability to critically assess secondary literature and to contribute to scholarly debate.

4. Communication

- a. The ability to give a clear and well-argued oral presentation on a research topic in accordance with the academic standards of the relevant specialisation;
- b. The ability to give a clear and well-argued oral presentation that aims at a wider audience of humanities scholars and / or the general public;
- c. The ability to write a clear and well-argued written presentation on a research topic in accordance with the academic standards of the relevant specialisation.

5. Learning skills

- a. The learning abilities required to be able to follow post-master's professional training or a PhD training of a largely self-determined or autonomous nature.

Learning Outcomes per specialisation

1. Graduates of the specialisation Assyriology will have attained the following achievement levels:

1. Knowledge and understanding

- a. Knowledge and understanding of the grammar, and an adequate reading level in the original script, of Akkadian, Sumerian or Hittite;
- b. Knowledge of the cultural and historical context of the period in order to interpret these written sources;
- c. Knowledge and understanding of methodologies which are both specific to the field and of a general historical nature.

2. Applying knowledge and understanding

- a. The ability to formulate and discuss research questions concerning the history of ancient Mesopotamia and/or Anatolia;
- b. The ability to select and analyse primary sources relevant to a research question, and to use methodologies which are both specific to the field and of a general academic or historical nature.



2. Graduates of the specialisation Classics will have attained the following achievement levels:

1. Knowledge and understanding (varying in emphasis according to the special subject chosen)

- a. Knowledge and understanding of the formal and linguistic aspects of Greek and Latin textual sources;
- b. Knowledge and understanding of literary aspects of Greek and Latin textual sources;
- c. Familiarity with scholarly approaches to the history of ancient Greece and Rome and / or ancient philosophy;
- d. A diverse and well-balanced view of Greco-Roman antiquity on the basis of an integrated linguistic, literary, cultural-historical approach, and reflection on the relation between classical antiquity and later periods (in particular early modern Europe and the twenty-first century world).

2. Applying knowledge and understanding

- a. The ability to formulate and discuss research questions concerning the semantics and the communicative and persuasive functions of Greek and Latin texts;
- b. The ability to formulate and discuss research questions concerning literary devices and intertextual relations in Greek and Latin texts, and to assess their influence in a broader literary context;
- c. The ability to formulate and discuss research questions concerning Greek and Roman history and / or ancient philosophy;
- d. The ability to interpret the complex connections between classical antiquity and the modern world on the basis of primary and secondary sources.

3. Graduates of the specialisation Egyptology will have attained the following achievement levels:

1. Knowledge and understanding

- a. Detailed knowledge of Egyptian archaeology and cultural history;
- b. Knowledge of various language phases and script types of Egyptian, mainly of the language and script development in the Hellenistic and Roman periods;
- c. Knowledge of Egypt as a country and recent developments in archaeology and research facilities in Egypt.

2. Applying knowledge and understanding

- a. The skills necessary to analyse an issue with regard to Ancient and Coptic Egypt and to perform research of a limited scope based on sources of a varied nature;
- b. The skills necessary to combine textual and archaeological sources in this research.

4. Graduates of the specialisation Hebrew and Aramaic Studies will have attained the following achievement levels:

1. Knowledge and understanding

- a. Proper overview of the body of definitions and the scientific progress in the field of Hebrew or Aramaic language and culture;
- b. Knowledge and understanding of the source material which was written in various periods in Hebrew and Aramaic;
- c. Knowledge and understanding of the present scholarly debate in the field of Hebrew and Aramaic language, literature and cultural studies;
- d. Knowledge and understanding of the linguistic and philological body of definitions in the field of Hebrew and Aramaic.

2. Applying knowledge and understanding

- a. The skills to apply either linguistic or literary research methods of the field of expertise;
- b. The skills to process source materials in Hebrew or Aramaic.

APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

	EC	Level	Assyriology	Classics	Egyptology	Hebrew and Aramaic Studies
<i>Joint courses</i>						
Classics and Ancient Civilizations MA Seminar	5	500	x	x	x	x
MA Thesis Classics and Ancient Civilizations	15	600	x	x	x	x
<i>Assyriology</i>						
Choose 30 EC out of the following: Advanced Cuneiform Epigraphy (10 EC, 500); Royal Inscriptions from the Assyrian to the Persian Empire (10 EC, 500); Epic Tales from the Ancient World (10 EC, 500); Akkadian Literary Texts (10 EC, 500); Tutorial Akkadian (10 EC, 400); The Sumerian Language: Structure and Analysis (5 EC, 400); Advanced Sumerian (10 EC, 500); Hittite: Structure and Analysis (5 EC, 500)	30		x			
Choose 10 EC out of the following: Old Assyrian Archives (10 EC); Aramaization of Assyria (10 EC); Intermediate Sumerian (5 EC); The Epic of Erra: Text and Context (10 EC); The Written Legacy of Hittite Anatolia (10 EC); Anatolian Historical Linguistics (10 EC)	10	500	x			
<i>Classics</i>						
Core course: Classics Now!	5 or 10	500		x		
Choose 30 EC out of the following: Seminar Greek: The Other Socrates: Xenophon's Socratic Dialogues (10 EC, 500); Tutorial Greek: The Athenian Acropolis - Texts, Terms and Topography (10 EC, 500); Seminar Latin: Lucretius, De Rerum Natura (5 of 10 EC, 500); Tutorial Latin: Seneca Thyestes (5 of 10 EC, 600); The Last Pagan: Julian Apostata as Emperor and Intellectual (10 EC, 500); Psychology, Ethics, and Education from Antiquity to the Present (10 EC, 500); Epigraphy (10 EC, 500); Masterlanguage: Classics (5 + 5 EC); Epic Tales from the Ancient World (10 EC, 500)	30	-		x		

Choose 10 EC out of the following: Seminar Greek: What Greek Myths Do (10 EC, 500); Tutorial Greek: Greeks on the History of Their Language (10 EC, 600); Seminar Latin: Classical Reception in Florence in the 15th Century: Historiography, Exempla, Typology (10 EC, 500); Tutorial Latin: Fake Poetry: The Appendix Vergiliana (10 EC, 600); Seminar Ancient Philosophy: The Theaetetus of Plato (5 of 10 EC, 500); 'Everyone Will Fear You': Powerful Objects in Ancient Religions (10 EC, 500); Diversities of Doing Greek. 'Hellenisation' and 'Hellenism' in Ancient Eurasia (10 EC, 500); Alexander of Aphrodisias On Fate, or How Human Beings Escape Determinism (10 EC, 500); Lactantius, De Mortibus Persecutorum and the Enemies of Christianity (10 EC, 500); Greek Papyrology (10 EC, 500); Palaeography of the Greek Papyri and Edition Technique of Papyrus Documents (5 EC, 400); Numismatics: A Practical Guide (10 EC, 500); Masterlanguage: Classics (5 + 5 EC)	10	-			x	
Egyptology						
Egyptology in the Field: Research and Facilities in Egypt	15	500			x	
Choose at least 15 EC, matching the student's academic background: Egyptian Temple Inscriptions of the Graeco-Roman Period (10 EC, 500); Amarna Seminar (10 EC, 500); Demotic Papyrology I (10 EC, 400); Coptic Papyrology (10 EC, 600); Selected Topics in Egyptian Archaeology (5 EC, 400); Introduction to Middle Egyptian and the Hieroglyphic Script (10 EC, 400)	15	-			x	
Choose at least 10 EC out of the following: Deir el-Medina Seminar (5 EC, 600); Seminar Mastabas/Old Kingdom elite tombs (5 of 10 EC, 500); Demotic Papyrology II (10 EC, 500); Coptic Papyrology (10 EC, 600); Greek Papyrology (10 EC, 500)	10	-			x	
Extracurricular: Late Cursive (Abnormal) Hieratic Papyrology I	10	400			x	
Hebrew and Aramaic Studies						
Historical Grammar of Hebrew and Aramaic	10	500				x
Choose two of the following: Reading Source Texts (10 EC, 500); Cultural History of Aramaic (10 EC, 600); Language Contact (10 EC, 500)	20	-				x
Choose one of the following: Advanced Biblical Hebrew Grammar (600); Aramaization of Assyria (500); The Unification of the Mediterranean (400)	10	-				x

APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

Day 1: Wednesday 5 June 2019 – Bachelors International Studies, Ancient Near Eastern Studies, Bachelor Classics (GLTC), Master Classics and Ancient Civilizations

08.30 – 08.45	Brief welcome
08.45 – 09.00	Installation of the panel
09.00 – 11.30	First meeting and reading of documentation
11.30 – 12.15	Faculty Board
12.15 – 12.45	Lunch
12.45 – 13.15	Programme Board and Coordinator of Studies of International Studies
13.15 – 14.00	Students and alumni International Studies
14.00 – 14.30	Staff International Studies
14.30 – 14.45	Panel meeting International Studies
14.45 – 15.00	Break
15.00 – 15.45	Programme Boards and Coordinators of Studies Ancient Near Eastern Studies, Bachelor Classics and Master Classics and Ancient Civilizations
15.45 – 16.30	Students Ancient Near Eastern Studies, Bachelor Classics and Master Classics and Ancient Civilizations
16.30 – 17.15	Staff Ancient Near Eastern Studies, Bachelor Classics and Master Classics and Ancient Civilizations
17.15 – 18.00	Panel meeting
18.00 – 18.30	Open consultation hour Area Studies I

Day 2: Thursday 6 June 2019 – Bachelor & Master Latin American Studies, Bachelor & Master Middle Eastern Studies, Bachelor & Master Russian (and Eurasian) Studies, North American Studies

08.30 – 09.00	Panel meeting and reading of the documentation
09.30 – 10.00	Programme Board and Coordinator of Studies Latin American Studies
10.00 – 10.30	Students Latijns-Amerikastudies and Latin American Studies
10.30 – 11.00	Staff Latin American Studies
11.00 – 11.15	Break
11.15 – 11.45	Programme Board and Coordinators of Middle Eastern Studies
11.45 – 12.15	Students Middle Eastern Studies
12.15 – 12.45	Staff Middle Eastern Studies
12.45 – 13.30	Lunch
13.30 – 14.15	Programme Board and Coordinators of Studies Russische Studies, Russian and Eurasian Studies, and North American Studies
14.15 – 15.00	Students Bachelor and Master Russian (and Eurasian) Studies, and North American Studies
15.00 – 15.45	Staff Russian (and Eurasian) Studies and North American Studies
15.45 – 16.00	Break
16.00 – 16.30	Alumni Russian and Eurasian Studies, North American Studies, and Latin American Studies
16.30 – 17.00	Alumni Middle Eastern Studies and Classics and Ancient Civilizations
17.00 – 18.00	Panel meeting

Day 3: Friday 7 June 2019 – Boards of Examiners

08.30 – 09.30	Panel meeting and reading of the documentation
09.30 – 10.30	Boards of Examiners Russian Studies, Art and Literature and American Studies, and Latin American studies
10.30 – 11.30	Boards of Examiners Middle-Eastern Studies, International Studies, and Classics and Ancient Civilizations
11.30 – 12.00	Panel meeting
12.00 – 12.30	Lunch
12.30 – 13.30	Final meeting management
13.30 – 16.30	Composing of final judgment
16.30 – 16.45	Break
16.45 – 17.30	Development dialogues – parallel
17.30 – 18.30	Report and drinks



APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Thesis selection

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied 12 theses of the master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations. The selection was based on a provided list of graduates between 2016-2018, including information on the 4 tracks. A variety of topics and a diversity of examiners were included in the selection. The project manager and panel chair assured that the distribution of grades in the selection matched the distribution of grades of all available theses.

Track/variant	Total theses 2016-2018	Thesis selection
Classics	44	7
Assyriology	3	2
Egyptology	13	2
Hebrew Studies	3	1
<i>Total</i>	63	12

Further information on the selected theses is available from QANU upon request.

The master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations shares a Board of Examiners with 2 bachelor's programmes (B Classics; B Ancient Near Eastern Studies), a research master's programme (ReMA Classics and Ancient Civilizations) and a minor (Rhetoric). Students choose electives as part of their study trajectory (30 EC). Most of these electives are shared with other master's programmes: M History (30 EC), M Philosophy (20 EC) and M Linguistics (10 EC).

Documents studied

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

Faculty-wide documents:

- Transferable skills at the Faculty of Humanities;
- Flyers Career Services Humanities (including: *Your Future: From university to a career*);
- Flyer Humanities Master's Buddy Programme;
- Overview Leiden University Master's Programmes 2019-2020;
- Flyer education vision: *Learning@LeidenUniversity*;
- *Tips bij Toetsen*;
- Expertisecentrum Online Leren Evaluatierapport 2017-2018.

Specific reading material master Classics & Ancient Civilizations:

- Course material on 'Babylonian Medicine and Pharmacology', 'Core Course: Classics Now!', 'Selected Topics in Egyptian Archaeology';
- Programme Board reports 2015-2018;
- Board of Examiners reports 2015-2018;
- Minutes of Programme Committee 2015-2019;
- Factsheets of Nationale Studentenenquête 2018;
- Programme evaluation (Res)MA Programme Classics & Ancient Civilizations 2019;
- Course evaluations Classics & Ancient Civilizations;
- Programme metrics (*Opleidingsjaarkaarten* 2015-2018);
- Assessment plan I and II;
- Writing instructions and grading form MA thesis Classics & Ancient Civilizations;

- Self-Evaluation Report;
- Guide Academic Skills;
- Other documents.

Classics & Ancient Civilizations:

- Mary Beard, *Women & Power: A Manifesto*;
- Martha C. Nussbaum, *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities*;
- Eindrapport van de Verkenningcommissie Klassieke Talen: *Het geheim van de blauwe broer*;
- Syllabus Academic Skills: *A Guide for the Master and Research Master Classics & Ancient Civilizations 2018-2019*.

Links provided on laptops:

- Learning environment selected courses;
- Structure of the Faculty of Humanities movie;
- Study association Classics – Sophia Aeterna.