

MASTER'S PROGRAMME
RUSSIAN AND EURASIAN STUDIES
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 RUSSIAN AND EURASIAN STUDIES 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.....	13
APPENDICES	25
APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES	27
APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM	28
APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT	29
APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL	30

This report was finalised on 5 March 2020



REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME RUSSIAN AND EURASIAN STUDIES 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 Russian and Eurasian Studies

Name of the programme:	Russian and Eurasian Studies
CROHO number:	60848
Level of the programme:	master's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	60 EC
Specialisations or tracks:	-
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 Russian and Eurasian Studies 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 Russian and Eurasian Studies 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 5 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

The panel considers the intended learning outcomes of the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies to be well-formulated and of an appropriate academic master's level. Intended learning outcomes 1a and 1b and 2a could be filled in with some more detail. The panel appreciates the successful blending of cultural and linguistic components, which makes the Leiden programme stand out internationally. The intended learning outcomes reflect the European Reference Framework for Language Proficiency and meet the international requirements for academic education as laid down in the Dublin Descriptors. The panel advises the Faculty of Humanities to harmonise the intended learning outcomes for all of its programmes in terms of terminology and categorisation. This will enhance transparency.

The expertise and intercultural sensitivity that students acquire is important for the Dutch knowledge infrastructure. The panel endorses that the programme maintains relationships with social partners, but also recommends enlarging its comfort zone. The programme could explore new professional options for its alumni, and incorporate them into the intended learning outcomes and information about the labour market.

Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

The master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies offers a well-structured curriculum, with a topical and adventurous course on information and disinformation and a research course and a thesis trajectory for all students, as well as sufficient opportunities for individual students to follow their own interests by choosing electives or an internship. The panel is enthusiastic about the build-up towards the thesis, starting with an introduction to different research methods and research fields and ending in a public presentation and panel discussion about the thesis. The panel finds the teaching in small, interactive international classrooms with frequent use of opinion pieces very fitting to this specific master's programme. It judges the content of the courses and course literature to be of the right depth and level. The panel recommends keeping an eye on the Eurasian dimension.

The panel found no major issues regarding feasibility, although it can be difficult to fit in an internship in one nominal master's year. Student guidance and programme-specific services are in order, in the panel's view. Faculty and programme combine forces in preparing students for the labour market. In this effort, the panel is particularly impressed by the annual Labour Day, where students meet with alumni from their own programme. Students would like to have more frequent contacts with alumni, the panel found. Perhaps the Study Association can arrange this.

The staff is well-prepared, competent, accessible and dedicated, but struggling to balance education and research, is the panel's impression. It encourages the programme management to continue its laudable efforts to protect its staff and safeguard the link between research and education.

Overall, the panel assesses the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies as a successful and well-working programme, and feels supported in this point of view by its discussions with students.

Standard 3: Student assessment

According to the panel, the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies has a sound and transparent assessment system. Its quality is safeguarded by applying the four-eye principle in the design and the use of answer models. The assessment plan provides sufficient insight into the method of assessment and the relationship between the learning outcomes and course objectives. The assessment methods are sufficiently varied and the programme is experimenting with new assessment methods, which the panel welcomes.

The assessment procedure for the master's theses is clearly designed and its quality is guaranteed by having two independent examiners, while the programme aims to avoid fixed couples. The panel



endorses this goal and believes that the keen eye of colleagues from outside the programme can be of added value to permanently reinforce the objectivity of the assessment. The panel also considers the knock-out criteria a good practice. It found the assessment of the theses in the sample to be sufficiently critical, nuanced and balanced, with the caveat that present circle of examiners is a little limited.

Finally, the panel notes that the Board of Examiners for the bachelor's programme 'Russische Studies' and the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies is adequately performing its task to assure quality of assessment. The Board of Examiners has made a professionalisation step itself and that also applies to faculty support. The panel encourages the faculty and Board of Examiners to continue and expand this line. In addition, it asks the faculty to re-examine the faculty guidelines for handling plagiarism and fraud cases, and thereby coordinate a clear line with the relevant boards of examiners.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

Based on a selection of the master's theses, the alumni survey and interviews with alumni during the site visit, the panel concludes that the students realise the intended learning outcomes as formulated by the programme. The panel found the theses in the sample it studied of excellent academic quality, testifying to the high academic level of the programme and good thesis guidance. The programme's own research shows that alumni take up a wide variety of positions. This matches the challenging and multifaceted nature of the master's programme, and the space it offers its students to develop their own interests and to reach out to society.

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

Master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies

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, drs. Mariette Huisjes, 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 Russian and Eurasian Studies is one of 18 master's programmes at the Faculty of Humanities of Leiden University. It is a small (but growing) programme; the past few years it had an influx between 12 and 20 students.

The faculty is organised as a matrix of research institutes and educational programmes. The lecturers are appointed by one of the faculty's research institutes, such as the Leiden University Centre for Linguistics or the Institute for History, and perform their own research there. Besides that they teach in one or more of the faculty's educational programmes. The Programme Board is responsible for the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies. It consists of a head of department from the academic staff and a student member. The Programme Board receives solicited and unsolicited advice from the Programme Committee, consisting of both staff and students. In addition, assessment within the master's programme is supervised by a Board of Examiners, that also supervises the Dutch language bachelor's programme 'Russische Studies'.

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

The master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies aims to train students to make a distinctive contribution to the Dutch and European knowledge infrastructure on Russia and Eurasia. In a globalised society, such an infrastructure is essential for government, civil society organisations, business and cultural life. Graduates of the programme can interpret information from and about Russia and Eurasia in a scholarly way, on the basis of knowledge of the Russian language as well as the various underlying historical, cultural, linguistic, political or economic mechanisms. In this context, 'Russia and Eurasia' should be understood as comprising Russia, Belarus, Ukraine and the former Soviet Republics. These are the regions on which the programme focuses.

The University of Ghent offers the only other master's programme in the Dutch-speaking area that also focuses on Russia and the Russian language. Compared to this programme, distinct qualities of the Leiden programme are: its full focus on Russia and Eurasia (whereas the Ghent programme also includes the Balkan states), its broad curriculum that is not only accessible for students with a bachelor's degree 'Russische Studies' from Leiden University, but also for students with a relevant bachelor's degree from other universities, and the fact that it takes contemporary topics and debates in research and society as the starting point, where the Ghent programme is more historically oriented. On a wider international scale, the Leiden programme stands out because it is one of the few in Europe and North America that fully integrates both cultural and linguistic studies in one programme. That Leiden University offers an attractive and rare programme also becomes apparent from the rising number of students. Now approximately one third of the student population comes from abroad.

The panel finds that the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies has a clear profile and unique position in the Dutch-language academic landscape. It distinguishes itself by its exclusive focus on East-Slavic countries, its link to present-day issues and the successful blending of cultural and linguistic components in one programme. Access to the Russian language and culture has a current social relevance. The master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies sees it as its challenge to propagate this relevance. The panel supports this wholeheartedly.



In general, the panel is impressed by the diversity and depth of Leiden University's cultural profile, to which the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies contributes. The exceptional expertise found under its umbrella testifies to the university's commitment to its cultural and diverse profile. A small programme like this is vulnerable, because it is relatively expensive to maintain. However, 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 'less studied' languages and cultures is no longer passed from one generation to the next, the Netherlands will weaken its international position.

Intended learning outcomes

The programme's profile is expressed in five sets of intended learning outcomes, categorised according to the Dublin Descriptors in 'knowledge and understanding', 'applying knowledge and understanding', 'judgement', 'communication', and 'learning skills'. For a full overview of the intended learning outcomes, see Appendix 1. The intended learning outcomes combine elements that can traditionally be found in a classical Russian Studies programme with elements that are associated with a classical Slavic Languages and Cultures curriculum. For instance, students are to have 'general knowledge and multidisciplinary understanding of current issues and debates in [...] politics, economics, international relations, history, culture, literature and linguistics'. The intended learning outcomes also bear witness to the importance that the programme attaches to a critical interpretation of current developments and topics, such as 'the ability to critically reflect on differing opinions and hypotheses as well as one's own research, taking into account and weighing alternative arguments'. Finally, the intended learning outcomes emphasise research skills and students are to acquire 'the ability to operate a scientific conceptual apparatus and to employ relevant and appropriate modern research methods'.

To keep in touch with the professional fields that students will work in, the programme maintains intensive contacts with its social partner Window on Russia (in Dutch: 'Raam op Rusland'). This cultural stage is a good reflection of Dutch Russia experts from different sectors of society. In addition, the programme regularly meets with ministries and talks to alumni from various sectors at the annual 'Labour Day' that it organises for its students.

The panel considers the intended learning outcomes of the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies to be well-formulated and of an appropriate academic master's level. It agrees with the programme that the intended learning outcome 2a ('the ability to operate a scientific conceptual apparatus and to employ relevant and appropriate modern research methods') could be specified in more detail, so as to give more direction to the research methods course. Also, there may be room to further specify the level on which knowledge is to be achieved (1a en 1b).

The intended learning outcomes reflect the European Reference Framework for Language Proficiency and meet the international requirements for academic education as laid down in the Dublin Descriptors. The expertise and intercultural sensitivity that students acquire is important for the Dutch knowledge infrastructure. The panel thinks it makes sense for the programme to maintain relationships with social partners, for example through 'Raam op Rusland'. The panel does, however, support the point for improvement identified by the programme itself that it could spread its wings somewhat in terms of areas in which partnerships are developed. In addition to the traditional journalism, cultural and diplomatic sectors, the programme could also explore other options for its alumni, and incorporate them into the intended learning outcomes and information that is given to students about the labour market.

The panel recommends harmonising the intended learning outcomes of different programmes within the faculty. Obviously they will differ, but it would enhance transparency if all programmes use the same terminology and categorisation.

Considerations

The panel considers the intended learning outcomes of the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies to be well-formulated and of an appropriate academic master's level. Intended learning outcomes 1a and 1b and 2a could be filled in with some more detail. The panel appreciates the successful blending of cultural and linguistic components, which makes the Leiden programme stand out internationally. The intended learning outcomes reflect the European Reference Framework for Language Proficiency and meet the international requirements for academic education as laid down in the Dublin Descriptors. The panel advises the Faculty of Humanities to harmonise the intended learning outcomes for all of its programmes and check any reformulation in terms of terminology and categorisation to other programmes within the faculty. This will enhance transparency.

The expertise and intercultural sensitivity that students acquire is important for the Dutch knowledge infrastructure. The panel endorses that the programme maintains relationships with social partners, but also recommends enlarging its comfort zone. The programme could explore new professional options for its alumni, and incorporate them into the intended learning outcomes and information about the labour market.

Conclusion

Master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies: 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. This decision was based on three arguments. Firstly, English is the lingua franca of international science to which the master's programmes intend to connect. Secondly, alumni are increasingly active on the international labour market. Thirdly, the university wants to attract international students because an international classroom enriches students' perspective. Accordingly, the programme name is also in English. During the visit, students did not object to this set-up, although in the student chapter of the self-evaluation report it is stated that some students would like to improve their Russian language skills, which is not an element of the current master's programme. However, the panel was told during the site visit that being able to read primary Russian sources is a prerequisite of the programme and students are allowed to attend the bachelor's 'Russische Studies' language learning courses to bring their language skills to a higher level. The panel considers this a sufficient offer, since it understands that language acquisition is not a focus of the master's programme. It can therefore agree with the chosen educational language and name.

Curriculum content and structure

The curriculum's structure 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. Practically, 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's thesis project, demanding autonomy and independence in the applied research methods and skills (600). In the panel's view, this course level structure reflects and safeguards the level requirements for a master's degree.

For a full overview of the Russian and Eurasian Studies master's curriculum, see Appendix 3. All courses run for a full semester over a period of fourteen weeks and all students follow a core curriculum that takes up half of the programme. This core curriculum consists of an interdisciplinary



course 'Information and disinformation in Russia and Eurasia' (5 EC), a research seminar (5 EC) and the writing of the master's thesis (20 EC). The programme offers six electives, each consisting of 10 EC, of which students choose three. Three elective courses are in the fields of history, politics and economics and two in the fields of linguistics, literature and culture. Students are free to mix their electives. As an alternative for one of the courses, students can opt for a 10 EC internship or another course approved by the Board of Examiners, at Leiden University or another university. Ensuring the coherence of the curriculum is a joint effort of the Programme Board, the Programme Committee and the staff. Both committees meet twice a month to discuss coherence and quality of the programme.

The thesis trajectory consists of two elements that form a continuum. The research seminar introduces the students to theoretical and methodological approaches and to the fields of expertise of the core staff members. This course ends with small-group tutorials for which students choose a potential supervisor, and where they submit their first research proposal and literary review. In the second semester, the master's thesis is written, on the basis of the research proposal from the research seminar. The thesis consists of a scholarly report (20.000 words) on an extended piece of independent research. While supervision takes place mostly on an individual basis, the students are asked to report on their progress in a group setting twice. During the first meeting, they present their work in progress to their supervisors and their peers, and receive and provide feedback. The second meeting is a symposium that takes place at the end of the semester, where all students present their completed research to their supervisors and their peers, and engage in a panel discussion about it. Students told the panel that they are happy with this set-up. Particularly the research seminar they found very useful as an introduction to writing their thesis.

The panel finds the curriculum's structure well thought out. It appreciates, for instance, that the group work in the research methods course and the thesis trajectory is merged and that therefore students develop research skills with ladder assignments. It considers the multidisciplinary 'Information and disinformation in Russia and Eurasia' course, taken by all students and taught by five staff members with different expertise, an adventurous and topical start of the programme, which at the same time captures its essence. The panel recommends keeping an eye on the Eurasian dimension of the programme, since its aim is not to focus exclusively on Russia.

The panel studied the course literature, which has in its view the appropriate depth and academic level. The panel values the consistency in the programme, in the sense that all topics are studied and discussed from the perspective of present day relevance. Students are happy with the programme as well, the panel found. They think it is academically challenging and allows them to train their critical thinking and problem solving skills.

Teaching methods

In line with the faculty's didactic principle of creating an interactive and research-led classroom, teaching is done in small interactive groups. This allows for intensive contact and exchange among students and between students and lecturers. Since a third of the students come from abroad, the classroom is international and lively, and different voices and opinions can be heard. Students are actively engaged in the research of staff members. Their expertise is one of the structuring forces behind the programme. PhD students are actively engaged in the programme and teach about their research topics, and guest lecturers are frequently invited to broaden the scope of the programme.

The panel finds the teaching methods in use suitable for a master's programme. It appreciates that opinion pieces have a central role in the courses, for this fits the programme's orientation on present-day issues. Also, discussions on these pieces stimulate both critical thinking and oral proficiency and the ability to communicate scientific knowledge in a socially relevant way. For the same reasons, the panel appreciates that students present their thesis twice: once for peers and supervisors with a formative goal, and once after finishing the thesis in a public symposium, as a form of summative assessment. The international classroom as well contributes to teaching students the soft skills they

need. In short, the panel considers the teaching methods used in the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies to be well-chosen and conducive to realising the intended learning outcomes.

Feasibility

Though the workload is high, the panel encountered no major problems in the feasibility of the programme. The regular meetings of the Programme Board, Programme Committee and staff guard that these do not occur. That said, some issues were reported to the panel. Students perceive some imbalance in workload between courses. The panel recommends keeping a sharp eye on this in the aforementioned meetings. Although it is in principle possible to replace an elective with an internship, in practice students find it hard to fit an internship into their programme, the panel found. Many students who choose to do an internship feel obliged to prolong their study. The panel recommends trying to find more space for an internship in the programme, though it understands that this may not always be possible.

Labour market orientation

Trying to make it easier for students to do an internship also serves students' chances of finding a job soon after graduation, as research by the Faculty of Humanities has shown. Improving labour market orientation is one of the challenges currently taken up 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 graduating, as alumni told the panel. The faculty organises events where students can gain 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.

At the programme level, there is the annual job market preparation day ('Labour Day') where students can meet alumni, and the co-operation with the cultural platform 'Raam op Rusland', which gives students an opportunity to share their views and get in touch with Russia-minded experts in different sectors of the Dutch society. Students think that it would be a great addition to the programme if alumni and current students could be brought in to contact more.. Perhaps extra career days or alumni events could be organised by the study association, with some help from the faculty. In general though, the panel finds that the joined efforts of the faculty and the programme prepare students sufficiently for the job market.

Student support

The programme's study coordinator also serves as study advisor. In that capacity, she or 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 serves as the contact for students who study abroad. On the programme level, the study advisor uses an extensive student guidance system to keep an eye on each individual student's progress. The study advisor's door is always open, and at strategic moments, students receive information on the procedures that await them. Students told the panel that they feel well looked after, and that the lecturers listen to any feedback they have on the programme and try to accommodate this.

Lecturers

Staff members also are well-prepared for teaching. They have the appropriate teaching qualifications, or are in the process of acquiring them if recently hired. Their level of English is assessed and monitored prior to being allowed to participate in the master's programme. The faculty stimulates lecturers in their professional development by offering them workshops 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.



The panel found that keeping the workload within limits is a continuous challenge, for the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies as well as for other programmes in the humanities. The limited budget of relatively small programmes combined with the intensity in contact hours that is required for writing theses that are up to the mark threaten to overburden the staff. Dealing with this is complicated by the fact that the educational staff is made available for teaching by the faculty's research institutes and centres, such as the Leiden University Centre for Linguistics, the Institute for History and the Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society. The institutes, not the Programme Board, are directly responsible for personnel management. This may get in the way of a fair division of labour amongst all members of staff. For instance, some institutes allocate more hours to certain tasks than others. The panel fully supports the faculty in trying to harmonise this, and calls on the institutes to stick to the list of compensation hours per task that is provided by faculty management.

The panel considers workload a serious challenge, but also found that the faculty management is very aware of this problem, and does the utmost to tackle it. The faculty management tried to analyse what causes excessive workload and came up with a ten points action plan: it provided extra funds for the research institutes to reduce workload; it brought more stability in the programmes; it weeded out superfluous administrative obligations and courses that no longer fit well into the programme; it considered merging committees; it encouraged the institutes to harmonise the allocation of hours; and it decided to lift the obligation for all programmes to maintain a dual intake system (September and February), as of September 2019. 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. For if lecturers spend so much time on education that they have hardly any time left for research, this connection is in danger. The lecturers of the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies confirmed this in their discussions with the panel. They said they 'work like horses' and that education takes up so much time that research tends to get overgrown. Trying to integrate research and education – for instance by encouraging students to take part in the research – may be a solution to this. Also, the lecturers said that perhaps being a successful educator might be more esteemed in personal assessments. This is a suggestion the panel fully endorses.

The panel judges that the staff in the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies is a relatively small but very competent and dedicated team, with a good international network, albeit struggling with workload issues. The panel applauds the deployment of PhD-students in the programme, to share their enthusiasm and expertise and also because they are role models for the students. Students as well value the academic level of their lecturers and their availability. The panel encourages the faculty management to go on protecting their staff, and to safeguard the link between research and education.

Programme-specific services

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 in Dutch for students from Leiden University, Delft University of Technology and Erasmus University Rotterdam. Through assessments, training sessions delivered by professionals and practical assignments, they learn to apply their own qualities. Students who wish to improve their Russian language skills may make use of the language courses of the bachelor's programme 'Russische Studies'. The panel finds the programme-specific services in order.

Considerations

The master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies offers a well-structured curriculum, with a topical and adventurous course on information and disinformation and a research course and a thesis trajectory for all students, as well as sufficient opportunities for individual students to follow their own interests by choosing electives or an internship. The panel is enthusiastic about the build-up towards the thesis, starting with an introduction to different research methods and research fields and ending in a public presentation and panel discussion about the thesis. The panel finds the teaching in small, interactive international classrooms with frequent use of opinion pieces very fitting

to this specific master's programme. It judges the content of the courses and course literature to be of the right depth and level. The panel recommends keeping an eye on the Eurasian dimension.

The panel found no major issues regarding feasibility, although it can be difficult to fit in an internship in one nominal master's year. Student guidance and programme-specific services are in order, in the panel's view. Faculty and programme combine forces in preparing students for the labour market. In this effort, the panel is particularly impressed by the annual Labour Day, where students meet with alumni from their own programme. Students would like to have more frequent contacts with alumni, the panel found. Perhaps the Study Association can arrange this.

The staff is well-prepared, competent, accessible and dedicated, but struggling to balance education and research, is the panel's impression. It encourages the programme management to continue its laudable efforts to protect its staff and safeguard the link between research and education.

Overall, the panel assesses the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies as a successful and well-working programme, and feels supported in this point of view by its discussions with students.

Conclusion

Master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies: 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

Assessment policy at the faculty level

The Faculty of Humanities safeguards the system of assessment for all programmes in the Region Studies cluster at Leiden University, the panel learned from the self-evaluation. The faculty 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. Fraud and plagiarism are considered intolerable; 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 assessment methods is always peer-reviewed: assessments and exams are checked on their validity and coherence prior to being administered. Also, the exams are designed in such a way that students are invited to continuously sharpen 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 assessed, as along with academic and communication skills. The students are preferably assessed multiple times within a course allowing for a diversity of assessment methods. At least two independent examiners are involved in the assessment of theses or final projects. The panel finds this a reliable procedure.

The faculty developed various guidelines and materials to support the boards of examiners, programmes and their staff in order to enhance their assessment practices and design. Notably, the panel verified that a newly developed *Manual for Boards of Examiners* proves helpful to align assessment practices across the various programmes. It also considered the support materials available to staff very useful. These contain advice regarding the quality assurance of assessment, practical tips and suggestions regarding exam design. These guidelines currently exist only in Dutch; an English version may be useful for international staff members, especially for master's programmes with a high number of international specialists. In addition, the faculty recently introduced a standard



online 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 appreciates 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 examiners 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, 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, not by lecturers. The panel advises clearly communicating the faculty guidelines regarding fraud, and to adjusting them if and where necessary.

Board of Examiners 'Russische Studies' and Russian and Eurasian Studies

In addition to the faculty guidelines, the panel studied the programme's Course and Examinations Regulations and its assessment plan along with the rules and regulations of the responsible Board of Examiners for the bachelor's programme 'Russische Studies' and the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies. The Board of Examiners consists of three staff members (each with a PhD and specific substantive expertise) and an external member with long-standing assessment expertise. It collaborates closely with both programme directors and study advisors and is supported by a secretary. Over the last years, all members of the Board of Examiners have invested in further professionalisation regarding their assessment practices and knowledge about assessment methods. The panel appreciates this.

The Board of Examiners is responsible for guaranteeing the quality and standard of examinations and degrees at both the bachelor's and the master's programme under its responsibility. In order to do so, it appoints examiners for all courses, sets a number of ECs for individual internships prior to their approval and ratifies every student's full dossier with assessment results before they receive their diploma, including decisions regarding honours (*cum laude*; *summa cum laude*). Additionally, the Board of Examiners advises on matters regarding assessment and is involved in the further development of teaching staff's assessment practices.

In 2016, the Board of Examiners developed a new methodology for quality assurance of assessment, based on the faculty manual and sample practices in other study programmes. The core of the new methodology is a form that distinguishes four quality aspects of assessment: validity, reliability, transparency and usability. On the basis of this form, the Board of Examiners evaluates each course unit once every three years. Recommendations and actions following from these reviews are passed on to the responsible Programme Board and monitored. For courses with a problematic assessment, the Board consults with the lecturers involved and reviews this course again the following year. In addition, the Board of Examiners monitors the average grade per course and subjects any outliers to a quality check. Every year, the Board of Examiners takes a sample of at least six master's theses, spread over the specialisations and final grades and re-assesses these on the basis of a quality assurance form. The panel finds this procedure sufficient.

The panel shares the Board of Examiners' opinion that assessment practice for the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies has improved in recent years, driven by the professionalisation that the entire faculty has gone through in this area and the new working method of the Board of Examiners. The panel learned from both the Board of Examiners and staff members that they now feel more supported and that communication about assessment methods and assessment policy in the study programme has been intensified. However, the panel noted that there is still some resistance among members of staff against this professionalisation, which seems to be considered time-consuming and, in the eyes of some, infringes on the integrity and professionalism

of individual teachers. This resistance sometimes means that the recommendations of the Board of Examiners are not followed.

Although there were no complaints from this Board of Examiners about the allocation of hours, the panel nevertheless emphasises that it is important to give the member of the Board of Examiners sufficient time for their work, so that they can (continue to) create support for further professionalisation.

Assessment practices at Russian and Eurasian Studies

The panel studied the assessment plan for the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies, which is reviewed annually. It applies the same approach as other programmes in the Region Studies cluster at the Leiden Faculty of Humanities. The assessment plan consists of two parts; the first part specifies the courses in which the various intended learning outcomes are assessed, the second part describes the types of assessments used and the partial assessments per course. In the panel's view, the assessment plan for the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies enables the Board of Examiners to determine that graduates have achieved the intended learning outcomes for all programme components.

The assessment weeks are planned between blocks in the curriculum. Often partial assessments also take place during the semester, for example in the form of assignments. All study components contain two to four assessment methods, usually both oral and written. In some cases, active participation during the tutorials is taken into account when assessing the final grade. Oral exams are recorded to prevent discussion afterwards. The panel is satisfied with the variation of assessment methods and the many feedback opportunities, as are the staff members and students. The programme is experimenting with new forms of assessment that better match the labour market, such as policy briefs. The panel welcomes this.

The course coordinator designs the assessments in a course, possibly with input from the participating lecturers. All assessments are then checked by a colleague. The intended learning outcomes, work forms and assessment methods are described per course in the E-prospectus, so that students can prepare themselves. In addition, students receive oral information about the assessment method at the start of a course. Lecturers usually check the assessments together on the basis of answer models. The panel has the impression that there is much informal consultation about the assessment in this small and stable programme, which it welcomes. Forms are used to assess oral presentations. Written papers are provided with written comments to clarify the assessment. The panel is of the opinion that the assessment is generally valid and reliable.

Thesis assessment

Thesis assessment at the master's programme follows faculty policy. Every thesis is assessed by two examiners, who fill in a digital assessment form individually and independently. The criteria on the evaluation form are in accordance with the programme's intended learning outcomes. In order to ensure that the master's thesis is fully in line with the final qualifications of the programme, the Board of Examiners has formulated knock-out criteria that describe the minimum level a student should have reached in order to qualify for a master's degree. Supervisors and examiners are instructed to keep these criteria in mind. In case of discrepancies between the thesis assessments of the two examiners – with a 1.0 grade point difference as cap point – the Board of Examiners appoints a third examiner, who sets a final mark within the range of the first two assessments. Examiners are appointed by the Board of Examiners, which tries to avoid standard pairs. The panel approves this practice, which demonstrates awareness of the potential dangers involved with allowing fixed assessment pairs in programmes with limited staff. It recommends, however, to stimulate the appointment of second examiners across 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. Such an element can be especially valuable for small programmes with a limited student intake, in the panel's view.

Prior to the visit, the panel examined a sample of eight master's theses, including the accompanying assessment forms. It struck the panel that the same names occur on many of these forms. This underscores that it would be a good idea to seek fresh outside influences, as suggested above. Nevertheless, the panel found the thesis assessment generally critical, nuanced and balanced. It does advise the programme management and the Board of Examiners to continue critically following the assessments handed out. It is precisely in a small community like the Russian and Eurasian staff that subjective colourings of judgement based on personal preferences are lurking.

Considerations

According to the panel, the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies has a sound and transparent assessment system. Its quality is safeguarded by applying the four-eye principle in the design and the use of answer models. The assessment plan provides sufficient insight into the method of assessment and the relationship between the learning outcomes and course objectives. The assessment methods are sufficiently varied and the programme is experimenting with new assessment methods, which the panel welcomes.

The assessment procedure for the master's theses is clearly designed, and the quality of assessment is guaranteed by having two independent examiners, while the programme aims to avoid fixed couples. The panel endorses this goal and believes that the keen eye of colleagues from outside the programme can be of added value to permanently reinforce the objectivity of the assessment. The panel also considers the knock-out criteria a good practice. It found the assessment of the theses in the sample to be sufficiently critical, nuanced and balanced, with the caveat that present circle of examiners is a little limited.

Finally, the panel notes that the Board of Examiners for the bachelor's programme 'Russische Studies' and the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies is adequately performing its task to assure quality of assessment. The Board of Examiners has made a professionalisation step itself and that also applies to faculty support. The panel encourages the faculty and Board of Examiners to continue and expand this line. In addition, it asks the faculty to re-examine the faculty guidelines for handling plagiarism and fraud cases, and thereby coordinate a clear line with the relevant boards of examiners.

Conclusion

Master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies: 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

The assessment plan, the assessment system and the quality assurance role of the Board of Examiners guarantee that the intended learning outcomes per course and thus ultimately the intended learning outcomes of the programme are achieved. This is also evident from the quality of the master's theses. The panel studied a sample of eight theses and finds the quality excellent. Most of the theses were captivating, thorough and well-documented, some theses were profound. They bear witness to a generally high academic level of the programme and more specifically a fine practice of thesis guidance. The theses fit well with the learning objectives and are based on a sound methodological basis.

The panel appreciates that the programme did thorough research into the position of its alumni. It investigated where the approximately one hundred graduates from the period 2005 to 2016 ended

up on the labour market. This concerns both graduates with only a bachelor's degree in 'Russische Studies' and graduates with a master's degree in Russian and Eurasian Studies. The study shows that only a few alumni do not have paid work. Around half of alumni work in a business organisation, including newspapers and publishers, around a quarter work for the Dutch government and international organisations and another quarter in the education, culture and science sector. Approximately 70 per cent of alumni hold a position that is not directly related to Russia or the Russian language. They have achieved this position either through their soft skills, or they acquired a different master's degree, or they have moved on from a Russia-related position. The cognitive and practical challenges that both the bachelor's and the master's programme offer ensure that students develop competences with which they can succeed in generalist professions. A relatively high number of alumni carry out PhD research. Some do this in Leiden but others in Oxford, Cambridge or Princeton. This shows that the level of graduates is competitive.

Considerations

Based on a selection of the master's theses, the alumni survey and interviews with alumni during the site visit, the panel concludes that the students realise the intended learning outcomes as formulated by the programme. The panel found the theses in the sample it studied of excellent academic quality, testifying to the high academic level of the programme and good thesis guidance. The programme's own research shows that alumni take up a wide variety of positions. This matches the challenging and multifaceted nature of the master's programme, and the space it offers its students to develop their own interests and to reach out to society.

Conclusion

Master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies: 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 Russian and Eurasian Studies 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 Russian and Eurasian Studies* 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. General knowledge and multidisciplinary understanding of current issues and debates in the main disciplines of Russian and Eurasian Studies (politics, economics, international relations, history, culture, literature and linguistics), viewed in their national context and/or from a broader Eurasian and international perspective.
- b. Specialised knowledge of and insight into at least two research areas in the field of Russian and Eurasian Studies (politics, economics, international relations, history, culture, literature and linguistics), viewed in their national context and/or from a broader Eurasian and international perspective.

2. Applying knowledge and understanding:

- a. The ability to operate a scientific conceptual apparatus and to employ relevant and appropriate modern research methods, in order to independently develop a problem formulation in the field of Russian and Eurasian Studies.

3. Judgement:

- a. The ability to independently define informed and persuasive viewpoints (on the basis of Russian and non-Russian sources and supplemented by one's own findings) which contribute to scholarly discussions about developments in the field of Russian and Eurasian Studies.
- b. The ability to critically reflect on differing opinions and hypotheses as well as on one's own research, taking into account and weighing alternative arguments.

4. Communication:

- a. The ability to independently draw up an adequate scholarly report of the research conducted in the field of Russian and Eurasian Studies in various presentation forms.
- b. The ability to communicate the scientific knowledge and skills that are characteristic of graduates of the master's degree programme Russian and Eurasian Studies in a socially relevant way.

5. Learning skills

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



APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

	Core Curriculum	Courses in the field of Politics, History, and Economics	Courses in the field of Language and Culture
Year 1 Sem. 1	Information and Disinformation in Russia and Eurasia (5 EC) Research Seminar (5 EC)	Corruption in Russia and Eurasia (10 EC) International Relations in the Slavic Triangle: Russia, Ukraine and Belarus (10 EC)	Culture and Literature: Russian Culture and Everyday Life During the Crazy 1990s (10 EC) Language and Identity of Minorities in Siberia (10 EC)
Year 1 Sem. 2	MA Thesis Russian and Eurasian Studies (20 EC)	The Russian Revolution Revisited (10 EC)	Old Church Slavic Language and Culture (10 EC)

Electives:

- ▶ Curricular: Internship Russian and Eurasian Studies (10 EC)
- ▶ Extra-curricular: The Grammar of the Georgian Verb (5 EC)
- ▶ Extra-curricular: Paper on the Georgian Verb (5 EC)

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 eight theses of the master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies. The programme does not include specified tracks or variations which the panel had to take into account in its thesis selection. 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. Further information on the selected theses is available from QANU upon request.

The master's programme Russian and Eurasian Studies shares a Board of Examiners with the bachelor's programme Russian Studies. In its mandatory programme, two courses are shared with the master's programme International Relations (20 EC in total).

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.

Documents concerning the master Russian and Eurasian Studies:

- Course material on 'International Relations in the Slavic Triangle: Russia, Ukraine and Belarus', 'Information and disinformation in Russia and Eurasia';
- Programme Board reports 2015-2018;
- Board of Examiners reports 2015-2016, 2017-2018;
- Minutes of Programme Committee 2015-2019;
- Factsheets of Nationale Studentenenquête;
- Course evaluations;
- Programme metrics;
- Assessment plan I and II;
- Self-Evaluation Report;
- Guide Academic Skills;
- Other documents.

Specific reading material master Russian and Eurasian Studies:

- Jaap Kamphuis, *Verbal Aspect in Old Church Slavonic*;
- Syllabus *Russische Basisgrammatica*;
- Simeon Dekker, *Old Russian Birchbark Letters: A Pragmatic Approach*;
- Gulnaz Sibgatullina, *Languages of Islam and Christianity in Post-Soviet Russia: Institutional Discourses, Community Strategies and Missionary Rhetoric*;
- Jos Schaeken, *Voices on Birchbark: Everyday Communication in Medieval Russia*;
- Ramaz Kurdadze, *The Georgian Language 1: A Practical Course of the Georgian Language for Foreign Students*.

Links provided on laptops:

- Learning environment selected courses;
- Structure of the Faculty of Humanities movie;
- Website MOST, Russian Studies study association;

- Facebookpagina 'Russian in Leiden';
- Website 'Window on Russia' (in Dutch: 'Raam op Rusland')