

# **HISTORY**

ERASMUS SCHOOL OF HISTORY,  
CULTURE AND COMMUNICATION

**ERASMUS UNIVERSITY ROTTERDAM**

QANU  
Catharijnesingel 56  
PO Box 8035  
3503 RA Utrecht  
The Netherlands

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

Project number: Q0722

© 2019 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

<b>REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME AND THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME HISTORY OF ERASMUS UNIVERSITY ROTTERDAM .....</b>	<b>5</b>
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMMES.....	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION.....	5
COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL .....	6
WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL .....	6
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	11
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED PROGRAMME ASSESSMENTS.....	15
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>33</b>
APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES .....	35
APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM .....	38
APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT .....	42
APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL .....	43

This report was finalised on 20 December 2019.





# REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME AND THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME HISTORY OF ERASMUS UNIVERSITY ROTTERDAM

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

## ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMMES

### Bachelor's programme History

Name of the programme:	History (Geschiedenis)
CROHO number:	56034
Level of the programme:	bachelor's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	180 EC
Specializations or tracks:	Dutch: Geschiedenis English: International Bachelor History
Location:	Rotterdam
Mode of study:	fulltime
Language of instruction:	Dutch, English
Programme specific details:	Option of choosing an educational minor offered by ICLON, Leiden University
Submission deadline NVAO:	01/05/2020

### Master's programme History

Name of the programme:	History (Geschiedenis)
CROHO number:	66034
Level of the programme:	master's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	60 EC
Specializations or tracks:	- Dutch: Geschiedenis van Nederland in een mondiale context (as of 2019: Cultuurgeschiedenis) - English: Global History and International Relations
Location:	Rotterdam
Mode(s) of study:	fulltime, part-time
Language of instruction:	Dutch, English
Joint programme:	Joint International Master Global Markets, Local Creativities (GLOCAL)
partner institutions involved:	University of Glasgow, Universitat de Barcelona and Georg-August-Universität Göttingen
type of degree awarded:	multiple degree
Submission deadline NVAO:	01/05/2020

The visit of the assessment panel History to the Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication of Erasmus University Rotterdam took place on 27 and 28 June 2019.

## ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

Name of the institution:	Erasmus University Rotterdam
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 February 2019. The panel that assessed the bachelor's programme and the master's programme History consisted of:

- Prof. dr. I.B. (Inger) Leemans, professor in Cultural History at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and Principle Investigator at Humanities Cluster KNAW [chair];
- Prof. dr. P. (Peter) Bursens, professor in Political and Social Sciences at the Antwerp Centre for Institutions and Multilevel Politics and vice dean Social Sciences at University of Antwerp (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. E. (Eric) Vanhaute, professor in Economic History and World History and co-chair of the research group Economies-Comparisons-Connections (ECC) at Ghent University (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. N. (Nanci) Adler, professor in Memory, History, and Transitional Justice at the University of Amsterdam and Program Director Genocide Studies at the Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies (NIOD);
- Rikst van der Schoor BA, student master's programme Intellectual History, University of St. Andrews (United Kingdom) [student member]

The panel was supported by dr. F. (Floor) Meijer, who acted as secretary.

## WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The site visit to the bachelor's and master's programme History at Erasmus University Rotterdam was part of the cluster assessment History. Between April 2019 and December 2019 the panel assessed 24 programmes at eight universities. The following universities participated in this cluster assessment: Erasmus University Rotterdam, Maastricht University, Radboud University, University of Groningen, Leiden University, Utrecht University, University of Amsterdam and VU Amsterdam.

On behalf of the participating universities, quality assurance agency QANU was responsible for logistical support, panel guidance and the production of the report[s]. Dr. A.H.A.M. (Alexandra) Paffen was project coordinator for QANU. Dr. A.H.A.M. (Alexandra) Paffen, dr. F. (Floor) Meijer, J. (Jaïra) Azaria MA, drs. R.L. (Renate) Prenen, V. (Victor) van Kleef acted as secretary in the cluster assessment.

### *Panel members*

The members of the assessment panel were selected based their expertise, availability and on independence. The panel consisted of the following members:

- Dr. J.W. (Jan Willem) Honig [chairman] is senior lecturer in War Studies, Department of War Studies, King's College London and visiting professor of Military Strategy at the Swedish Defence University in Stockholm [chair];
- Prof. dr. I.B. (Inger) Leemans, professor in Cultural History at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and Principle Investigator at Humanities Cluster KNAW [chair];
- Prof. dr. J.F.J. (Jeroen) Duindam, professor of Early Modern History at Leiden University;
- Prof. dr. W.J.H. (Jan Hein) Furnée, professor and chair of European Cultural History at the Radboud University;
- Prof. dr. P. (Peter) Bursens, professor in Political and Social Sciences at the Antwerp Centre for Institutions and Multilevel Politics and vice dean Social Sciences at University of Antwerp (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. W.P. (Wim) van Meurs, professor and chair of the Political History at Radboud University;

- Prof. dr. E. (Eric) Vanhaute, professor in Economic History and World History and co-chair of the research group Economies-Comparisons-Connections (ECC) at Ghent University (Belgium);
- V. (Vicky) Marissen LL.Mis, Managing Director at PACT European Affairs and partner at consultancy company EPPA;
- Dr. N. (Nico) Randerdaad, associate professor in History and European Studies at Maastricht University and interim director at the Social Historical Centre Limburg;
- Prof. dr. N. (Nanci) Adler, professor in Memory, History, and Transitional Justice at the University of Amsterdam Program Director Genocide Studies at the Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies (NIOD);
- Prof. dr. K. (Koenraad) Verboven, professor of Ancient History at Ghent University (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. V. (Violet) Soen, associate professor in Early Modern Religious History and chair of the research group Early Modern History at KU Leuven (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. C.A. (Claire) Dunlop, professor in Politics and Public Policy and head of research at the Department of Politics of the University of Exeter (United Kingdom);
- Prof. dr. E.B.A. (Erik) van der Vleuten, professor in the History of Technology at the School of Innovation Sciences of the Eindhoven University of Technology and Scientific Director at the Foundation for the History of Technology;
- Mel Schickel MA, alumnus of the master's programme History of Society at Erasmus University Rotterdam. He now works as a research assistant at the Faculty Behavioral and Social Sciences of the University of Amsterdam [student member];
- Rikst van der Schoor BA, student master's programme Intellectual History, University of St. Andrews (United Kingdom) [student member]
- Rico Tjepkema, bachelor's student International Relations & International Organization at the University of Groningen [student member].

#### *Preparation*

On 2 March, the panel chair was briefed by QANU on her role, the assessment framework, the working method, and the planning of site visits and reports. A preparatory panel meeting was organised on 14 April 2019. During this meeting, the panel members received instruction on the use of the assessment framework. The panel also discussed their working method and the planning of the site visits and reports.

The project manager composed a schedule for the site visit in consultation with the Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication. Prior to the site visit, the Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication selected representative partners for the various interviews. See Appendix 3 for the final schedule.

Before the site visit to the Erasmus University Rotterdam, QANU received the self-evaluation reports of the programmes and sent these to the panel. A thesis selection was made by the panel's chair and the secretary, based on a list of students who graduated in 2017 and 2018. For each programme the selection consisted of fifteen theses and their assessment forms, covering all modes of study (full time/part-time) and tracks, as well as a representative variety of grades, topics and examiners.

After studying the self-evaluation report, theses and assessment forms, the panel members formulated their preliminary findings. The secretary collected all initial questions and remarks and distributed these amongst all panel members.

#### *Site visit*

The site visit to Erasmus University Rotterdam took place on 27 and 28 June 2019. At the start of the site visit, the panel learned that – following a number of tumultuous events, which led to tensions within the Faculty and the history Department – on 24 June 2019 a new interim dean was appointed to the Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication (ESHCC). His assignment entailed an assessment of the future of the Faculty as an independent unit, e.g. through a reconsideration of a



possible merger of ESHCC with the Erasmus School of Social and Behavioural Sciences (ESSB) or the Erasmus School of Philosophy (ESPhil). Prior to the interviews, the newly appointed interim dean briefed the panel on the current situation within ESHCC and his planned course of action for the coming period. Although the panel was worried about continuing the site visit in these challenging circumstances, over the course of the site visit, the panel found that the circumstances did not distract substantially from the main purpose of the site visit, i.e. to assess the quality of the bachelor's and master's programmes in History. The panel felt fully facilitated in accomplishing this task.

At the start of the site visit, the panel discussed its initial findings on the self-evaluation report and the theses, as well as the division of tasks during the site visit. During the site visit, the panel studied the additional documents provided by the programmes. 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. It also offered students and staff members an opportunity for confidential discussion during a consultation hour. No requests for private consultation were received.

The panel used the final part of the site visit to discuss its findings in an internal meeting. Afterwards, the panel chair presented the panel's preliminary findings and general observations to the management team and, in a separate session, to a broader audience of staff and students.

#### *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 report to the Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication in order to have it 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 Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication 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

### *Intended learning outcomes*

Both the bachelor's and the master's programme in History of the EUR aim to distinguish themselves with a profile that is characterised by a focus on modern history from a global perspective, a combination of historical and social sciences theories, concepts and methods, a historicising approach and an orientation towards the professional field. The panel concludes that these aspects give the programmes a distinct identity. It is, furthermore, impressed by the energy boost that extensive internationalisation efforts, have provided to the programmes. Nonetheless, it does feel that different (historical and socio-scientific) approaches and perspectives may be more explicitly prioritised.

The bachelor's and master's ILOs that were presented to the panel prior to the site visit reflected the programmes' profiles and matched the level and orientation described in the Dublin Descriptors. However, the panel felt that the ILOs lacked specificity and made very little distinction between historical and socio-scientific knowledge and techniques. In the interviews the panel suggested to add subsets of ILOs for the different master's specialisations, including GLOCAL. A new set of master's ILOs that was presented to the panel shortly after the site visit effectively deals with the objections raised by the panel. The panel concludes that the new ILOs provide a clearer starting point for the curricula of the different specialisations. It encourages the master's programme to take further fine-tuning steps with regard to the revision process and the bachelor's programme to revise its ILOs along the same lines.

A particular strength is that the programmes have fostered close, both formal and informal relationships with the professional field. By regularly exchanging views and experiences with representatives of relevant employers, the programmes stay attuned to developments in the professional field. One suggestion that the panel would like to propose is to make more structural use of the networks and expertise of alumni.

### *Teaching-learning environment*

The panel concludes that both the bachelor's and the master's programme offer students a suitable and stimulating learning environment. The curricula of both programmes match their profile and include high-quality, research-led courses taught by experienced and committed staff members. Both curricula focus on modern history, offering thematical courses on topical issues that are not just studied from a historical perspective but also by using theories and concepts from the social sciences and cultural theory. Increasingly, the scope of the courses is global. The panel concludes that this temporally-limited yet broad approach is rather unique to Rotterdam, even if it is not fully convinced that the curricula as a whole are best qualified as 'multidisciplinary'. The courses in both the bachelor's and master's programme seem to principally teach students the skillset of the historian, and in this sense the curricula are fairly conventional, which the panel does not object to. For the master's programme, however, there is a possibility that this will change, as EUR is now part of the consortium that offers the GLOCAL programme. The inflow of students from non-historical backgrounds into the master's programme may provide a challenge in terms of the learning goals. As much as the panel appreciates the international prestige that GLOCAL brings to the department, it feels that this development will require careful monitoring. A strong feature of both programmes is the level of interaction with the professional field. The panel particularly appreciates the bachelor's internship. It established that students conduct very meaningful work that helps them to prepare for the labour market.

The panel was pleased to find that both programmes favour small-scale intensive teaching. Teaching methods are largely appropriate, but the bachelor's programme could aim for increased variety, which would help to activate students even more. In particular, the use of blended learning could be explored further. The recent internationalisation efforts are impressive and have clearly given a boost to the programmes in terms of student numbers and curriculum content. The programmes are aware of the added value of having a diverse and international student population, which exposes students to different perspectives and advances their intercultural competencies. Providing additional training



to staff with respect to inclusive teaching would help to bring out the full potential of the international (or, in a broader sense: mixed) classroom. Both programmes appear sufficiently feasible, with no obvious obstacles that prevent students from completing them in the designated time period. Staff members, moreover, offer sufficient guidance and are described by students as helpful and approachable. Lecturers are also knowledgeable in their fields and often involved in research that supports their teaching. For permanent staff, having a PhD and a BUTQ is seen as a prerequisite. The workload of staff is high. The panel established that this has the attention of the department management.

A point for further improvement is that the blueprint - of both the bachelor's and the master's programme - as represented by the curriculum matrix that links course-specific objectives to ILOs, requires further fine-tuning. The panel feels that the recommendations put forward by the previous panel, with respect to the formulation of learning objectives and linking them to ILOs, are - partly - still relevant. According to the panel, getting a firmer grip on the foundations that support the teaching should be a group effort. Initiating a continuous dialogue between staff members on the contribution of individual courses to the curriculum as a whole should provide a good opportunity for strengthening the sense of shared responsibility for and ownership of the curriculum.

#### *Assessment*

The panel established that the system of assessment of the bachelor's and master's programme is based on the guiding principles of the university - and faculty - wide assessment policies. As a rule, all courses use multiple and diverse assessment methods, including both formative and summative assessments. Providing students with sufficient feedback is considered important. At course level, assessment matrices are used to ensure the validity of tests, while the deployment of answering models heightens the reliability of assessment. Standardised course manuals provide students with the necessary information with respect to assessment methods and criteria, deadlines etcetera. The quality of sample tests studied by the panel is appropriate.

In their system of assessment, the programmes strongly rely on the professionalism and quality of their staff. While the panel appreciates this principle, it feels that formal procedures could be strengthened. Opportunities for further improvement of assessment practices include the compulsory use of the four-eye principle in test design, as well as the use of standardised forms and rubrics for the assessment of written assignments. Also, the panel recommends organising peer coaching and calibration sessions for examiners, in order to establish a common assessment standard. This should help deal with the observations of both students and Examination Board that staff members have divergent expectations and interpret the assessment scale in different ways.

The procedure for assessing internships and theses is reasonably well organised and the panel generally agrees with the thesis assessments, although it found some of the scores slightly inflated and others on the low side. An issue that should be remedied is that the individual assessment forms of the supervisor and second reader are currently not archived, which interferes with the transparency of the assessment process.

The EB, which has a faculty-wide responsibility, operated too much at a distance throughout the review period. In the coming period, however, the EB plans to scale up its assessments of sample tests and introduce an extensive system for checking the quality of theses and their assessments. The EB will be compensated for these efforts by additional FTE's. Although all of these measures could ideally have been introduced sooner, the panel is sufficiently convinced that the EB is now firmly on the right track. It expects the EB to be in control of assessment quality in the coming period.

#### *Achieved learning outcomes*

Based on samples of recently completed theses and a conversation with alumni, the panel concludes that both bachelor's and master's students achieve the intended learning outcomes. Theses clearly show that students are able to bring an independent research project to a successful conclusion.

Generally, students formulate relevant and interesting research questions that are well embedded in the current state of affairs in a particular field. Theories and concepts receive a lot of attention, just like the justification of the methodologies used. A point of attention is the balance between historical methods and insights derived from the social sciences. Generally, the panel found that assessors could be more alert on heuristic shortcomings. Alumni are unanimously enthusiastic about the knowledge and skills that they acquired during the programmes, which they view as a solid foundation on which careers in a range of sectors can be successfully built (as attested by the career trajectories of the group with which the panel made acquaintance).

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

*Bachelor's programme History*

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	meets the standard
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	meets the standard
Standard 3: Assessment	meets the standard
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	meets the standard
General conclusion	Positive

*Master's programme History*

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	meets the standard
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	meets the standard
Standard 3: Assessment	meets the standard
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	meets the standard
General conclusion	Positive

The panel chair, prof. dr. I.B. (Inger) Leemans, and secretary, dr. F. (Floor) Meijer, 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: 20 December 2019.



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

## Scope of the assessment

The panel's assessment covers the bachelor's and the master's programme in History, including the underlying tracks and specialisations. The international Erasmus Mundus programme GLOCAL was also part of the assessment. At the time of the site visit, students of this multiple degree programme participated in one of the regular master's specialisations. As of 2019-2020, however, a new specialisation of the master's programme will be established to better accommodate GLOCAL students. The master's programme is a daytime programme and can be followed both fulltime and part-time. Part-time students follow the same curriculum as fulltime students, but at a slower pace. The findings and considerations in this report apply to both fulltime and part-time students.

### **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

Both the bachelor's and the master's programme in History at Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR) aim to establish a strong connection between past and present. They start from the premise that historical developments provide valuable insight into current social, political and cultural issues. In order to help students understand and explain past and present, the programmes adopt a multidisciplinary perspective. Historical concepts, theories and methods are combined with insights from the social sciences. Further key features of the programmes are their strong emphasis on the theory of history and historiography, and their international orientation, including global as well as European and Dutch history. Finally, both programmes are tightly linked to professional practice.

Following the advice of the previous assessment panel, the programmes have revisited their profile. In response to declining student numbers and funding, they sought to further enhance their distinctiveness and attractiveness to international students. For the bachelor's programme, rethinking the programme's profile was part of a broader educational reform ('History Now') initiated in 2014. In this year, an international advisory committee recommended to shift the programme's focus to the period from 1750 to the present, to pay particular attention to urban history – especially the history of the city of Rotterdam – and to give more weight to social scientific approaches. The current programme offers students a choice of two tracks, whose main difference is the language of instruction: (1) International Bachelor History (IBH), taught in English, (2) Bachelor Geschiedenis, taught in a combination of Dutch and English. The overall objective of the bachelor's programme is to prepare students for a broad professional field. It sees the subject-specific as well as the general academic skills developed in the courses as a solid basis for a wide range of positions focusing on analysing, interpreting and communicating on social change processes and long-term problems. Experience, however, shows that a large majority of students first complete a master's programme before entering the labour market. The bachelor's programme has therefore chosen to focus first and foremost on preparing students for successfully enrolling in a relevant master's programme.

Profile changes in the master's programme (formally: the master's programme History of Society, but this additive will soon be dropped) also reflect the intention of stabilising student numbers by increasing the singularity of the 'EUR approach' – a multidisciplinary approach to history and a focus on the modern period. Over the past six years, the programme has embraced internationalisation, notably by exploring opportunities for international cooperation (see below: 'GLOCAL'). Currently, the master's programme consists of two specialisations: (1) Global History and International Relations (GHIR), an English-taught specialisation that deals with cutting-edge questions related to historical processes of globalisation, international relations and cultural encounters, (2) Geschiedenis van Nederland in een mondiale context (GNMC), a (mostly) Dutch-taught specialisation that focuses



on the history of the Netherlands in its relationship to the world and on the influences of globalisation processes in the Netherlands and vice versa. A change that is effectuated in 2019 is the rebranding of the GNMC specialisation to 'Cultuurgeschiedenis' (Cultural History). According to programme representatives this name change reflects a gradual shift in content, making the former title less appropriate. With its new title, the specialisation is considered more visible and attractive to Dutch students from outside of Rotterdam. The overall ambition of both specialisations is to produce ambitious, versatile historians with an eye for the economic, political, cultural and international backgrounds of social issues. The programme intends to equip students with a broad base of knowledge and skills that allows them to pursue a variety of career options, for example, in international organisations, journalism, cultural organisations such as museums and other heritage institutions, businesses and government institutions.

The panel has carefully considered the profiles of the bachelor's and master's programmes and recognises many positive aspects. The increasing emphasis on combining historical and social sciences perspectives has the clear potential of furnishing the programmes with a distinct identity. The panel also appreciates the global outlook and energetic internationalisation efforts, which have demonstrably contributed to the vitality and robustness of the programmes. Moreover, it concludes that the programmes succeed in conveying a clear picture of their profile to students. In the interviews, both bachelor's and master's students confirmed that they deliberately chose EUR for its broad, multidisciplinary approach to history and its focus on the modern period. Students with an interest in ancient or medieval history are directed towards programmes at other universities. Notwithstanding its favourable impression of the programmes' profiles, the panel feels that – in the face of a limited temporal framework and increasing expansion into adjacent disciplines – it is important to maintain and continue to stress those features that are considered characteristic for a history programme. This includes the use of primary sources and heuristic and hermeneutic methods. The panel also detects a certain tension between increasing internationalisation and a focus on local urban history within the bachelor's programme, not least because the associated source material might be unintelligible for international students. These are aspects for the programmes to consider as they continue to build their profiles.

#### *Intended learning outcomes*

The programmes have translated their profile and objectives to a set of intended learning outcomes (ILOs), see appendix 1. Both the (9) bachelor ILOs and the (13) master ILOs are organised according to the Dublin Descriptors (Knowledge and Understanding; Applying Knowledge and Understanding; Making judgement; Communication; Learning Skills), thereby assuring an appropriate level and orientation. In both sets of ILOs the panel recognises the multidisciplinary setup of the programmes, their wide geographical focus – ranging from the local to the global – their historicising approach, and their orientation towards professional practice. Furthermore, the panel appreciates that the bachelor's ILO that deals with the ability to carry out an academic research project (ILO 9) has been toned down to an appropriate level after the previous panel commented on the rather ambitious formulation of this ILO.

The panel also identified some opportunities for further improvement. A first observation is that the bachelor's and master's ILOs presented to the panel prior to the site visit are very generic. They do not distinguish between various subdisciplines and often mention historical and socio-scientific methods and techniques in the same breath, thereby providing no prioritisation of different types of knowledge and skills. In the master's ILOs the panel would have preferred to see more specific references to the content of the specialisations, as well as an ILO that details the expectations with respect to setting up and carrying out an academic research project at master's level (as a counterpart to the bachelor's ILO 9). Also, it felt that – compared to the level of instruction in the social sciences provided in the courses – the ILOs somewhat overstate the role of socio-scientific methods and techniques.

All of these observations were discussed during the site visit. In response, the master's programme produced a new set of ILOs, which it submitted to the panel. The panel concludes that improvements



were made in this new set of ILOs, which was established after consulting RISBO, the educational expertise centre linked to EUR. The (14) revised ILOs integrate different learning outcomes per specialisation, better distinguish between the different methodologies, and integrate the ability to independently conduct research. The panel applauds the master's programme for its swift and adequate response to the panel's suggestions. It does however urge the programme to keep working on this document.

#### *Links with the professional field*

The panel established that both programmes appropriately pride themselves on their orientation on, and extensive contacts with, the professional field. These contacts include links with teacher associations, representatives of museums/heritage and creative industries (particularly the fashion industry), and other for-profit companies and (semi) government bodies. Currently, the programmes are seeking to extend their contacts with municipalities, government and public order, which would further strengthen their connection to the local and regional level. From the documentation it is clear that the programmes favour an informal approach to building their network and consulting the field on curriculum content; the work field committee (*werkveldcommissie*) has not met since 2013 and is now considered redundant. The panel is supportive of this approach but does advise the programmes to make better and more structural use of the expertise and networks of alumni. During the site visit, graduates of the programmes indicated that they would like to stay more involved after graduation.

#### *GLOCAL*

A prominent result of EUR's dedication to establishing new international partnerships that match its research interests is its participation in the Erasmus Mundus multiple degree programme GLOCAL (Global Markets, Local Creativities), that started in September 2017. GLOCAL is a highly selective two-year multidisciplinary master's programme on the intersection of history, economics, business and cultural studies that is open to students from a variety of backgrounds in the social sciences, business, humanities and languages. The programme is offered by a consortium of four universities: University of Glasgow, Universitat de Barcelona, Georg-August Universität Göttingen and EUR. Within the programme, students explore a variety of multidisciplinary perspectives on the process and experience of globalisation from a place-based perspective, in particular of cities, creative industries, development and local cultures of entrepreneurship. After spending their first year in Glasgow (30 EC) and Barcelona (30 EC), students – depending on their own preference – take the remainder of the courses and write their thesis (60 EC) in either Rotterdam ('Pathway A: Global History and Creative Industries') or Göttingen ('Pathway B: Global Markets and Development'). In 2018/2019, EUR was host to a first cohort of 13 GLOCAL students. In 2019/2020 the number of GLOCAL students will grow to 22.

The panel congratulates EUR on its participation in this prestigious programme, which has brought significant numbers of talented international master's students to Rotterdam, thereby adding to the vitality and international profile of the master's programme. At the same time, the panel feels that a more transparent and suitable organisational foundation could have been laid for EUR's contribution to GLOCAL. One of the issues that the panel discussed with the programme management is that originally no separate ILOs had been specified for GLOCAL, which meant that students from a variety of backgrounds were expected to realise the ILOs of the master's programme in History. The panel was pleased to find that this potential problem was remedied in the new set of master's ILOs, presented to the panel after the site visit. The panel, however, has some concerns on how the programme can guarantee that ILO3 and ILO5 are also met by GLOCAL students (analyse historical data & analyse historical developments).

#### **Considerations**

Both the bachelor's and the master's programme in History aim to distinguish themselves with a profile that is characterised by a focus on modern history from a global perspective, a combination of historical and social sciences theories, concepts and methods, a historicising approach and an orientation towards the professional field. The panel concludes that these aspects give the



programmes a distinct identity. It is, furthermore, impressed by the energy boost that extensive internationalisation efforts, have provided to the programmes. Nonetheless, it does feel that different (historical and socio-scientific) approaches and perspectives may be more explicitly prioritised.

The bachelor's and master's ILOs that were presented to the panel prior to the site visit reflected the programmes' profiles and matched the level and orientation described in the Dublin Descriptors. However, the panel felt that the ILOs lacked specificity and made very little distinction between historical and socio-scientific knowledge and techniques. In the interviews the panel suggested to add subsets of ILOs for the different master's specialisations, including GLOCAL. A new set of master's ILOs that was presented to the panel shortly after the site visit effectively deals with the objections raised by the panel. The panel concludes that the new ILOs provide a clearer starting point for the curricula of the different specialisations. It encourages the master's programme to take further fine-tuning steps with regard to the revision process and the bachelor's programme to revise its ILOs along the same lines.

A particular strength is that the programmes have fostered close, informal relationships with the professional field. By regularly exchanging views and experiences with representatives of relevant employers, the programmes stay attuned to developments in the professional field. One suggestion that the panel would like to propose is to make more structural use of the networks and expertise of alumni.

### **Conclusion**

*Bachelor's programme History:* the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'meets the standard'.

*Master's programme History:* 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**

#### *Curriculum bachelor's programme*

The curriculum of the three-year bachelor's programme (180 EC) puts emphasis on the history of economic, political, social and cultural processes in global, (trans)national, regional and local societies. It does not deal with history in a chronological order, but instead presents students with a series of thematic courses that aim for the bigger picture. The focus of the courses gradually shifts from a broad outlook to more specific cases. The panel established that – although no specific learning pathways have been defined – the curriculum as a whole is sufficiently coherent, with a logical sequence of courses and a gradually increasing level of complexity. In terms of content, both tracks of the programme are identical. The first year of the programme consists of mandatory courses (7,5 EC each), which fall into two categories: (1) courses with a focus on historical phenomena and processes and (2) courses that deal with research skills, methodologies and theoretical issues. These courses give students a general introduction to the field of academic history. In the second year, students take two further courses in theory and methods (15 EC). Also, they choose a major (30 EC) out of four focus area's: (1) Economic History, (2) International Relations, (3) Cultural History and (4) Social History. The major entails four mandatory courses and is complemented by two electives (15 EC). In the third year, students can either choose to go on an exchange abroad (30 EC) or they select a minor from EUR, TU Delft or Leiden University (15 EC) and do an internship (15 EC). In both cases they take one additional course (7,5 EC). The programme is concluded with a thesis preparatory class (7,5 EC) and the writing of a bachelor's thesis (15 EC). An overview of the curriculum can be found in Appendix 2.

During the site visit, the panel studied materials from a number of courses (see Appendix 5). It established that the level of these courses is appropriate and that the content is topical, with relevant reading materials being used. From the course material, but also from the interviews with staff

members, the panel concludes that the current curriculum, which was implemented in the period 2014-2016, is still firmly grounded in the discipline of history, with ample attention being paid to the specific skill set of the historian. At the same time, the new curriculum aims for a more consistently multidisciplinary approach. The elaboration thereof was a conversation topic during the interviews. The panel's overall impression is that multi-disciplinarity is more about introducing perspectives and topics derived from the social sciences into the courses than about fully familiarising students with socio-scientific methodologies. Students work on issues, and with concepts, that are traditionally associated with e.g. sociology, economics and political science, but the methodology that they use is more often than not historical. The historical context is a factor that is always explicitly taken into consideration. Although the panel feels that 'multidisciplinary' is perhaps too strong a label for the curriculum as a whole, it does conclude that students highly value the inclusion of non-historical perspectives and see this as a bonus that adds to their versatility as historians. The panel agrees with the latter. Students who develop a particular interest in one of the adjacent disciplines can pursue this in their minor.

The panel established that the content of the curriculum is sufficiently research-led. The four focus areas follow logically from the research lines of the History Department and individual staff members are encouraged to link their teaching to their research. The courses, particularly the theory and methods courses, systematically develop students' academic and research skills. From day one, students examine primary sources, learn how to date and contextualise these sources, and describe their findings in written assignments. They also learn how to assess research conducted by others for such aspects as reliability, validity and argumentation. At the end of each year, students complete a research project, in which they integrate their acquired knowledge and skills. The short bachelor-1 paper that they write in year 1 (4000 words) is followed by a somewhat longer paper in the field of the chosen focus area in year 2 (5000 words). In year 3, students conclude the programme with a bachelor's thesis (10.000 words, 15 EC). This is a large research paper based on both secondary and primary sources. Before they start writing the thesis, students are assigned to a *Bachelor Thesis Class* (BTC, 7,5 EC), which centres around a specific topic (e.g. 'the Netherlands and Germany, 1800 to present day; twentieth century international business in times of political and economic crises'). The panel appreciates that these classes, which consist of small-scale interactive tutorials, provide structure and focus to the bachelor's thesis projects.

While academic in character, the bachelor's curriculum also aims to prepare students for professional practice. This is most clearly reflected in the third year. Unless they choose to go abroad, students do an internship and follow the course *The Public Role of Historians*, which (amongst other things) aims to make them aware of the value of historical knowledge and skills within society. During the site visit the panel examined a list of recently completed internships and studied a number of internship reports. It is very impressed by the highly varied and relevant collection of internship providers (including cultural and heritage organizations, schools, media, government agencies and smaller and larger companies), as well as by the richness of the learning experience that students describe in their reports. From the interview with students, the panel concludes that they highly appreciate this curriculum component. For some, the internship was the deciding factor for choosing the EUR programme. Although the choice for an internship often seems to cause challenges for students in terms of finishing their programme in time, students themselves did not seem to regard this as a serious problem. Students seem less satisfied with the overall level of labour market preparation, but the panel nonetheless feels that the programme is doing an adequate job of interacting with the outside world. Specific labour market preparation is offered to students who consider a career in teaching. These are eligible for taking an Educational Minor (30 EC) at Leiden University. The panel spoke with alumni who made use of this option and concludes that this minor is a welcome addition to the programme.

The panel appreciates that, following the advice of the 2013 panel, the programme has re-examined the course-specific learning objectives in relation to the ILOs, with the aim of making them more precise and measurable. The panel concludes that for many courses good progress has been made. However, after studying the underpinning of the curriculum as a whole – as visualised in a matrix



that relates the learning objectives of the courses to the nine ILOs – the panel identified some opportunities for further enhancement. The matrix, for example, reveals that not all courses include measurable learning objectives. The most significant example is the course *History of Modern Societies* that has only one fairly random objective: 'The course is an introduction to the western world from 1750 to the present day'. Moreover, a single learning objective sometimes covers a multitude of (up to five) ILOs and some ILOs are much more broadly covered by the curriculum as a whole than others. A prominent example of the latter is that the (highly important) ILO on students being able to conduct a small-scale research project (ILO 9) is (according to the matrix) only trained during the bachelor-1 paper in year 1 and finally in the bachelor's thesis in year 3, with no mention being made of the second year research project. Finally, the panel noticed that the internship has accidentally been left out of the matrix, even though learning objectives have been formulated for this curriculum component. The panel recommends to adjust the matrix and, furthermore, to regard it as a living document that needs to be continuously discussed, edited and updated, thereby involving the full team of lecturers. This helps to promote a general awareness of the overall structure of the curriculum and the place that individual curriculum components hold within it.

#### *Content master's programme*

The one-year master's curriculum (60 EC) offers students a combination of factual knowledge, theory and empirical research skills. Both specialisations – Global History and International Relations (GHIR) and *Geschiedenis van Nederland in een mondiale context* (GNMC, as of 2019/2020: *Cultuurgeschiedenis*) – have a similar setup. An outline of the curriculum is included in appendix 2. In the first semester, students start by taking three thematic seminars (20 EC), which give them an overview of the specialisation-specific knowledge and familiarise them with the 'Rotterdam approach'. They also choose a research workshop (10 EC) from a list of four to five options, which runs for the remainder of the programme. The second semester enables students to further explore their own interests. They choose two electives (5 + 5 EC), or one elective (5 EC) and a short research internship (5 EC). The programme is concluded with the master's thesis (20 EC). The panel established that the two specialisations partly overlap. Both include the thematic seminar *Historical Culture in a Globalising World* (5 EC). Also, some of the research workshops and most of the electives are shared. Students indicated to the panel that they perceive the structure of the curriculum as clear and helpful, allowing for in-depth research in the second semester.

From the documentation and interviews, the panel concludes that the content of the curriculum fits the programme's profile and is relevant and up to date. It notes that students particularly praised the non-Eurocentric approach and societally relevant topics. Courses tend to apply a diachronic perspective, sometimes reaching back to the early modern period. The primary focus, however, is on the period from 1750 onwards. Like in the bachelor's programme, the master's courses combine historical knowledge with insights derived from other humanities domains (e.g. cultural theory) and the social sciences, with the specific purpose of enabling students to adopt an inquiring and critical attitude. During the interviews, the course *Rotterdamse verhalen uit een (post-)koloniale wereld* was cited several times as a good example of this approach. It requires students to interview postcolonial citizens of Rotterdam and record their histories, thereby practicing the use of oral history (in conjunction with reading important texts by oral historians) and becoming aware of the fact that historians not only use but also create sources. Students also mentioned the elective *Text and Context: from Source to Science* (GNMC/GHIR) as particularly helpful for understanding the 'Rotterdam approach' to history, as it links the analysis of primary sources to theoretical developments in history, anthropology, and cultural, minority and subaltern studies. The panel endorses the value of including the perspective of other disciplines and can understand why this appeals to students. However, as stated above, the panel found it difficult to grasp the exact level of multidisciplinary that is achieved in the master's programme. Rather than teaching several disciplines on a more or less equal footing, the programme seems to aim for broadening the main discipline (history) by including issues, concepts, frameworks (and much less methods, data, research design) from other disciplines (especially the social sciences). The panel does not perceive this as something that should be changed but suggests to make this specific approach and the requirements more clear to the students.

From the interviews the panel concludes that staff and students support the renaming of the programmes specialisations. In their opinion, the new specialisation title 'Cultuurgeschiedenis' is a sufficiently broader, suitable umbrella term which covers present activities. The panel appreciates that there seems to be a broad consensus on this development, but would recommend the programme to elaborate further on the relationship between curriculum and specialisation title. The panel noticed, for instance, that the current curriculum does not include an introductory course on cultural history, or a design that is related to the subfields of cultural history, as is common in other cultural history programmes.

After studying material from a number of sample courses (see appendix 5 for an overview), the panel is largely satisfied with the level that is achieved – with the small side note that the thematic course *Mapping Global Order* (GHIR, 10 EC) is clearly an introductory course and perhaps a bit too superficial for the significant number of credits involved. The learning objectives of these and other courses are generally detailed and measurable. However, the curriculum matrix, that provides the blueprint for the programme by linking course specific learning objectives to the ILOs, would benefit from further fine-tuning. The panel found that it is not uncommon that a single learning objective is related to six different ILOs. In some cases (e.g. the course *Mapping Global Order*), learning objectives that are intended to measure knowledge are related to ILOs that deal with skills. After the site visit, when the programme presented the panel with its new ILOs, it also expressed the intention of reviewing the learning goals of the various courses and their relationships with the ILO's. The panel encourages this initiative and recommends to make this a joint effort of all staff involved in the teaching.

The panel established that the content of the courses is closely connected to the research interests of staff members and that there is a lot of attention for academic and research skills. A particular strength of the Rotterdam master's programme is the structured approach to writing the thesis. Central to this approach is the Research Workshop (RWS), which covers all phases from the writing of the thesis up to the presentation of the final result. To help students decide on a thesis topic, a Master Thesis Market is organised halfway through the first semester. Following this market, students choose a specific RWS and determine their own research topic within the broader theme of the RWS. Notably, some of these workshops have been set up with external partners that also offer internships (RWS Maritime History and Port Cities in cooperation with the Rotterdam Maritime Museum; RWS Rise and Fall of the American Empire in cooperation with the Roosevelt Institute for American Studies). At the end of the RWS, students present their thesis topic to an audience of staff and students during the Master Thesis Conference. The master's thesis is seen as the final product of the master's programme, in which students must demonstrate their ability to contribute to the scientific debate on a certain topic within their field of expertise.

The programme acknowledges the importance of preparing students for the labour market. To this end, it offers a facultative research internship (5 EC), which is a popular feature amongst students. Roughly half of the students choose to do an internship at one of the programme's partner institutions, which include museums, research institutions, archives, educational institutions, ministries and businesses. Often, the topic of the thesis is linked to the internship, although these are separate curriculum components. The panel is quite pleased with the current level of interaction between programme and the professional field, but nonetheless notes that students and alumni indicated that they would like to see a more explicit link to the professional field throughout the programme, for example by involving more guest lecturers and by paying more attention to practical skills. The programme management is aware of this sentiment and seems open to suggestions for improvement.

#### **GLOCAL**

An important topic during the site visit, was the manner in which the multiple degree programme GLOCAL has been incorporated into the existing master's curriculum. The panel notes that the programme decided to have the first cohort of GLOCAL students participate in the GHIR specialisation. Since GLOCAL students have to achieve the same ILOs and receive the same diploma



as regular students, no distinction was made in terms of what is expected of them, versus what is expected of regular students. According to lecturers of GHIR courses that the panel spoke with, the fact that most GLOCAL students have a bachelor's degree in a different discipline and that much of the first year of the GLOCAL programme focuses on non-historical aspects, does not prove problematic. GLOCAL participants are seen as bright students who easily pick up on new perspectives and, as such, are considered an attractive group of students to teach. The GLOCAL student that was present in the interview with master's students told the panel that she and her fellow GLOCAL students at first found it rather difficult to keep up with the workload and expectations, but gradually eased into it. She added that most of her fellow GLOCAL students appreciate the opportunity of adding new skills and knowledge to their toolkit; they were therefore willing to put in the extra effort. More problematic, they found, was the suboptimal communication and the unclear expectations at the start of the programme. Initially, GLOCAL students do not seem to be aware that at EUR they will be part of a History programme. Also, GLOCAL students experienced that integrating into the larger student population was rather difficult.

From the interviews, the panel got the impression that the programme is dealing with issues that manifested themselves in the first year of hosting GLOCAL students. Based on the experiences and feedback of the first cohort, the programme has decided to launch a dedicated GLOCAL specialisation. In practice, many of the courses will still be shared with GHIR, but two of the thematic courses (15 EC) will become unique to GLOCAL. This allows for a more multidisciplinary approach and increased emphasis on the central focus of this programme, which is based on global relations rather than on global history. The panel was pleased to learn that improvements for students are underway. Even so, it would also like to see that more explicit attention is paid to preparing GLOCAL students for writing a master's thesis that matches the profile and ILOs of the master's programme. During the site visit, the panel studied a list of thesis project titles and a number of research proposals put forward by the first cohort of GLOCAL students. From this material the panel concludes that many thesis projects seem to build on work that the students have done at bachelor's level, most of it in different disciplines such as anthropology, business or sociology. Interesting as these projects may be, generally they do not seem to focus on a historical problem, event, or approach/question. Rather, they include the historical context as an additional layer to a contemporary issue. This, in the panel's opinion, will result in theses that are significantly different from the theses of regular students. Therefore, it believes that the relation between GLOCAL's final products and the ILOs will need careful monitoring (see Standard 3).

#### *Teaching methods*

In the self-evaluation report, the educational approach is described as gradually shifting throughout the programmes. The bachelor's programme initially aims for well-structured courses, including relatively intensive guidance and assignments focused on knowledge acquisition and reproduction. Over the years, courses require ever greater independence and creativity of students. At master's level, students are expected to be able to analyse multifaceted problems and contribute to knowledge creation. The panel established that this approach is reflected in the teaching methods. The first year of the new bachelor's curriculum adopts a serial approach to teaching. Students follow one five-week (7.5 EC) course at a time and a total of four courses per semester. This is thought to allow for a more focused approach that improves study success. During the courses, which all share the same structure of lectures, small-scale tutorials and a weekly consultation hour, students are required to write two papers and give one oral presentation. The serial approach is abandoned in the second and third year of the bachelor's programme, when students are believed to be better capable of handling different subjects coincidentally (at the same time). Courses now last 8 weeks and teaching increasingly takes place in tutorials and seminars (<25 students). The master's courses allow for even more intensive contact between students and between students and lecturers. During the interactive seminars, which are the most frequently used teaching format, students apply the theory in assignments and presentations. Self-study and individual processing of the mandatory literature are also considered important.

The panel concludes that the teaching methods are appropriate, and sufficiently interactive and student-centred. Students generally seem appreciative of the course formats and they pointed out to the panel that the atmosphere in class is positive and constructive, with teachers being very accessible, open to feedback and responsive to students' needs. Students feel that the serial approach in the first year of the bachelor's programme works well because it keeps them focused and on top of things, completing one thing before commencing the next. By contrast, the different approach in later years is seen as more demanding and requires better time management skills. Students agree that this fits the more advanced phase of the programme, but some do feel that the transition between year 1 and 2 could have been smoother. A point of improvement that was put forward in the student chapter and interviews is that the setup of tutorials tends to be a bit monotonous, with a lot of time spent on student presentations. Although students do realise that learning to present in class is useful, they would prefer to have more time set aside for group discussion, which is seen as an altogether more interactive and instructive teaching method. Balancing and varying different activating teaching methods, the panel agrees, is important (as are public presentation skills). In this sense it also encourages the programmes to more structurally explore the possibilities of blended learning. The panel notes that blended learning has been on the agenda in staff meetings, but thus far the development of concrete initiatives has largely been left up to individual teaching staff.

#### *Internationalisation and language*

The panel established that good progress has been made in internationalising the programmes, in terms of curriculum content and student/staff mobility. Both programmes now welcome students from abroad, by offering one of the tracks/specialisations in English. By establishing an international classroom, which facilitates in-class debates between students and staff of different backgrounds, the programmes aim to make students more aware of the existing plurality of historical perspectives and interpretations. To the same end, bachelor's students are encouraged to spend time abroad in their third year, via a summer school, an exchange programme or internship at one of EUR's many partner institutes. The panel was informed that students increasingly make use of this opportunity.

The panel applauds the hard work that has gone into internationalisation, as well as its promising outcomes. It is clear that staff and students are enthusiastic about these developments. Students referred to the international environment as a major strength of the programmes. Even so, the panel notes that internationalisation, and more specifically the quick advance of English-language teaching at bachelor's level, also causes some tensions. Following a programme that is completely taught in Dutch is no longer possible at EUR. Even students who deliberately choose the bachelor *Geschiedenis* (BG) over its fully-English equivalent, the International Bachelor History (IBH), encounter a significant amount of English-language teaching. As a rule, lectures in this track are in English, and tutorials only partly in Dutch. While the panel subscribes to the usefulness of familiarising bachelor's students with English-language teaching and source material, it does feel that students should be made aware of the amount of English that they can expect before starting the programme. Students indicated to the panel that this is not sufficiently the case. Students of the BG-track also mentioned that it is not exceptional that Dutch-taught tutorials are fully booked, forcing BG-students to join English-taught IBH tutorials. In cases where these are taught by international staff, customised solutions have to be found for students who wish to answer test questions and write assignments in Dutch. In the panel's opinion, this situation is burdensome on students and staff. Furthermore, it effectively undermines the *raison d'être* of having two separate but parallel tracks. The panel urges the programme to make sure that Dutch tutorials are always accessible to BG-students, and that the programme in general offers what it promises: a Dutch language BA track. In the interviews the panel was assured by the management that EUR is committed to continuing the Dutch bachelor's track.

Another challenge that was discussed during the site visit, is finding a sufficient number of meaningful internships for international students. The panel learned that the programmes are making good progress in this respect. They have established connections with a number of relevant international institutions in the Netherlands and abroad that offer internships. Increasingly, international students



are also welcomed by national institutions (e.g. Verzetsmuseum, Nationaal Onderwijsmuseum), some of which have collections of international sources. While master's students mentioned that it can still be difficult to find government- and policy-oriented internships in English, staff members believe that this problem is transitory, as Dutch institutions are also internationalising. Finally, the management described the particularities of international classroom teaching as a point of attention. According to the self-evaluation report, staff need to be trained in the dynamics of diversity and strengthen their intercultural competencies. The panel strongly agrees that it is important to take international classroom teaching to its full potential by professionalising staff in this respect. Moreover, it wishes to stress that inclusive teaching is not just about accommodating international students in the best possible way, but also about embracing the diversity of Dutch students.

### *Feasibility*

Bachelor's and master's students confirmed to the panel that the programmes are sufficiently feasible. The course load is spread evenly across the curriculum and there are no particular stumbling blocks amongst the courses. Even so, the panel established that a majority of students do not graduate within the designated time frame. According to staff and students, this often pertains to the fact that students combine their studies with other activities, choose to extend their internship to improve their chances on the labour market, take an honours trajectory on top of the regular course load or enrol in a second (master's) programme before formally completing the first. It seems that at least for some students not finishing in time is a conscious decision. Students also seem to factor in that going on an international exchange in the third year of the bachelor's programme easily (although not necessarily) impedes timely completion. Academic timetables of EUR and its international partners are not always sufficiently aligned, which can cause (minor) delays. Most students, however, seem willing to accept that, given the perceived added value of gaining international experience.

To increase success rates, EUR has introduced a university-wide binding study advice (BSA) of 60 EC in the first year of all of its bachelor's programmes. This 'nominal=normal'-policy is paired with opportunities for compensation. A moderately insufficient grade (at least 5.0) can be compensated for in a maximum of two courses with a 7.0 or higher for a different course. A fail needs to be compensated for by a pass for one or more courses, together representing at least the same amount of credits. The panel does not particularly like this compensation scheme but has determined that the bachelor's programme is bound to it by university-wide policies, and that the EUR is not the only university embracing this strategy. The panel does recommend that the programme keeps track of how many students make use of this scheme, in order to gain a better understanding of (possible) stumbling blocks.

The panel is sufficiently satisfied with the guidance offered to students. This evolves with the particular phase of the programme in which students find themselves, from group mentoring sessions in the first half of the first bachelor's year to personalised supervision whilst students write their master's thesis. Whereas bachelor's students mostly seem pleased with the thesis supervision offered as part of the Bachelor Thesis Class, some of the master's students indicated to the panel that supervision could be more intense and hands-on. The programme may wish to look into this comment. In general, the panel is under the impression that staff are sufficiently sensitive to the needs of individual students, for example taking on board that some (international) students come from very different academic traditions and have no prior experience with conducting a research project and reporting on it. The panel is also satisfied with the procedures for supervising internships, which – for the bachelor's programme – are set out in the Internship Manual. All internships are supervised by a member of the academic staff (academic supervisor) and a representative of the organisation providing the internship (company coach). The department's internship coordinator oversees the process and monitors the quality of the internships by staying in touch with company coaches and paying frequent visits to internship providers.



### *Staff*

The panel is pleased with the quality of the teaching staff. Staff members are not only active researchers, with experience in fields that are relevant to the profile of the programme, but also committed to their teaching. Students describe their teachers as very helpful and knowledgeable, with many staff members being familiar with more than one field and therefore embodying the multidisciplinary approach of the programmes. Most of the permanent staff members have a PhD and a Basic University Teaching Qualification (BUTQ) or are in the process of obtaining a teaching qualification. Temporary staff and senior members of the permanent staff are exempted from having to acquire a BUTQ. The panel suggests encouraging more staff to obtain a Basic University Teaching Qualification (BUTQ) and offering trajectories for obtaining a Senior University Teaching Qualification (SUTQ), in order to provide staff members with a suitable opportunity for further innovating their teaching. This could provide a powerful stimulus to the further professionalisation of the staff.

Staff members experience a high workload. It was mentioned that the rapid growth of student numbers and the subsequent hiring of more temporary staff members have significantly added to the pressure on permanent staff, who have to supervise new staff and take on more managerial and administrative duties. This issue is thought to become even more urgent as a number of senior staff members will soon retire, while the group of mid-career staff who can follow in their footsteps is relatively small. The panel agrees with the management of the Department that this situation will require continuous attention and monitoring. In order to ensure the quality of final products, the panel feels that it is particularly important for the programmes to allocate an adequate (and fixed) number of hours to thesis supervision and assessment. The panel is pleased to read that the Examination Board has taken it upon itself to assure that this allocation is done properly.

An issue that was raised by staff and students is that diversity is limited amongst the current teaching staff. Although more non-Dutch staff members are being hired (currently there are eight foreign staff members), the profile of the staff is still somewhat homogenous (e.g. in terms of cultural background). The panel agrees with the programmes' intention to make diversity an explicit objective in recruitment policies, as having a diverse staff would help to support the increasingly international outlook and content of the programmes. English language skills are already an essential criterion when recruiting staff. The programmes aim for a proficiency in spoken and written English at Level C1 or higher. Existing staff are offered courses to improve their English. Although students are generally satisfied by their lecturers' command of English, they do note that in some cases the level of their verbal skills could be improved.

A final issue that the panel wishes to stress is the importance of sharing responsibility for the programmes as a whole. The panel is under the impression that the staff could operate more as a team, developing a common understanding of what unifies the individual courses within the programmes. The panel suggests to start by initiating a dialogue on how the curricula as a whole, as well as the underlying courses, contribute to students achieving the ILO's. According to the panel, the 'technical' side to putting together a curriculum could become a regular topic during staff meetings, ensuring that insights with respect to formulating learning objectives and linking them to appropriate teaching methods and forms of assessment ('constructive alignment') become common knowledge (even perhaps 'co-owned') within the team. This is especially important considering the growing group of temporary staff members who do not necessarily have access to BUTQ-trajectories.

### **Considerations**

The panel concludes that both the bachelor's and the master's programme offer students a suitable and stimulating learning environment. The curricula of both programmes match their profile and include high-quality, research-led courses taught by experienced and committed staff members. Both curricula focus on modern history, offering thematical courses on topical issues that are not just studied from a historical perspective but also by using theories and concepts from the social sciences and cultural theory. Increasingly, the scope of the courses is global. The panel concludes that this temporally-limited yet broad approach is rather unique to Rotterdam, even if it is not fully convinced that the curricula as a whole are best qualified as 'multidisciplinary'. The courses in both the



bachelor's and master's programme seem to principally teach students the skillset of the historian, and in this sense the curricula are fairly conventional, which the panel does not object to. For the master's programme, however, there is a possibility that this will change, as EUR is now part of the consortium that offers the GLOCAL programme. The panel wonders whether bringing students from non-historical backgrounds into the master's programme might bring challenges to the historical method. As much as it appreciates the international prestige that GLOCAL brings to the department, it feels that this development will require careful monitoring. A strong feature of both programmes is the level of interaction with the professional field. The panel particularly appreciates the bachelor's internship. It established that students conduct very meaningful work that helps them to prepare for the labour market.

The panel was pleased to find that both programmes favour small-scale intensive teaching. Teaching methods are largely appropriate, but the bachelor's programme could aim for increased variety, which would help to activate students even more. In particular, the use of blended learning could be explored further. The recent internationalisation efforts are impressive and have clearly given a boost to the programmes in terms of student numbers and curriculum content. The programmes are aware of the added value of having a diverse and international student population, which exposes students to different perspectives and advances their intercultural competencies. Providing additional training to staff with respect to inclusive teaching would help to bring out the full potential of the international (or, in a broader sense: mixed) classroom. Both programmes appear sufficiently feasible, with no obvious obstacles that prevent students from completing them in the designated time period. Staff members, moreover, offer sufficient guidance and are described by students as helpful and approachable. Lecturers are also knowledgeable in their fields and often involved in research that supports their teaching. For permanent staff, having a PhD and a BUTQ is seen as a prerequisite. The workload of staff is high. The panel established that this has the attention of the department management.

A point for further improvement is that the blueprint - of both the bachelor's and the master's programme - as represented by the curriculum matrix that links course-specific objectives to ILOs, requires further fine-tuning. The panel feels that the recommendations put forward by the previous panel, with respect to the formulation of learning objectives and linking them to ILOs, are - partly - still relevant. According to the panel, getting a firmer grip on the foundations that support the teaching should be a group effort. Initiating a continuous dialogue between staff members on the contribution of individual courses to the curriculum as a whole should provide a good opportunity for strengthening the sense of shared responsibility for and ownership of the curriculum.

### **Conclusion**

*Bachelor's programme History:* the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'meets the standard'.

*Master's programme History:* 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**

The bachelor's and master's programme adhere to the general principles for assessment as set out in the Assessment Policy of Erasmus University Rotterdam and the ensuing Assessment Policy of the Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication (2013). The faculty-wide policy holds that the primary purpose of assessment is to determine whether a student meets the learning objectives of the course and the ILOs of the programme as a whole. Assessment should furthermore take place by means of regular and differentiated testing that rewards active study behaviour and offers the possibility of interim feedback. Tests need to meet the quality requirements regarding transparency, reliability, validity and efficiency. In addition, the scheduling of assessments should avoid competition between the tests of parallel curriculum components.

### *Course assessment*

The panel established that both programmes have drawn up an assessment plan, in which they provide information on the forms of assessment that are used within the programme. Common types of assessment in the bachelor's programme are written exams, shorter and larger papers, research proposals, practical exercises, presentations and oral exams. Most of these tests are individual, but group presentations and collaborative research reports are also used in order for students to learn how to work in teams. Continuous feedback (from staff and fellow students) is considered important. Presentations and (shorter) papers are often formative rather than summative; students can use the feedback that they receive to identify their strengths and weaknesses and target areas that need work. Most (but not all) bachelor's courses use more than one form of examination, often a written exam in combination with a paper and a presentation. Participation in class is also usually taken into consideration in the final grade. The self-evaluation report notes that throughout the bachelor's programme there is a gradual build-up in the level of complexity of tests and the creativity that is required of students. Tests in the first year of the bachelor's programme typically measure factual knowledge and relatively simple skills. In later years, the assessment addresses more advanced cognitive levels. Courses in the final phase of the bachelor's programme tend to favour papers over written exams. The types of assessment in the master's programme are similar to those used in the bachelor's programme, with written exams further decreasing in importance and frequency and assignments/papers becoming the most prominent form of assessment. Most courses test students' knowledge and skills with a combination of one or more presentations and written assignments, including a final (summative) paper. Assessments at master's level commonly focus on students' questioning and expanding their knowledge.

From the interviews with students and the student chapter, the panel learned that students are generally content with the current assessment methods but would appreciate a bit more variation. They suggest to also include assignments that help to develop professional skills (e.g. policy papers, elevator pitches). The panel finds this a useful recommendation. After studying a number of sample tests, both from the bachelor's and the master's programme, the panel established that the level of assessment is adequate. On the whole, the panel finds that suitable assessment methods are used in both programmes. It regrets, however, that it is currently not possible to study the link between assessment types, course-specific learning objectives and ILOs at curriculum level. The curriculum matrices that are included in the assessment plans do not include information on assessment methods. The panel was informed that at course level, the use of an assessment matrix that links learning objectives, ILOs and assessment methods is required as of 2018-2019. According to the self-evaluation report, teaching staff received information and instruction on how to create such matrices. The panel applauds this development, which will create more awareness of the importance of choosing a valid assessment form. An appropriate next step would be to also include assessment methods in the curriculum matrix.

The panel established that, in order to ensure transparency, course manuals are drawn up according to a standard format, which contains details with respect to assessment forms, assessment criteria, grading factor and deadlines, and (if applicable) examination dates. Lecturers are responsible for constructing assessments. In cases where courses are taught by a team of lecturers, as is common for all courses in the first year and a good part of the courses in the second year of the bachelor's programme, the design of the course assessment is usually a joint effort. For other courses, a four-eyes principle is not automatically applied. The panel feels that the programmes would do well to introduce this principle in all courses, so that all examiners may benefit from receiving peer feedback on their tests. It was pleased to learn that the Examination Board intends to introduce mandatory peer review, in which lecturers are asked to keep a record of which colleagues were consulted and which recommendations were given. In recent years it has become customary to use answer models to heighten the reliability of grading. In the panel's opinion, this is a good development. The use of rubrics and standardised assessment forms for written assignments is not yet established practice. According to the panel, progress could and should be made in this regard, especially since students signal a lack of consistency in how different staff members use the grading scale; some lecturers are perceived as more lenient than others. Furthermore, students rightfully feel that the use of a



standardised rubric would make feedback more insightful. In the opinion of the panel, organising regular calibration sessions for staff members could be regarded as a helpful way of improving inter-rater reliability. In a general sense, the panel notes that the current system of assessment relies strongly on the professionalism and quality of the staff. Commendable as this may be, the panel believes that formal procedures could be further strengthened.

#### *Internship and thesis assessment*

The panel has paid particular attention to the assessment of bachelor's and master's internships and theses. With respect to internships it found the assessment procedures sufficiently clear. Internships are assessed by the academic supervisor, who consults with the company coach and uses a standardised form to arrive at an assessment. Aspects that are considered are (1) the quality of the internship plan, (2) the day-to-day functioning of the student as perceived by the company coach, (3) the communication with the student throughout the internship and (4) the quality of the internship report. All internships are graded on a pass/fail basis, which, the panel understands, students are not necessarily happy with. Staff members, however, convincingly argued that it would be very difficult to award grades, as this would require a level of precision that is hard to achieve given the variety of projects and internship providers, who each provide input according to their own set of standards.

The assessment of the bachelor's and master's thesis consists of two consecutive steps. Before starting their research, students submit a research proposal which has to be approved by the supervisor. After completing their research, they hand in the final thesis, which is then evaluated by both the supervisor and a second reader, with the help of a standardised assessment form. The second reader is appointed by the Examination Board, which ensures that there is sufficient variation in the combinations of supervisors and second readers. Both assessors independently fill out the assessment form, after which they compare their assessments and decide upon a provisional grade. If they cannot reach agreement on the grade (>one point difference), or in case of provisional grades between 5,5 and 6 or 8,5 and higher, the EB appoints an arbitrator. In 2017-2018, the first year that this new system was in place, there were seven cases in which an arbitrator had to be involved. According to the Examination Board, the relatively high number of cases in which the assessments of supervisor and second reader diverged, should be explained by the different standards of permanent and temporary staff. This, according to the panel, underscores the need for more calibration and peer coaching (*intervisie*) amongst staff.

Before starting the thesis, students are familiarised with the assessment criteria, either in the Bachelor Thesis Class or the Research Master Class. The different assessment forms for the bachelor's and master's theses represent the different expectations with respect to the level of depth and independence that the student needs to achieve. After completion, students receive the filled-out form, which contains sub-scores for the different criteria as well as qualitative comments. The panel is generally satisfied with the thesis procedures and finds that – with some exceptions – the assessment forms are filled out well. The assessments are comprehensible, even if the panel did not always agree with the grades that were awarded by the original assessors. For a number of bachelor's and master's theses the panel's grades were up to a point lower than the original assessors, while in other cases the panel awarded higher grades. An issue in the current system is that only the final form, which could be characterised as a synthesis of the findings of the supervisor and the second reader, is archived. There is no paper trail for the individual findings of the supervisor and the second reader, resulting in a process that is not (sufficiently) transparent. The EB intends to adjust this procedure as of 2019-2020 by ensuring that the assessment forms filled out by the supervisor and the second reader are both archived in addition to the final form. Furthermore, the EB is currently taking the initiative for revising the assessment forms, in order to make the grading more transparent and uniform. These are developments that the panel applauds.

#### *Quality assurance and Examination Board*

The quality assurance of assessment is the responsibility of the faculty-wide Examination Board. To ensure that the EB has sufficient insight into the context of the underlying programmes, it includes

two members of each Department. Since the previous assessment a number of steps have been taken to strengthen the role of the EB in safeguarding the quality of assessment. Amongst other things, the Examining Board has formulated rules and guidelines concerning testing and assessment. The Assessment Protocol, which is based on the Faculty's assessment policy, is an overarching document that provides concrete guidelines and tools for the construction, administration, assessment, and archiving of assessments. The EB has also started to monitor the quality of assessments by periodically evaluating a sample of courses. In total, it screens 16-18 courses per year, 4 of which are from the bachelor's and 2 from the master's programme in History. This selection includes new courses and courses from external professors, as well as a number of randomly selected courses. For each of the selected courses the EB studies the course guide, the exams/assignments, the answer models and (where available) the assessment matrix, in order to evaluate the level and content of the assessments as well as their validity, reliability and transparency. The panel established that the findings on the 2017-2018 sample were generally positive, although in a single case the evaluation criteria were found too general.

An important responsibility that the EB could have taken up much sooner is safeguarding the end level of the programmes by taking periodical samples of final products. The panel learned that a first check of theses completed by bachelor's and master's students is only scheduled for 2019-2020. From the interview with EB members, the panel got the impression that – over the previous period – the Examination Board has felt somewhat overwhelmed by its day-to-day activities (with regard to dealing with plagiarism and fraud, appointing examiners, giving out exemptions etc.), and did not have the capacity to fully shape its responsibilities at a higher level. The panel established that the board meets every 2-2,5 months and that members have 40 hours per year for their task in the EB, which the panel considers not many. Professionalisation efforts seem to have been limited to participating in the EUR-wide structure for exchanging information, experiences and dilemma's between EB's (by way of two-monthly meetings of all EB chairs and periodical mutual working visits).

After the site visit, the panel has given the EB the opportunity to propose improvements to its exercise of quality assurance duties. In a detailed memo the EB has set out a number of measures taken to safeguard the quality of (final) examinations. The panel is pleased with the thoroughness of the proposed measures. It concludes that, from 2019-2020 onwards, the EB intends to sample ten bachelor's theses and ten master's theses from each Department, distributed across the different specialisations, supervisors and grades. For the selected theses, the EB will assess the assessment forms, the actual theses and the Turnitin reports. Whenever irregularities in the assessment are observed, the EB will take this up with the assessors and their bachelor's or master's thesis coordinator. The same will be done when the thesis itself seems deficient on any of its main elements. In addition to the annual check of sample theses, the EB has tasked itself with a three-yearly review of the assessment plans of the individual programmes. Also, the EB plans to start assessing sample tests before they are administered and to significantly increase the sample of courses that is evaluated on their assessment practices after course completion. The panel welcomes all of these measures. Furthermore, it was pleased to learn that the EB will be given more time to fulfill its tasks and that it will be given the temporary additional support of an assessment expert. This increase in FTE's is in line with the updated EUR guidelines for strengthening the University's Examination Boards. Considering all these expected improvements, the panel is sufficiently confident that the EB will be in control of assessment quality in coming years. However, as far as the panel is concerned, a specific point of attention for the EB should be to check whether all GLOCAL students meet the standards to be awarded a EUR History Master's degree.

### **Considerations**

The panel established that the system of assessment of the bachelor's and master's programme is based on the guiding principles of the university- and faculty-wide assessment policies. As a rule, all courses use multiple and diverse assessment methods, including both formative and summative assessments. Providing students with sufficient feedback is considered important. At course level, assessment matrices are used to ensure the validity of tests, while the deployment of answer models heightens the reliability of assessment. Standardised course manuals provide students with the



necessary information with respect to assessment methods and criteria, deadlines etcetera. The quality of sample tests studied by the panel is appropriate.

In their system of assessment, the programmes strongly rely on the professionalism and quality of their staff. While the panel appreciates this principle, it feels that formal procedures could be strengthened. Opportunities for further improvement of assessment practices include the compulsory use of the four-eye principle in test design, as well as the use of standardised forms and rubrics for the assessment of written assignments. Also, the panel recommends organising peer coaching and calibration sessions for examiners, in order to establish a common assessment standard. This should help deal with the observations of both students and Examination Board that staff members have divergent expectations and interpret the assessment scale in different ways.

The procedure for assessing internships and theses is reasonably well organised and the panel generally agrees with the thesis assessments, although it found some of the scores slightly inflated and others on the low side. An issue that should be remedied is that the individual assessment forms of the supervisor and second reader are currently not archived, which interferes with the transparency of the assessment process.

The EB, which has a faculty-wide responsibility, operated too much at a distance throughout the review period. In the coming period, however, the EB plans to scale up its assessments of sample tests and introduce an extensive system for checking the quality of theses and their assessments. The EB will be compensated for these efforts by additional FTE's. Although all of these measures could ideally have been introduced sooner, the panel is sufficiently convinced that the EB is now firmly on the right track. It expects the EB to be in control of assessment quality in the coming period.

## Conclusion

*Bachelor's programme History:* the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'meets the standard'.

*Master's programme History:* 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

### *Theses*

Both programmes regard the thesis, which covers almost all of the ILOs, as their final and most important examination. Prior to the site visit, the panel studied a sample of fifteen bachelor's theses and fifteen master's theses. The sample included theses of both bachelor's tracks and master's specialisations. One of the master's theses was written by a part-time student. The sample did not include theses of GLOBAL students, as these were not yet available at the time of the site visit. For both programmes the panel concludes that the recently completed final products underline that students realise the ILOs.

With respect to the bachelor's theses the panel observes that these discuss interesting and often original topics that match the profile of the programme. In many cases theses are ambitious projects that are driven by well-defined research questions. A particular strength is that many theses explicitly and meticulously describe the research methods that were chosen. As was mentioned before, it is rare that students use social science methods, even if many theses study topics at the intersection of history and sociology, economics or political science. According to the panel this does not detract from the (often) high quality of the work. It does however underscore that claims of multidisciplinary should perhaps be toned down. Another conclusion is that the discussion of theory and historiography is often extensive, and in some cases this part of the thesis was found to slightly overshadow the analysis of the actual historical case. While the panel appreciates that students use both primary sources and literature, it would have liked to see them discuss and justify their choice of sources in

more detail, also giving more context to primary sources. Overall, however, the panel was quite satisfied with the level and content of the bachelor's theses.

The panel is also pleased with the master's theses, which show similar strengths to the bachelor's theses. Students pose relevant and interesting research questions and support their research with elaborate theoretical frameworks. Also, they convincingly justify the chosen research methodologies. At the same time, the theses also strike the panel as somewhat unbalanced. This seems to originate from the objective of combining historical research with concepts and theories from the social sciences. By giving quite a bit of attention to meta-developments, some theses tend to lose sight of historical particularities. Context-related historical studies, which could have helped to sharpen the research question and guide the analysis of sources, are sometimes overlooked in favour of grand narratives. Furthermore, the panel found that research of historical sources is not always prioritised and that heuristic imperfections are not necessarily picked up on by assessors. While the panel in no way doubts that students produce valuable work, in which they clearly demonstrate that they realise the ILOs, it does feel that assessors could be more alert to these particular aspects.

#### *Position of alumni*

The level that students achieve can also be deduced from the position of graduates in subsequent degree programmes and on the labour market. The panel found that the majority (72%) of bachelor's graduates choose to complete another degree programme (either at bachelor's or at master's level) before entering the professional field. Many of them opt for one of EUR's own master's programmes in the fields of History, Arts and Culture Studies or Media Studies. Alumni indicated to the panel that it is also quite common for bachelor's graduates to look beyond what EUR has to offer. Eventually, bachelor's and master's graduates often end up in a broad range of professions and sectors, including higher education, IT and related services, government and public services, creative industries, research and product development, media, and publishing.

The panel concludes that alumni look back on the programme with great appreciation. While some graduates that the panel spoke with hold jobs with a clear historical dimension (i.e. as secondary school history teachers), in most other cases the link is less direct – but, according to alumni, still present. Graduates were unanimous in stating that – on a daily basis – they greatly benefit from the knowledge and skills that the programmes have taught them. Being able to process, analyse and report on large amounts of data in a relatively short period of time was mentioned as a particularly useful skill. Furthermore, alumni feel that the multidisciplinary approach has served them well, by giving them an understanding of the many different perspectives from which problems can be seen and solved. The panel was impressed by the enthusiasm and commitment of alumni, all of whom indicated that they would like to be more closely involved in the programmes than is currently the case. In the panel's opinion the programmes would do well to setup an alumni policy and capitalise on the insights and experiences of graduates. The recent appointment of a new alumni officer, who is tasked with creating an alumni network and conducting an alumni survey, is a good first step.

#### **Considerations**

Based on samples of recently completed theses and a conversation with alumni, the panel concludes that both bachelor's and master's students achieve the intended learning outcomes. Theses clearly show that students are able to bring an independent research project to a successful conclusion. Generally, students formulate relevant and interesting research questions that are well embedded in the current state of affairs in a particular field. Theories and concepts receive a lot of attention, just like the justification of the methodologies used. A point of attention is the balance between historical methods and insights derived from the social sciences. Generally, the panel found that assessors could be more alert on heuristic shortcomings. Alumni are unanimously enthusiastic about the knowledge and skills that they acquired during the programmes, which they view as a solid foundation on which careers in a range of sectors can be successfully built (as attested by the career trajectories of the group with which the panel made acquaintance).



**Conclusion**

*Bachelor's programme History*: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'meets the standard'.

*Master's programme History*: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'meets the standard'.

**GENERAL CONCLUSION**

The panel assesses Standard 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the bachelor's and master's programme in History as 'meets the standard'. In accordance with the decision rules of NVAO's Framework for limited programme assessments 2018, the panel gives a positive advice on the reaccreditation of both programmes.

**Conclusion**

The panel assesses the *bachelor's programme History* as 'positive'.

The panel assesses the *master's programme History* as 'positive'.



## APPENDICES



# APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

## **Bachelor's programme History**

The graduate:

1. has knowledge and understanding of the main historical trends of various societies since 1500, within a global context;
2. is able to analyse local, regional, and global historical events and place them in a longer-term perspective.

### *Applying knowledge and understanding*

The graduate:

3. can independently find different types of source material, and critically assess it based on specific historical contexts, and link this information to relevant socio-scientific and historical theory concepts;
4. has a command of historical and socio-scientific methods and techniques;
5. is able to apply historical skills in the professional field within changing multicultural societies;

### *Making judgements*

The graduate:

6. is able to take up a position related to historical events and processes on the basis of various kinds of historiography and theoretical historical knowledge.

### *Communication*

The graduate:

7. can present academic reports, both orally and in writing, on findings from literature study and the graduate's own research;
8. has knowledge of the impact of historical processes in multicultural societies and is able to introduce these critically into various discussions taking place within a societal context;

### *Learning skills*

The graduate:

9. is able to conduct a small-scale research project based on primary sources and secondary literature.

## **Master's programme History**

### *Knowledge and understanding*

The graduate:

- possesses thorough knowledge of global historical development with respect to local and regional perspectives;
- is able to compare and analyse historical phenomena and processes in time and space with each other;
- is able to examine the past using theories and perspectives from the social sciences and the humanities;

### *Applying knowledge and understanding*

The graduate:

- can apply research results to academic debates, particularly those of the science of history;
- can interpret current debates and developments in the world in a historical manner, evaluate them and take a well-argued stand on them;

### *Judgment*

The graduate:

- masters academic and critical ways of thinking
- is able to formulate academically sound conclusions on the basis of historical sources;



- is capable of formulating his/her own point of view on important historical debates within academia, as well as on debates within the philosophy of history, particularly in the area of the master's thesis;

#### *Communication*

The graduate:

- can report on academic conclusions both orally and in writing, to experts and laypeople on the basis of secondary literature and original studies of sources;
- can write a report that complies with historical academic prerequisites:
  - formulates researchable research questions with possible hypotheses,
  - situates the topic in historiographical debates,
  - applies theoretical ideas while taking into account the historical context,
  - provides clear composition of the thesis,
  - provides adequate argumentation when answering the questions with the help of historical data,
  - accounts for the historical data in a verifiable manner;

#### *Learning skills*

The graduate:

- can independently investigate primary source material, using qualitative and/or quantitative research methods;
- can independently and creatively apply academic understanding and skills in academic and professional contexts;
- possesses the oral and written skills to communicate historical knowledge and the results of (own) historical research in a distinct and committed way to both colleagues and the wider public.

Adjusted ILOs master's programme History (Autumn 2019)

	<b>DD 1: Knowledge and comprehension</b>
<b>ILO</b>	<i>Graduates will be able to:</i>
<b>1</b>	<b>explain (CG)</b> long-term developments in early modern and modern cultural history, in particular developments in political culture and historical culture; <b>(GHIR)</b> long-term developments in the history of empire and states in the context of world history, in particular the geopolitical dimension of modern international relations; <b>(GLOCAL)</b> long-term developments of glocalization in modern society, in particular the dynamics of global and local processes in globalizing urban contexts
<b>2</b>	analyse spatial and temporal variations in historical developments with different methodological approaches
<b>3</b>	identify key theoretical insights, empirical studies, and current scientific discussions concerning historiography and related social sciences, in particular <b>(CG)</b> cultural history, cultural theory and the public sphere, <b>(GHIR)</b> international relations and global history, <b>(GLOCAL)</b> urban studies and creative industries.
	<b>DD 2: Implementation knowledge and comprehension</b>
	<i>Graduates will be able to:</i>
<b>4</b>	formulate relevant research questions concerning the fields of <b>CG, GHIR and GLOCAL</b>
<b>5</b>	analyse historical data (concerning the fields of <b>CG, GHIR and GLOCAL</b> ) by making use of a broad range of interdisciplinary research skills
<b>6</b>	evaluate current debates and developments in the world in a historical manner and take a well-argued stand on them
<b>7</b>	independently conduct research in the field of history by applying qualitative and/or quantitative research methods and report this in a clearly structured manner.
	<b>DD 3: Judgement</b>
	<i>Graduates are able to:</i>
<b>8</b>	demonstrate academic and critical ways of thinking both orally and in writing
<b>9</b>	draw academically sound conclusions on the basis of historical evidence
<b>10</b>	formulate their own point of view on important empirical and theoretical academic debates in an ethical way, particularly in the area of the master's thesis.
	<b>DD 4: Communication</b>
	<i>Graduates will be able to:</i>
<b>11</b>	explain historical developments and the results of historical research both orally and in writing to professionals in the historical field and to the wider public (e.g. museum exhibitions, articles in newspapers and other media)
<b>12</b>	write a report that complies with historical academic prerequisites (including the formulation of sound research questions, a literature review, an application of theory to empirical cases, a clear structure and composition, an adequate argumentation supported by empirical evidence, and proper annotation).
	<b>DD 5: Learning ability</b>
	<i>Graduates will be able to:</i>
<b>13</b>	evaluate complex theses from the field of history and demonstrate awareness of international and cultural variations
<b>14</b>	independently and creatively apply academic skills in academic and professional contexts outside the historical field.



## APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

### Bachelor's programme History

The programme comprises the following compulsory components with the corresponding study load:

BACHELOR 1	code	60 EC
Global History	CH1101	7,5 EC
Heuristic Skills and Sources	CH1104	7,5 EC
History of Early Modern Societies	CH1103	7,5 EC
Rethinking History 1	CH1102	7,5 EC
History of Modern Societies	CH1105	7,5 EC
History and Social Sciences	CH1106	7,5 EC
Dutch History in a Globalizing World	CH1107	7,5 EC
Bachelor-1 Paper	CH1108	7,5 EC

BACHELOR 2		
MAJOR	code	45 EC
<b>Theory and Methods (mandatory)</b>		
- Rethinking History 2	CH2217	7,5 EC
- Quantitative Historical Methods	CH2216	7,5 EC
<b>Focus Areas</b>		
The student chooses one of the four Focus Area's:		30 EC
<b>Economic History (EH)</b>		
- Economic History	CH2201	7,5 EC
- International Business and Nation-states	CH2202	7,5 EC
- Emerging Economies and Global Labour	CH2203	7,5 EC
- Capitalism and Inequality	CH2204	7,5 EC
<b>International Relations (IR)</b>		
- International Relations	CH2201	7,5 EC
- International Business and Nation-states	CH2202	7,5 EC
- Migration, Citizenship and Identity in Global History	CH2205	7,5 EC
- Religion, Culture and Global Encounters	CH2206	7,5 EC
<b>Cultural History (CH)</b>		
- Social and Cultural History	CH2207	7,5 EC
- Historical Representation and Imagination	CH2208	7,5 EC
- Migration, Citizenship and Identity in Global History	CH2205	7,5 EC
- Religion, Culture and Global Encounters	CH2206	7,5 EC
<b>Social History (SH)</b>		
- Social and Cultural History	CH2207	7,5 EC
- Historical Representation and Imagination	CH2208	7,5 EC
- Emerging Economies and Global Labour	CH2203	7,5 EC
- Capitalism and Inequality	CH2204	7,5 EC

BACHELOR 2		
<b>ELECTIVES</b>		<b>15 EC</b>
<b>Electives</b> The student takes <u>two</u> electives amounting to 15 EC		15 EC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Total War</i> CH2209 7,5 EC</li> <li>- <i>Representing War in popular historical culture</i> CH2210 7,5 EC</li> <li>- <i>Urban History: Rotterdam in Global Perspective</i> CH2211 7,5 EC</li> <li>- <i>Erasmus and Grotius on Islam and Judaism</i> CH2213 7,5 EC</li> <li>- <i>Historical Databases: Demography and Social Mobility</i> CH2214 7,5 EC</li> <li>- <i>History behind Writing</i> CH2215B 7,5 EC</li> <li>- <i>Geschiedenis van het Schrift</i> CH2215A 7,5 EC</li> <li>- <i>Mobility and constructing identities in the context of globalization</i> CH2219 7,5 EC</li> <li>- <i>Historical Representation and Imagination (elective for the Focus Areas EH and IR)</i> CH2208 7,5 EC</li> <li>- <i>International Business and Nation-states (elective for the Focus Areas CH and SH)</i> CH2202 7,5 EC</li> </ul>		
The student is also allowed to take electives from ACW or IBACS, IBCoM or other bachelor programmes at the EUR or another university. An overview of options is provided on the programme website. The course may not be of an introductory level.		
<b>EXTRA CURRICULAIR</b>		
<b>History Honours Class</b> (extracurricular class for selected students)	CH2100	15 EC

BACHELOR 3		
<b>MAJOR</b>	<b>code</b>	<b>22,5 EC</b>
<b>Thesis / Final project</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bachelor Thesis Class within the subjects followed in BA-2 CH30xx 7,5 EC</li> <li>- Bachelor Thesis CH3100 15 EC</li> </ul>		
<b>OPTION 1</b>	<b>code</b>	<b>37,5 EC</b>
<b>Minor</b> The student chooses one minor from those offered by EUR*, Delft or Leiden.		15 EC
<b>The Public Role of Historians</b>	CH3051	7,5 EC
<b>Internship</b>	CH2020	15 EC
<b>OPTION 2</b>	<b>code</b>	<b>37,5 EC</b>
<b>Studying abroad</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Studying abroad</li> </ul> <i>If the student opts to study abroad, the minor lapses (15 EC). Dependent on the content and scope of the programme followed abroad, these programmes may replace certain courses or the internship. This will be assessed by the Examination Board.</i>		30 EC
<b>OR</b> <b>Vocational minor</b> <i>* Students may also opt to follow an Educational Minor with a scope of 30 EC. The internship of 15 EC will then be replaced by a practical internship of 15 EC as part of the Educative Minor. In addition, they will take courses within this minor with a scope of 15 EC.</i>		

<b>Extra electives</b> The student should choose one course from:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Emerging Economies and Global Labour (CH2203)</li> <li>- Migration, Citizenship and Identity in Global History (CH2205)</li> </ul>		7,5 EC

\* The complete offer of EUR minors can be found on the website <http://www.eur.nl/english/minor/>

## Master's programme History

### Master's programme History of Society 2018-2019

#### Specialisatie Geschiedenis van Nederland in een Mondiale Context

---

##### Thematische Seminars 20 credits

- Publieke opinie in de Nederlanden 1600-heden 10 credits
- Historical Culture in a Globalizing World 5 credits
- Rotterdamse verhalen uit een (post-)koloniale wereld 5 credits

##### Research Workshop (*students choose one subject*) 10 credits

Keuze uit:

- Reizigers in tijd en ruimte: egodocumenten 1600-1940
- Vensters op de wereld
- History, Memory and National Identity
- Maritime History and Port Cities

##### Keuzevakken (*students choose two electives*) 10 credits

Keuze uit:

- Globalization and the Making of Europe, 1850-present 5 credits
- Text and Context: From Source to Science 5 credits
- Traveling Things: the making of Heritage in Different Educational Contexts 5 credits
- Onderzoekstage 5 credits

##### Master's Thesis 20 credits

#### Specialization Global History and International Relations

---

##### Thematic Seminars 20 credits

- Mapping Global Order 10 credits
- Historical Culture in a Globalizing World 5 credits
- International Relations Theories 5 credits

##### Research Workshop (*students choose one subject*) 10 credits

Options:

- The Rise and Fall of the American Empire
- History of Cultural Difference
- History, Memory and National Identity
- Maritime History and Port Cities
- Histories of Local Creativities

##### Electives (*students choose two electives*) 10 credits

Options:

- Text and Context: from Source to Science 5 credits
- Globalizing and the making of Europe, 1850-present 5 credits
- Traveling Things: the making of Heritage in Different Educational Contexts 5 credits
- Spaces and Places of Fashion 5 credits
- Research Internship 5 credits

##### Master's Thesis 20 credits



**Programme History of Society for GLOCAL students**

<b>Thematic Seminars</b>	<b>20 credits</b>
• Mapping Global Order	10 credits
• Creative Industries in the Global Economy	5 credits
• International Relations Theories	5 credits
• Creative Industries of the Global Economy	5 credits
<b>Electives</b>	<b>10 credits</b>
<u>Options:</u>	
• Text and Context: from Source to Science	5 credits
• Globalizing and the making of Europe, 1850-present	5 credits
• Traveling Things: the making of Heritage in Different Educational Contexts	5 credits
• Spaces and Places of Fashion	5 credits
• Research Internship	5 credits
<b>Master's Thesis</b>	<b>30 credits</b>
• Research Workshop	10 credits
<u>Options:</u>	
• The Rise and Fall of the American Empire	
• History of Cultural Difference	
• History, Memory and National Identity	
• Maritime History and Port Cities	
• Histories of Local Creativities	
• Master's Thesis	20 credits

## APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

### Donderdag 27 juni

10.45 – 11.00	Aankomst en welkom
11.00 – 12.30	Intern overleg en inzage documentatie
12.30 – 13.00	Lunch
13.00 – 13.45	<b>Interview inhoudelijk verantwoordelijken</b>
13.45 – 14.00	Uitloop /pauze
14.00 – 14.45	<b>Interview studenten bachelor</b> (incl. OC-lid)
14.45 – 15.30	<b>Interview docenten bachelor</b> (incl. OC-lid)
15.30 – 15.45	Pauze / intern overleg
15.45 – 16.30	<b>Interview studenten master</b> (incl. OC-lid)
16.30 – 17.15	<b>Interview docenten master</b> (incl. OC-lid)
17.15 – 17.30	Pauze
17.30 – 18.00	<b>Interview alumni</b>

### Vrijdag 28 juni

09.00 – 10.00	Aankomst en voorbereiding
10.00 – 10.45	<b>Interview examencommissie</b>
10.45 – 11.30	Intern overleg
11.30 – 12.15	<b>Slotinterview formeel verantwoordelijken</b>
12.15 – 12.45	Lunch
12.45 – 14.15	Opstellen oordelen
14.15 – 14.30	<b>Mondelinge terugkoppeling</b>
14.30 – 14.45	Pauze
14.45 – 15.30	<b>Ontwikkelgesprek</b>
15.30 – 15.45	Afronding

## APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied 15 theses of the bachelor's programme History and 15 theses of the master's programme History. Information on the selected theses is available from QANU upon request.

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):

- Annual report Examination Board 2016-2017
- Annual report Examination Board 2017-2018
- Annual report Programme Committee 2016-2017
- Annual report Programme Committee 2017-2018
- Assessment Protocol Examination Board ESHCC
- ESHCC Assessment Policy
- ESHCC Educational Quality Assurance System
- ESHCC Educational Policy Plan 2019-2023
- Educational vision EUR
- Educational vision ESHCC
- Education Figures 2017-2018
- Mentor guide 2018-2019
- Documentation of selected courses:
  - *Global History* (BA-1);
  - *Quantitative Historical Methods* (BA-2);
  - *Rethinking History 2* (BA-2);
  - *Europe in a Globalizing World: Migration*;
  - *Citizenship and Identity* (BA-2);
  - *International Business and Nation States* (BA-2);
  - *Mapping Global Order* (MA GHIR);
  - *Publieke Opinie in de Nederlanden, 1500-heden* (MA GNMC);
  - *Historical Culture in a Globalizing World* (MA GHIR en GNMC).
- Some examples of assignments
- List of partner universities (exchange)
- Stage handleiding BA Geschiedenis 2018-2019
- Internship Manual IB History 2018-2019
- Inhoud Educatieve minor Geschiedenis 2018-2019
- Samenwerkingsovereenkomst ESHCC en ICLON augustus 2017
- GLOCAL Consortium Agreement 2017
- Domeinspecifiek referentiekader Geschiedenis 2014

