



**RESEARCH MASTER'S  
PROGRAMME  
CLASSICS AND ANCIENT  
CIVILIZATIONS**

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES  
**LEIDEN UNIVERSITY**

Qanu  
Catharijnesingel 56  
3511 GE 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: Q0771

© 2021 Qanu

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

# CONTENTS

REPORT ON THE RESEARCH MASTER'S PROGRAMME CLASSICS AND ANCIENT CIVILIZATIONS OF LEIDEN UNIVERSITY .....	4
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME .....	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION.....	5
COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL.....	5
WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL .....	6
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	10
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENTS.....	5
GENERAL CONCLUSION .....	29
APPENDICES.....	5
APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES .....	33
APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM .....	37
APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE ONLINE VISIT.....	41
APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL.....	45

This report was finalised on 16 July 2021



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

This report makes use of the NVAO's *Assessment Framework for the Higher Education Accreditation System of the Netherlands* (September 2018) and the *Specification of Additional Criteria for Research Master's Programmes* (May 2016). It takes the criteria for limited programme assessments as its starting point, supplemented by the additional aspects for research master's programmes.

## ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

### Research master's programme Archaeology

Name of the programme:	Oudheidstudies (research)
International name:	Classics and Ancient Civilizations (research)
CROHO number:	60039
Level of the programme:	master's level
Orientation of the programme:	academic research master
Number of credits:	120 EC
Specialisations:	Assyriology Classics Egyptology Hebrew and Aramaic Studies
Location:	Leiden
Mode of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	English
Submission deadline NVAO:	01/11/2020, extension submission date until 31/10/2021 due to legislation WHW art. 5.16 lid 4

The online assessment of the research master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations of Leiden University took place on 3-5 February 2021.

## ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

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

## COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The NVAO has approved the composition of the panel on 2 June 2020. The panel that assessed the research master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations consisted of:

- Prof. dr. K. (Kristoffel) Demoen, professor Ancient Greek Literature at Ghent University (Belgium) [panel chair Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and Leiden University];
- Prof. dr. T. (Thomas) Meier, professor for Pre- and Protohistory and executive director of the Heidelberg Center for the Environment at Heidelberg University (Germany);
- Em. prof. dr. phil. J.U. (Jens-Uwe) Hartmann, professor Indian and Iranian Studies at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in München (Germany);

- Em. prof. dr. J.F. (John) Healey, emeritus professor in Semitic Studies at the University of Manchester (United Kingdom);
- Prof. dr. E.H.M. (Helena) Houvenaghel, professor Spanish Language and Culture at Utrecht University;
- Dr. G. (Gerhard) Anders, senior lecturer African Studies and International Development at the Centre of African Studies of the University of Edinburgh (United Kingdom);
- Y.P. (Yannick) de Raaff, MA, recent graduate of the research master Archaeology at the University of Groningen [student member].

The panel was supported by Dr. E. (Els) Schröder, who acted as secretary and project coordinator. Dr. I. (Irene) Conradie and V. (Victor) van Kleef MA supported the panel and secretary as notulists during the site visit.

## WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The online site visit to the research master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations at the Faculty of Humanities of Leiden University was part of the cluster assessment Archaeology, Classics and Ancient Civilizations and Region Studies. The following universities participated in this cluster assessment: University of Groningen, University of Amsterdam, Leiden University and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.

On behalf of the participating universities, quality assurance agency Qanu was responsible for logistical support, panel guidance and the production of the reports. Dr. E. (Els) Schröder was project coordinator for Qanu. Dr. E. (Els) Schröder (Leiden University, University of Groningen and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam) and V. (Victor) van Kleef MA, (University of Amsterdam) acted as secretaries in the cluster assessment. Dr. I. (Irene) Conradie acted as notulists during the site visit at Leiden University.

The nine programmes of the four universities were scheduled to be assessed between April 2020 and June 2020. Unfortunately, the COVID-19 outbreak made site visits impossible, and all assessments, except that of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, were rescheduled for more suitable dates in the second half of 2020 and 2021. The project coordinator and the representatives of the programmes agreed to schedule digital assessments.

### *Panel members*

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

- Prof. J. (Jacqueline) Mulville, professor in Bioarchaeology and Director of Research and Impact at the School of History, Archaeology and Religion of Cardiff University (United Kingdom) [panel chair University of Amsterdam and University of Groningen];
- Prof. dr. K. (Kristoffel) Dempo, professor Ancient Greek Literature at Ghent University (Belgium) [panel chair Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and Leiden University];
- Dr. G. (Gerhard) Anders, senior lecturer African Studies and International Development at the Centre of African Studies of the University of Edinburgh (United Kingdom);
- Dr. K. (Kim) Beerden, University Lecturer at the Institute for History of Leiden University;
- Prof. dr. M.B.H. (Martin) Everaert, professor Linguistics at Utrecht University;
- Em. prof. dr. phil. J.U. (Jens-Uwe) Hartmann, professor Indian and Iranian Studies at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in München (Germany);
- Prof. dr. J. (Johannes) Haubold, professor of Classics at Princeton University (United States);
- Em. prof. dr. J.F. (John) Healey, emeritus professor in Semitic Studies at the University of Manchester (United Kingdom);
- Prof. D. (Dan) Hicks, professor of Contemporary Archaeology at Oxford University (United Kingdom);
- Prof. dr. E.H.M. (Helena) Houvenaghel, professor Spanish Language and Culture at Utrecht University;
- Prof. dr. T. (Thomas) Meier, professor for Pre- and Protohistory and director of the Käthe Hamburger Center for Apocalyptic and Post-Apocalyptic Studies at Heidelberg University (Germany);

- Prof. dr. E.M. (Eric) Moormann, professor of Classical Archaeology at Radboud University;
- Prof. dr. J. (Jeroen) Poblome, professor Classical Archaeology and director of the Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project (Belgium);
- Y.P. (Yannick) de Raaff, MA, recent graduate research master Archaeology at the University of Groningen [student member].
- R. (Rory) Granleese, BA, research master student Archaeology at Leiden University [student member].

#### *Preparation*

Planning for the cluster assessment started in October 2019. On 13 March 2020, Prof. dr. K. Demoen was briefed by Qanu on his role as panel chair, the assessment framework, the working method, and the planning of the site visits and reports. Prior to the assessment, the panel members received instructions on the use of the assessment framework and the planning of the (online) site visits and reports.

Before the online site visit to the Leiden University, Qanu received the self-evaluation report of the programme and sent it to the panel. In January 2020, the panel received a report on the measures taken to assure the quality of teaching and assessment during the Covid-19 pandemic. The thesis selection consisted of fifteen theses and their assessment forms for the programme, based on a provided list of graduates between 2018 and 2020. In addition, the panel studied two theses and assessment forms that were completed in the second half of 2020.

#### *Online assessment*

At the end of March 2020, it became clear that due to COVID-19, all universities would be closed until further notice. Leiden University indicated an interest in organising a digital site visit. The project coordinator asked the panel chair, Prof. dr. K. Demoen, whether he would be willing to lead a digital assessment. He consented to chairing a digital assessment on 3 April 2020. The panel members involved also confirmed their consent in partaking in a digital assessment. Their messages of consent have been archived by Qanu and can be provided upon request.

For Leiden University, it was decided that the online assessment of the programme would take place on 3, 4 and 5 February 2021, but only if the panel chair confirmed that no hindrances were found in the documentation that would require an actual site visit based on the study of existing documents, a so-called 'go/no go-decision'. After studying the existing documentation, the panel chair communicated a 'go' to the project coordinator/secretary on 1 December 2020.

After studying the self-evaluation report, theses and assessment forms, the panel members formulated their preliminary findings and questions. The project coordinator/secretary collected all initial questions and remarks and distributed them amongst all panel members. Two preparatory panel meetings were organised. A first on 10 December 2020, a second on 18 January 2021. During these meetings, the panel discussed its initial findings based on the self-evaluation report and the theses, as well as the division of tasks during the site visit.

The project coordinator/secretary composed a schedule for the online assessment in consultation with the policy officers of the Faculty of Humanities and the Faculty of Archaeology at Leiden University and the panel chair. Prior to the assessment, the Programme Board selected representative partners for the various interviews. See Appendix 3 for the final schedule. Also, a digital protocol was drawn up by Leiden University with input from the project coordinator/secretary and panel chair. This protocol discussed the ways in which communication during the interviews would be organised to guarantee that all interviewees and panel members would be able to speak freely and add whatever seemed important to the conversation. Leiden University provided the necessary software to enable a digital site visit and development dialogue, including a fall-back option in case the digital environment malfunctioned. This back-up option was never used.

### *Site visit*

The site visit to Leiden University took place on 3, 4 and 5 February 2021 by digital means. Before and during the site visit, the panel studied the additional documents provided by the programme. An overview of these materials can be found in Appendix 4. The panel conducted interviews with representatives of the programme and other parties involved: students and staff members, the faculty's Board and the programme's Board, alumni, representatives of the Board of Examiners and representatives of the relevant research institutes. It also offered students and staff members an opportunity for a confidential discussion during a consultation hour ahead of the digital site visit. Qanu stipulated a digital environment for this meeting in order to guarantee privacy. No requests for a 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 its preliminary findings and general observations. This last digital time slot could be accessed by anyone wishing to attend.

### *Development dialogues*

Five digital development dialogues were scheduled at the following dates:

- 2 March 2021: research master's programme African Studies;
- 3 March 2021: research master's programmes Middle Eastern Studies and Asian Studies (combined);
- 8 March 2021: research master's programme Latin American Studies;
- 18 March 2021: research master's programmes Classics and Archaeology (separate discussions).

For the dialogues, the programmes at Leiden University prepared an agenda. At least three representatives of the panel took part in each dialogue. The outcomes of the development dialogue have been drawn up separately, and confirmed by the panel representatives. These documents are not part of the application for accreditation.

### *Consistency and calibration*

In order to ensure the consistency of assessment within the cluster, various measures were taken:

1. The panel composition ensured regular attendance of key panel members, including the chairs;
2. The coordinator was present at the start of all site visits as well as at the panel discussion leading to the preliminary findings for all site visits within the cluster assessment;
3. Calibration meetings were scheduled on 25 September 2020 and 17 December 2020, in which the two chairs discussed the approach to digital assessment and how to reach conclusions regarding the quality of the assessed programmes.

### *Working method during site visit*

For Qanu, a team of NVAO-accredited secretaries was appointed to take notes during the site visit in parallel sessions. Involved were: Dr. I. (Irene) Conradie (notulist during the site visit), V. (Victor) van Kleef, MA (notulist during the site visit) and Dr. E. (Els) Schröder (project coordinator/secretary). The notulists attended the preparatory meetings (December 2020/January 2021). During the site visit, the notulists and secretary attended the relevant panel discussions and the presentation of the findings. The meetings of the various interviews were shared, prior to writing the reports. The project coordinator acted as active secretary, assuring overview during the site visit. She is also the secretary of all six reports. For a division of task, see the programme for the site visit (Appendix 3).

### *Report*

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



### *Definition of judgement standards*

In accordance with the NVAO's *Assessment Framework for the Higher Education Accreditation System of the Netherlands* (September 2018) 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.

For research master's programmes, the aspects as listed in the *Specification of Additional Criteria for Research Master's Programmes* (May 2016) are considered as supplementary to the criteria in this framework and are assessed accordingly.

## SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

The research master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations offers a two-year research-oriented programme of 120 EC. The majority of the teaching staff is affiliated with the Leiden University Institute for Area Studies (LIAS), the Leiden University Centre for Linguistics (LUCL) and the Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society (LUCAS). In June 2019, LIAS was assessed for the period of 2012-2017 using the Standard Evaluation Protocol. It scored 'excellent/world leading' (1) for research quality. LUCL was reviewed in 2018 for the period 2012-2017, and was assessed 'very good' (2) for research quality. The LUCAS assessment committee assessed it as 'very good' (2) in 2018; it identified Classics in 2018 as the strong cluster of LUCAS for its individual quality and its coherence. Some staff members are affiliated with the Leiden University Institute for Philosophy (LUIP) and/or Leiden University Institute for History (LUIH). These institutes were also assessed for the period 2012-2017 in 2018, as 'very good' (2) and 'excellent/world leading' (1), respectively, for research quality. According to the panel, these high scores testify to the staff members' research credentials and their excellent international reputation. It offers students in the research master's programme a relevant and valuable research environment and embedment.

### *Standard 1*

The panel found that the research master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations aspires to deliver specialised researchers with knowledge of both disciplinary and interdisciplinary aspects of their field and with highly advanced academic and professional skills. The programme's interdisciplinary take and the combination of subjects taught jointly stand out in an international context. It brings together a rich array of disciplines and fields and stands out for the attention paid to languages. The panel also noted a strong tradition of research in material culture. This research may benefit from increased collaboration with the Faculty of Archaeology, which the panel heartily recommends. It was impressed by the way in which the programme acted upon earlier recommendations to bring the specialisations together in a shared profile and vision. In particular, it appreciates the move by Hebrew and Aramaic Studies to create a better fit with the other tracks within the programme. It considers this move necessary. Hence, it asks for the support of all relevant university bodies involved to strengthen the steps taken and to maintain an environment in which this track could move on to further diversification.

Based on its study of the intended learning outcomes (ILOs), the panel concluded that they compare favourably with similar international ones in terms of the target achievement level. It verified that the ILOs are aligned with the Dublin descriptors at the master's level and pay sufficient attention to the training of research skills at the required attainment level for a research-oriented programme. In this way, the ILOs tie in with the level and orientation of the programme and with international requirements. The programme's objectives offer the students a relatively rare set of skills that positively influences their chances for acquiring a successful career, especially within their fields in academia but also in other professional contexts. The panel acknowledges that the programme took earlier suggestions to reformulate and refine the ILOs to heart. It encourages the programme to continue polishing its ILOs to help the students to better define the skills and level of knowledge obtained. In particular, the acquisition of transferable skills and the skills related to knowledge acquisition could be made more explicit in this regard, which would also make the programme's connection to the expectations of the professional job market more transparent. The panel also recommends formulating a learning outcome highlighting the target level in written communication.

### *Standard 2*

The research master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations has adequately translated its ILOs into a coherent curriculum for all four tracks, offering opportunities for specialisation while also living up to its interdisciplinary aims. The students interact with theory from multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary angles at an advanced level, and methodology training is fully integrated into the curriculum design. The new skills training, designed in response to recommendations made by the previous assessment panel, is considered of very good quality by the panel. The differentiation between the master's level and research master's level is adequately designed. The panel recommends including the thesis tutorial in the thesis contract to better manage expectations for the tutorial and to create greater consistency between the various practices currently used. In general, it

considers the programme very open to suggestions. In particular, it wants to commend the Programme Committee on its active role in the programme, which truly results in further strengthening of the programme's course offerings. It concluded that the programme is feasible and that a good system of guidance and support is available to students. In the past, some deadline clashes occurred in particular tracks, but the Programme Committee and Board are taking adequate action, as the panel concluded.

The panel endorses the programme's ambitions to create additional opportunities for international exchange similar to the current model employed in the Egyptology track, which it considers an attractive feature of this particular track. It also recommends exploring new ideas inspired by the programme's own measures taken in response to the lockdown. In particular, exchange with museums and institutions involved in archaeological research could provide new opportunities. The Leiden research environment for students is excellent. The panel verified that the facilities are top of the range, and many interesting collaborations with both cultural institutions and professional organisations are available to the students. A suggestion could be to extend these collaborations to the Faculty of Archaeology with its world-class facilities. In generally, the panel considers the measures taken by the programme in reaction to Covid-19 fitting and in line with its aims.

The staff members cover all necessary disciplines, and their research abilities are a credit to the programme. The panel shares the staff members' concern regarding the potential threat that upcoming retirements may bring to the availability of expertise that now so positively influences the quality of the teaching-learning environment. It found that the students are very positive about the enthusiasm, helpfulness and accessibility of their teachers as well as the study guidance. This positive student feedback also underlines the didactic skills of the teachers involved in teaching in the programme. In particular, the enthusiasm of the staff in the Classics track to try out new teaching models in the classroom is considered best practice by the panel. The staff's teaching credentials and proficiency in English are also up to standard. By offering the programme in English, an international classroom setting is achieved that is challenging and meets the expectations of the professional field. The panel concludes that the programme is well-placed for selecting suitable candidates and that its admission criteria are fair and sufficiently transparent. For the Hebrew and Aramaic Studies track, it endorses the ambitions that the programme formulated with respect to its reorientation. This should lead to continuous diversification of the course offering. Combined with the active recruitment of suitable candidates, this will hopefully also result in a larger intake in this track.

### *Standard 3*

The panel verified that the research master's programme CAC has a well-functioning system of assessment that benefits from the quality culture at the Faculty and the demonstrated effort of staff members at the programme to raise quality standards. The existing assessment policies and protocols in the programme are of good quality. The panel verified that these policies are not only accepted and implemented at the programme, but that the programme also actively contributed to the creation of some of them. The assessment methods used are considered suitable to test the students' abilities, skills and knowledge at the desired research master's level. Differentiation in assessment methods in modules shared with the one-year master's programme is closely monitored and tailored to the learning objectives of the research master's programme. The panel was pleased by the clear evidence of the willingness to diversify assessment. In particular, the variety in written assessment types in the Classics track was considered inspiring. The panel encourages the programme to also consider adding some additional variety that is based on student involvement and group work, for example peer-review exercises and group presentations.

The panel wants to compliment the Board of Examiners for its keen awareness of the diplomacy needed to advance the quality culture in assessment. Due to the Board's careful handling of procedures and the implementation of necessary changes, the existing quality culture at the programme level improved over the period of assessment to a good level while also ensuring the staff members' willingness to co-operate and change existing practices. As a result, the assessment is transparently organised and solidly grounded in shared Faculty practices, while also acknowledging the extra administrative burden that new procedures sometimes present at their implementation. The panel verified that the members of the Board of Examiners fulfil their formal tasks and responsibilities and work

according to transparent procedures. It encourages the Faculty to continue monitoring the Board of Examiners' workload and to pay attention to the continuous need for sufficient secretarial support. It concluded that the programme has an adequate system of student assessment in place that benefits from the good work of the Board of Examiners and the staff working at the various programmes under its remit.

The quality of the assessments at the programme is considered high. The evaluation of theses is fair and transparent. Grades are reasonable and a fair reflection of the variations in quality. However, the panel invites the programme to start using the full grading scale in line with international practices and expectations, especially at the higher end of the scale. Based on its findings, coherent feedback practices on course assignments in the specialisations are a point for attention in the coming period. The panel fully trusts the programme to act upon this finding, as the Board of Examiners is already actively monitoring and encouraging more consistency. In addition, it sees room for some minor improvements. The transparency of the assessment could be strengthened by the creation of a more detailed marking scheme for thesis assessment. In addition, the programme is advised to introduce a qualitative reflection on the publishability of parts of the thesis on the assessment form for research master theses.

#### *Standard 4*

The panel concluded that graduates of all four tracks of the research master's programme CAC meet the intended learning outcomes at the required level for a research master's degree. Theses written by recent graduates offer a good representation of the research expertise and interests available in Leiden in the study of Classics and Ancient Civilizations. They embody all elements of the research cycle: from the formulation of a research question to the output of a written report that offers sufficient grounds for publication upon reworking into a suitable format. In their thesis, students have amply proved that they are able to set up an independent research project of high academic quality, and they are able to convey their findings in a suitable manner. The panel also verified that many theses provided leads for future research and publications, which has also been confirmed by PhD positions awarded and actual publications in well-regarded journals and essay collections. It considered many of the studied theses impressive in terms of their thoroughness and creativity, offering perspectives and insights that are relevant for the field. Graduates considered the programme a good preparation for their future careers and also performed well upon graduation, securing relevant positions in academia and beyond. In this way, the intended learning outcomes are convincingly met, including the criteria of the additional framework for research master's programmes.

The panel assesses the standards from the NVAO's *Assessment Framework for the Higher Education Accreditation System of the Netherlands* for limited programme assessments, in accordance with the aspects included in the *Specification of Additional Criteria for Research Master's Programmes*, in the following way:

#### *Research master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations*

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

The chair, Prof. dr. K. Demoen, and the secretary of the panel, Dr. E. Schröder, hereby declare that all panel members have studied this report and that they agree with the judgements laid down in it. They confirm that the assessment has been conducted in accordance with the demands relating to independence.

Date: 16 July 2021

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

### **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**

The research master's degree in Classics and Ancient Civilizations (CAC) at Leiden University aims to provide its students with the skills and knowledge to become capable researchers in one of the disciplines of its four tracks (Assyriology, Classics, Egyptology, or Hebrew and Aramaic Studies) and the interdisciplinary aspects of their specialisation. In geographical terms, the programme covers the areas of Egypt, Mesopotamia, Anatolia, Syria and Palestine, Greece and the Roman Empire (especially in the Mediterranean world). In chronological terms, it covers thousands of years, from the early origins of Egyptian and Sumerian societies down to the world of ancient Greece and Rome, including its modern reception from the Renaissance to the twenty-first century. Access to the classical and ancient world is primarily gained through the study of primary sources in material culture and in the original languages: Ancient Egyptian, Demotic, Coptic, Sumerian, Akkadian, Hittite, Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek and Latin, and other languages if appropriate. Along with this linguistic approach, the programme firmly adopts a multi- and interdisciplinary approach to gain advanced knowledge of the field of study. The students engage with the principal concepts, heuristic instruments, research methods and techniques from multiple disciplines, including philology, linguistics, literary studies, material culture, archaeology, economic, social and legal history, philosophy, religious studies, and reception studies. Through this training they acquire a critical research attitude and the ability to position their own research in relevant scientific debates as well as conduct independent research.

The research master's profile and aims are unique within the Dutch academic landscape, the panel established. Egyptology, Assyriology, and Hebrew and Aramaic Studies are only taught in Leiden and benefit from the unique research environment available there. The combination of disciplines taught jointly is also distinctive in an international context, as is the wide range of subject matter and the broad coverage of historical periods. The panel considers the programme's interdisciplinary position very valuable to the discipline. The language-based approach sets it apart from other Dutch research master's programmes with a focus on the classical and ancient world. The students and alumni of the programme are aware of the value of this language-based approach. During the site visit, the students indicated they had chosen the Leiden research master's programme for its distinct expertise in languages and rich research culture. Graduates who continued in academia confirmed their advanced ability to work with materials in the original languages. They considered their linguistic capability as beneficial for advancement in their further careers, a viewpoint the panel endorses. In its opinion, these testimonials serve as further evidence for the good connection between the programme's aims and the demands and expectations of the job market. It also noted a strong tradition of research in material culture, both in the programme and in the students' final projects (see Standard 4). In its opinion, this adds to the profile and could be highlighted, and forms a basis for increased collaboration and exchange with the Faculty of Archaeology.

The panel was impressed by the way in which the programme acted upon the recommendations made by the previous accreditation panel to bring the specialisations more closely together in a shared vision and approach. During the site visit, the staff's enthusiasm for the interdisciplinary aims shone through. The double objective to allow for specialisation in an expert field while also offering a broader framework of interdisciplinary study has been embraced by all four tracks. Collaboration between the tracks is very good. Traditionally, Hebrew and Aramaic Studies adopted a more philological approach due to the interests and expertise of its staff members. The panel was pleased to find that this track is now moving towards further diversification, both in its course offerings and learning objectives. This process is currently at a pivotal stage, as the chair in Hebrew and Aramaic Studies recently fell vacant (2020). The panel heard during the site visit that the group wants to continue branching out; it plans to

further enrich the philological with historical and archaeological approaches and confirms that the upcoming hiring procedure will take these wishes into consideration. This is in line with the profile and aims of the research master's programme and is considered by the panel an adequate response to the recommendations given in the assessment of 2015. Hence, the current panel fully supports these ambitions and also considers it the way forward to attract more and different students to this track and increase admissions (see Standard 2). It wants to emphasise the need for a suitable candidate to fill the vacant chair, at the appropriate level of seniority, to realise the formulated ambitions and to maintain its standing in research. This is necessary to ensure the track's visibility and continuation as part of the research master's programme.

In general, the panel is impressed by the commitment by Leiden University to maintain its diverse offer in research in languages and cultures at the Faculty of Humanities, to which the research master's programme CAC actively contributes. This commitment is of vital importance for international research and the training of future generations of scholars in these specialised subfields, and contributes directly to the good reputation of Dutch scholarship and academic teaching in the humanities.

#### *Intended learning outcomes*

The aims of the programme are summarised in five general and two track-specific ILOs, defining the level of skills, knowledge and understanding acquired and the way in which they are applied to their specific field (see Appendix 1). Based on a study of these ILOs, the panel concluded that they reflect the Dublin descriptors for academic programmes at the master's level. The research-oriented nature of the programme is substantiated in the ambition to gain extensive knowledge of the individual fields, as defined in the track-specific ILOs. The focus on research is confirmed by the attention paid to methodology and the independent collection of the relevant literature (ILO 2.b), the emphasis on analysis and the ability of graduates to formulate a well-founded thesis (ILO 2.c), and the aim to take on a research topic of substantial size (ILO 2.d). The panel considers the interdisciplinary take a distinguishing feature that contributes to the research-oriented character of the programme. This approach is embedded in the programme's aims (ILO 1.b), but less so in the programme's communication to prospective students and in its profile, as the panel concluded after talking to the students and on the basis of the information provided on the programme's website. This could be amended. Furthermore, the panel advises the programme to include an ILO addressing the target level for the thesis in terms of its suitability for publication, for example 'the ability to independently formulate, perform and assess scientific research at a level suitable to preparing scientific publications'. In its view, the ILOs are well designed to deliver graduates at the right attainment level; in their emphasis on research, they compare favourably to similar international ones and emphasise the research-oriented nature of the programme.

The panel found the current ILOs satisfactory. Since 2015, they have been reformulated and refined to meet suggestions to bring out the acquiring of academic skills more transparently. Additional improvements are still possible. The panel noted that some of the proposed outcomes are not easily measurable. In particular, those regarding the acquiring of knowledge could be redrafted with a stronger focus on the academic skills achieved. For example, an outcome stating that students have 'the ability to critically evaluate and reflect upon the cultural and historical context of...' is more easily measurable than an outcome stating that students 'have advanced knowledge of the cultural and historical context of...'. In addition, the current ILOs primarily define skills in terms of being relevant for a career in academia. The panel sees room for improvement to bring out the connection to the professional job market. The programme has adequately formulated its view on professional skills in its vision and profile. For example, it identified lifelong learning skills – such as critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, teamwork, information management, project design, time management and problem solving – as relevant outcomes of the learning process in the self-evaluation report. These transferable skills could be added in the ILOs to the skills expected to be acquired.

## Considerations

The panel found that the research master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations aspires to deliver specialised researchers with knowledge of both disciplinary and interdisciplinary aspects of their field and with highly advanced academic and professional skills. The language-based approach sets it apart within the Dutch landscape in Classics, Ancient History and/or Ancient Civilisations, as does the unique combined expertise in Assyriology, Classics, Egyptology, and Hebrew and Aramaic Studies. The programme's interdisciplinary take and the combination of subjects taught jointly stand out in an international context. It brings together a rich array of disciplines and fields and stands out for the attention paid to languages. The panel also noted a strong tradition of research in material culture. This research may benefit from increased collaboration with the Faculty of Archaeology, which the panel heartily recommends. It was impressed by the way in which the programme acted upon earlier recommendations to bring the specialisations together in a shared profile and vision. In particular, it appreciates the move by Hebrew and Aramaic Studies to create a better fit with the other tracks within the programme. It considers this move necessary. Hence, it asks for the support of all relevant university bodies involved to strengthen the steps taken and to maintain an environment in which this track could move on to further diversification. In general, Leiden University's dedication to maintaining its diverse offer in research in languages and cultures at the Faculty of Humanities is considered commendable and vital for the future of small disciplines such as some of those involved in the research master's programme CAC.

Based on its study of the ILOs, the panel concluded that they compare favourably with similar international ones in terms of the target achievement level. It verified that the ILOs are aligned with the Dublin descriptors at the master's level and pay sufficient attention to the training of research skills at the required attainment level for a research-oriented programme. In this way, the ILOs tie in with the level and orientation of the programme and international requirements. The programme's objectives offer the students a relatively rare set of skills that positively influences their chances for acquiring a successful career, especially within their fields in academia but also in a professional context. The panel acknowledges that the programme took earlier suggestions to reformulate and refine the ILOs to heart. It encourages the programme to continue polishing its ILOs to help the students to better define the skills and level of knowledge obtained. In particular, the acquisition of transferable skills and the skills related to knowledge acquisition could be made more explicit in this regard, which would also make the programme's connection to the expectations of the professional job market more transparent. The panel also recommends formulating a learning outcome highlighting the target level in written communication.

## Conclusion

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

### **Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment**

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

## Findings

### *Programme language and admission procedures*

The programme CAC chose English as its language of instruction and has an English programme name, which is in line with Faculty practices for research master's programmes. Staff teaching in the programme often received their academic training outside of the Netherlands. In order to benefit from all of the expertise available in these fields of study, English seems an appropriate choice to the panel. By opting for English as the language of instruction, the programme widens the prospective talent pool and offers its students a teaching-learning environment that benefits from multicultural perspectives and multiple viewpoints in an international classroom setting. The students may reasonably expect to move abroad or work closely together with foreign colleagues in international collaborations,



both during their studies and upon graduation. In academic research within the field, English is considered a *lingua franca*. Many professional positions that graduates from the programme entered after graduation also demand good communication and writing skills in English. Hence, the panel considers the programme's choice for English to be of added value for the quality of the teaching-learning environment and the students' future careers.

Prospective students applying for the research master's programmes need to prove their affinity with and suitability for scholarly research. Interest in the field of study and a motivation to study in a challenging and international teaching-learning environment are also required for admission. Prospective students need to provide evidence of a strong academic record (an equivalent average mark of at least 7.5 and a bachelor's thesis graded at least 8.0 in the Dutch grading system). The required English proficiency level is an IELTS score of at least 7.0 and/or a TOEFL internet-based score of 100 and/or a C2 Proficiency (formerly CPE) or C1 Advanced (formerly CAE) of 185.

For the Assyriology, Egyptology, and Hebrew and Aramaic Studies tracks, applicants require a bachelor's degree in Ancient Near Eastern Studies or they must demonstrate that they possess an adequate level of knowledge, understanding and skills. For the Classics track, applicants require a bachelor's degree in Classics from a research university equivalent to the level of a Dutch degree in this field. Track-specific requirements have also been formulated to ensure that all students have the linguistic abilities and skills within their field to participate in the programme at the target level. The requirements are tailored to the demands of each track. These language requirements are considered adequate by the panel for the selection of students with the linguistic ability to succeed in each of the tracks.

Along with the standard application files, applicants send in a well-argued and structured letter of motivation and a writing sample that answers a research question and provides a reasonable and well-organised argument that demonstrates a satisfactory understanding of the topic of the essay. These are then assessed by the Board of Admissions, which consists of the four track leaders. If considered suitable based on the application files, prospective students are interviewed to explore their motivation, test their ability to communicate in English, and find out whether both parties feel comfortable working together. The students considered the admission criteria and the procedures for admission transparent and fair and appreciated the chance to discuss the programme and schedule prior to deciding to enrol.

The panel verified that the admission of international students is carefully handled. It found that determining their prior knowledge and ensuring that a good match is made often require additional work to uncover the individual background and prior choices made. The programme explained that knowledge of ancient language(s) is considered crucial, but that there are not many places in the world where these languages are taught at the bachelor's level. It is therefore as flexible as possible in responding to the needs of international students, in particular in the Assyriology and Egyptology tracks. In some cases, very promising applicants are offered the chance to work on the advancement of their ancient-language training in Leiden in these tracks, up to 20 EC at the advanced bachelor's 400 level. These admissions are closely monitored and also approved by the Board of Examiners, which is responsible for overseeing the students' individual learning journeys and ensuring that every student achieves all the programme and track-specific ILOs in their personal study portfolio. The panel verified that both the Board of Admissions and the Board of Examiners handle these applications with diligence and is convinced that the programme ensures a good fit between the applicants and its aims and profile in all four specialisations.

#### *Intake and the international classroom*

The intake in the programme is generally stable. Between 2014 and 2019, some 9-13 students were admitted each year, a total of 68 students. These students are not evenly distributed among the tracks. Assyriology, Classics and Egyptology admitted 18, 24 and 22 students, respectively, in this period while Hebrew and Aramaic Studies admitted 4 students. The panel considers the low student numbers in this field not a problem per se, because the labour market in this fields is very restricted in comparison to other fields. It shares the programme's concern regarding the low numbers in this last track, as the limited intake unavoidably also affects the track's visibility in the programme



and its student contributions to the interdisciplinary elements of the programme. It approves the route taken to branch out to include more historical and archaeological perspectives in the curriculum offer of the track (see Standard 1 and below). It advises those responsible to closely monitor the link between these changes and the application procedure, and perhaps the application requirements. In terms of reaching out, it strongly advises targeting programmes and student populations world-wide that may be suitable for this track to raise interest.

The panel is pleased that the programme succeeds in attracting students from various corners of the world. Of those accepted into the research master's programme CAC, 56% of those starting in 2018-2019 previously studied outside the Netherlands (31% in 2017-2018, 46% in 2016-2017). The panel heard that international students are admitted in all four tracks, but that Assyriology and Egyptology are particularly attractive for students from abroad due to Leiden's expertise in the ancient languages involved and the unique Leiden collections in these fields of study. It concluded that without a doubt, the resulting classroom is dynamic, multicultural and rich in perspectives due to the varied intake and the practice of mixing up research master students from the four tracks in shared modules and sharing some electives with one-year master students.

#### *Teaching concept and curriculum*

Research master students are in an advanced stage of their training as professional researchers; this notion also underlies the programme's didactic concept. The panel verified that the teaching in the programme is a fair representation of this notion. The modules and their content are strongly influenced by the staff members' research. The students engage with up-to-date approaches in the field and often contribute to and participate in ongoing projects. They interact with theory from multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary angles at an advanced level, and methodology training is integrated in the curriculum design. Skills training is also an integral part of the teaching curriculum in all four tracks. In reaction to suggestions by earlier review panels to make the training of skills a more explicit part of the teaching, the programme developed the 'Guide to Academic Skills for Classics and Ancient Civilizations' (introduced in 2018-2019). The panel considers this guide of very high quality. It explains the skills that students are expected to master and how the programme helps students to achieve them. The students confirmed that the Guide is widely used in their modules and that it forms the core of their preparation for the thesis trajectory. In the panel's view, the didactic concept and its implementation within the curriculum are a good match with the target attainment level of a research master's programme.

The curriculum for the research master's programme CAC comprises a two-year programme of 120 EC. The panel found that the four tracks share some common elements, which are mandatory for all students. These comprise 55 EC in total and are exclusively designed for, and attended by, research master's students. These course elements include two modules that stimulate interdisciplinary exchange (20 EC) and three courses dedicated to the necessary preparation for and the execution of individual research in the thesis (35 EC). Along with these common elements, the students specialise within their field, for a course load of 55 EC in total. Within this part, some tracks offer mandatory courses – for students in Egyptology, this includes *Egyptology in the field* (15 EC), and for students in Hebrew and Aramaic Studies, *Historical Grammar of Hebrew and Aramaic* (10 EC). In the other tracks, and in the remaining modules for these two tracks, the students choose electives within their specialisation, resulting in individually tailored learning paths. For an overview of the curriculum and a list of the electives offered, see Appendix 2.

The panel considers the curriculum design sound. Students in all tracks follow a structured programme that permits flexibility, which is considered appropriate. It allows them to attain the programme's ILOs as it offers the opportunity for track-specific knowledge acquisition and interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary exchange, along with academic and professional skills training. The students confirmed this favourable impression during the site visit. They felt that they had sufficient options for specialisation and were generally very pleased with the level of their courses of both the modules specifically designed for the research master's programme and those shared with one-year master students. In the courses shared with one-year master students, they also felt that they were offered the chance to specialise to the level expected of research master students. They were given an additional chance to discuss their

coursework with the module convenor in a one-to-one tutorial setting and additional tasks demanding the use and application of research skills. These shared courses had clearly defined learning objectives that differed from those of the one-year master students.

The students commented positively on the Programme Committee's involvement in the recent redesign of the common core course taught in semester 1, which involved the introduction of slavery as one of the topics for the coming years. The panel considered the common course prior to the topic change of good quality yet was interested to hear from the students what motivated the change of topic. The panel learned that the common course offers alternating topics and the students explained that the new topic of slavery was chosen based on the Programme Committee's input, after discussions amongst the students and staff. They were very pleased with the introduction of this new topic, as they felt that this subject suited all four tracks in a better way than the earlier topic, since it opened up many issues within classical and ancient societies. They felt that the new subject optimally tapped into multidisciplinary approaches and interdisciplinary perspectives, resulting in further exchange between the fields and adding to the body of knowledge of the ancient and classical world. The panel fully agrees with the students: slavery is a topic of value for the programme and very relevant for all four tracks and it illustrates the added value of the interdisciplinary approach within the combined programme. The panel feels that this case demonstrates the care taken by the Programme Board to take up suggestions for adjustment. The panel concluded that the programme is going from strength to strength; it is maturing into a truly interdisciplinary programme and benefits from the active and productive input of the Programme Committee.

The teaching methods and practices employed (e.g. classroom discussions, peer review exercises, essay writing) aim to develop the students' own research, learning and transferable skills as independent researchers in their own right, based on the idea of flexible learning paths. This is in line with the panel's expectations for a research master's programme. During the modules, the students practise their planning and communication skills, allowing for an increasing focus on informed interaction between fellow students rather than a more teacher-focused approach. This is considered positive by the panel. In particular, the chosen exercises in the modules in the Classics track were considered very diverse, creating a challenging and inclusive classroom aimed at truly student-centred learning methods. The panel heard that the teaching staff of this track had enthusiastically engaged with the opportunities offered by the Faculty to professionalise and broaden their teaching skills. The Programme Board considered this staff investment and enthusiasm for their teaching to be best practice. Staff members indicated that they regularly discuss their practices amongst the various tracks to learn from each other. These examples show that the staff take their teaching duties very seriously, according to the panel.

As mentioned, the Hebrew and Aramaic studies track is currently very small. The panel discussed the advantages and disadvantages of this very small-scale setting with various representatives of the programme. During the site visit, the panel spoke to one student in this track and one alumnus/a of this track. They considered the track's size mostly an advantage; they felt the programme could offer a perfect fit to their individual needs. The staff went out of their way to accommodate their needs and wishes, although sometimes more awareness of peak pressure periods for the students would be welcome. Their peers from other tracks indicated that they exchange ideas in the common courses and that they consider students in this small track an integral part of the programme. In this way the exchange of ideas and interaction with peers are satisfactory, the panel found. Everyone agreed, however, that a larger intake would create a more diverse teaching-learning environment.

The panel noted that the track has indeed diversified its course offerings in the last years. The programme seeks to expand its offer not only in terms of methodological and multidisciplinary approaches, but also by looking for opportunities to connect to the other tracks within the programme. It hopes to include Syriac Studies in the future, widening its focus beyond its current emphasis on the Ancient Near East and Bible world. This would offer additional opportunities for interaction with the other specialisations, notably Egyptology, especially in relation to Coptic. Another option would be to focus more on the use of Aramaic and Syriac in medieval Judea and the Roman Empire down to the Byzantine era. This would create crossover points with reception studies, history and the Classics track.

The panel supports these ideas, which it considers of added benefit to the programme. This would offer relevant and unique research angles that could attract new students and result in valuable research lines as well.

#### *Opportunities and research facilities*

The students praised the way in which they could make use of the unique facilities and collections available to them. In Egyptology, they eagerly reflected on the chance to actually work with papyri in the epigraphy course and to be involved in the editing process of these sources. In Assyriology, they commented on their weekly 'dates' with 'their' tablet for cuneiform epigraphy. In Hebrew and Aramaic Studies, they have access to unique fragments of the Dead Sea scrolls for their course work or further research, if requested. Students in Classics have access to unique manuscripts for their studies and glowingly reviewed the opportunity to get involved in actual text editing. The panel would also encourage the programme to look for exchange possibilities with the Faculty of Archaeology and its excellent facilities. This could potentially add even more to the wide range of opportunities for students.

The panel verified that Leiden University indeed offers an excellent infrastructure for the study of the Classical and ancient world, which stimulates and inspires the students' academic practice. The students have access to outstanding library facilities. Leiden University Library possesses numerous text editions, commentaries, volumes, monographs and journals, which are extensively used in the programme. It hosts the Papyrological Institute, with an impressive collection of Greek papyri. It also possesses a unique collection of Greek and Latin manuscripts. The students benefit from access to the Netherlands Institute for the Near East (NINO), with an extensive collection on Assyriology and Egyptology, and the Liagre Böhl collection, which contains the largest collection of cuneiform tablets in the Netherlands. Along with these library facilities, the research master students benefit from the collections of The National Museum of Antiquities (Rijksmuseum van Oudheden; RMO), situated near the University. The research master's programme collaborates with the RMO in various ways, from internships to the active use of the collections for teaching. The library, the various research institutes and the programme offer the opportunity for research master students to attend regular seminars, national and international conventions, and other events relevant to their research interests. All of these events contribute to a lively and challenging teaching-learning environment, the panel heard. This is considered fitting for the research-led nature of the programme.

For Egyptology, the Netherlands-Flemish Institute in Cairo (NVIC) plays an important role: annually, students follow a course at the NVIC. The opportunity to engage in research and get hands-on experience with the research setting, archaeological digs and situation in Egyptian museums is considered a strong asset of this particular track. Alumni of the track considered their semester abroad in Egypt as one of the most valuable parts of their training. The Programme Board is proud of its exchange with the NVIC and stresses the importance of its existence, with its tenured staff, for the continuation of this valuable experience. Staff members added in their interview with the panel that the programme is currently exploring whether an exchange with the Netherlands Institute in Turkey (NIT) could be created. The idea would be to offer a similar experience to the students in the Assyriology track at the NIT to that currently enjoyed by students in Egyptology at the NVIC. This initiative is enthusiastically supported by the panel. It wants to emphasise, however, that staying abroad should not be confined to the region you study. It sees opportunities for all tracks to diversify its current exchange programme.

The Programme Board explained that Leiden University's Erasmus exchange partners do not offer many good options for their disciplines. Hence, the panel was pleased to hear that one of the Covid-19 measures taken by the programme may be an entry for new collaborations and ideas for exchange. As a result of the Covid-19 pandemic, the semester in Cairo was replaced by a programme of touring European museums in 2020. This museum tour was originally planned to be physical, but was eventually given in a digital format. The panel verified that the feedback of students partaking in the alternative module was positive, and learning objectives were carefully checked and met. Most students agreed, however, that they would consider enrolling in the following year to have the actual Egyptian experience. The panel understands the students' motivation but also considered the programme's response to the pandemic adequate as it ensured that the students were able to meet the ILOs. It sees an opportunity for all tracks to use this model to explore new exchange programmes, in which the students could

potentially be sent for a period of time to a specific museum or institute with a relevant collection for part of their studies. In its opinion, major research centres in Europe and the US that could be considered for such an exchange are: the British Museum, the Louvre, the Berlin museums for Assyriology, Egyptology, Classics, and universities with rich collections and research in these fields, such as Heidelberg, Munich, Cambridge, Oxford, Chicago, etc. This would bolster the students' opportunities to employ research skills in a new and unfamiliar setting and may also offer a chance to work on their professional orientation and skills.

#### *Thesis trajectory and guidance*

The thesis trajectory in all four tracks follows the same structure. The students take an individual thesis tutorial (5 EC), in which they familiarise themselves with the scholarship in a specific field and delineate the topic for their final research project. The tutorial can adopt different forms, but commonly focuses on a selection of primary texts and secondary literature to spark ideas and adopt a framework and/or approach for further research. During the site visit, the students indicated that they consider the tutorials a very valuable part of their preparation trajectory, but that they could be a bit more structured. The panel understood that expectation management could be an issue here, as tutors offer different levels of organisation to their students. As a result, sometimes the students were clearly in the lead and at other times, the tutors, depending on the pairing. In the panel's view, a solution could be found in the current thesis supervision document that clearly outlines expectations for the students and staff at the start of the thesis writing process. This could be extended to include the tutorial, clarifying what would be expected from both and levelling differences between the approaches of the different staff members. The students would welcome this change.

Afterwards, the students continue with their research master thesis (25 EC), which contains a maximum of 25,000 words including footnotes, bibliography and appendices. The thesis should be based on original research and makes critical use of primary source material and secondary literature. The students generally work with primary sources in the original language(s) and/or relevant archaeological data. Prior to starting on their thesis, the students and supervisors sign a thesis contract, in which expectations are clarified and guidance and the terms of assessment are listed and discussed, a procedural exercise the panel endorses. While working on their thesis, the students follow the *Thesis Presentation and Research Proposal* seminar (5 EC). This seminar supports and guides them as they are writing their thesis. In addition, it guides them towards a career in academia. In the first part, they concentrate on academic research skills. Topics include the writing of a conference abstract, the composition of a professional CV, academic integrity, the planning of a research career and the writing of a research proposal. In the second part, all students present the topic of their thesis or work in progress. They offer and receive peer-feedback, which they appreciate as an exercise.

The students positively reflected on the preparation for the thesis trajectory and on the guidance and support received during their studies and thesis. They are assigned a mentor in their first year and choose their tutor/supervisor in their second year. They considered all staff members very open to discussing ideas and career planning and felt they received sufficient help when encountering challenges or problems. In terms of workload, they considered the programme challenging but feasible. The panel found that the Covid-19 pandemic resulted in some changes to the programme and the modes of teaching, but this did not compromise its quality or feasibility. It felt that some additional support may be wanted with respect to study support in the Assyriology and Hebrew and Aramaic tracks. As both tracks have a more limited staff size, staff members seemed a bit pressed for time. As a result, the students sometimes ran into deadline clashes. These matters had no effect on the quality of the supervision or tutoring, according to the students.

They were full of praise, insisting that the staff truly went the extra mile to help, support and guide them. The Programme Committee representative added that these cases were always discussed with the Programme Board and adequately addressed. To the panel, the courses in support of the thesis writing process and guidance during the study trajectory make a very favourable impression.

The panel is also positively impressed with the changes introduced since the 2015 assessment in the preparation for the job market. The programme worked hard to make the attained skills a more integral part of the teaching curriculum. It also initiated collaboration with external partners to offer the students a chance to compete for internships at established partners, such as the RMO, Brill Publishers and Uitgeverij LAMBO. These opportunities are being pursued, as the students confirmed during the site visit. The Faculty also invested in career events for the students in the Humanities. These events were less positively reviewed by the students. They considered these events too broad and not tailored to their interests and needs as research master students. In contrast, contact with alumni was considered very helpful, another area in which the programme invested. On balance, preparation for the job market could still benefit from fresh ideas and events. Nevertheless, the panel concluded that the programme took earlier suggestions regarding job preparation on board and is convinced that the programme will work together with its students to further improve its offer.

#### *Staff and research environment*

The programme is taught by 34 internal staff members and nine external staff members. In total, eight professors, three senior university lecturers and 22 lecturers teach and supervise students in the programme. Five staff members who have a status as teacher or a research-based appointment at the university are also involved in the teaching; they teach under supervision. The panel is pleased with the professional qualifications of the teaching team: all that are required to do so have successfully completed their teacher's training (Basiskwalificatie Onderwijs; BKO), with the exception of two team members who are currently completing it. The English proficiency of the staff members is also adequately monitored.

The students were appreciative of their teachers and the quality of their teaching. They highly appreciated the chance to engage with ongoing research projects in their modules. They mentioned that it helped them in identifying new approaches and gave them ideas for their own research projects. During the pandemic, the research staff were requested to work from home. The students considered them sufficiently accessible by digital means and even more responsive during the Covid-19 circumstances. Initially, research master students still followed many contact hours in class due to their low numbers. In the autumn of 2020, hybrid and digital teaching were introduced. Due to the small-scale teaching setting and the good communication by the programme and its staff, the students felt that the quality of the teaching was consistently very high, both in the physical and digital classrooms.

At Leiden University there are currently full professors of Assyriology, Greek Language and Literature, Latin Language and Literature, Egyptology and Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity. The full professor of Hebrew and Aramaic Studies will be replaced by a university lecturer (0.5 fte). The panel verified that all full professors play an active role in the programme. It heard that hiring for the Hebrew and Aramaic university lecturer position was being debated in the research institutes. It was assured that the needs of the Hebrew and Aramaic track at the master's level were being taken into account in this process. For the research master's programme, these needs are threefold: (a) the maintenance of the Hebrew and Aramaic track's full status within the CAC programme; (b) the maintenance of a teaching-learning environment of very high quality for students on the track; (c) ensuring the attractiveness of the programme and its staff to international students.

The staff expertise is excellently matched to the programme's curriculum and learning objectives, the panel found. Amongst the teaching staff are historians, art historians, philologists, literary scholars, linguists, religious-studies specialists, archaeologists and philosophers. Their expertise is wide-ranging, including both canonical and more obscure fields: it includes, for example, knowledge of Anatolian linguistics, the iconography of Egypt, the connections between the classical and modern world, excavation and interpretation of material culture remains, the editing of Greek papyri, cuneiform studies, Coptic, the study of Qumran Hebrew and the Dead Sea Scrolls, and expertise in the works and philosophy of many famous authors such as Plato, Homer and Herodotus. Staff members are generally content with the range of their expertise, but indicated they were worried for the future with expected retirements and the issue of whether funds would be available for replacements. Some expertise, notably Coptic

and Sumerian, may come under threat, which would also impact the available resources for the research master's programme. The panel shares these concerns.

The majority of the teaching staff is affiliated with the Leiden University Institute for Area Studies (LIAS), the Leiden University Centre for Linguistics (LUCL) and the Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society (LUCAS). In June 2019, LIAS was assessed for the period of 2012-2017 using the Standard Evaluation Protocol. It scored 'excellent/world leading' (1) for research quality. LUCL was reviewed in 2018 for the period 2012-2017, and was assessed 'very good' (2) for research quality. The LUCAS assessment committee assessed it as 'very good' (2) in 2018; it identified Classics in 2018 as the strong cluster of LUCAS for its individual quality and its coherence. Some staff members are affiliated with the Leiden University Institute for Philosophy (LUIP) and/or Leiden University Institute for History (LUIH). These institutes were also assessed for the period 2012-2017 in 2018, as 'very good' (2) and 'excellent/world leading' (1), respectively, for research quality. According to the panel, these high scores testify to the staff members' research credentials and their excellent international reputation. The staff's expertise and standing were also confirmed by the acquisition of competitive scholarships, grants, prizes and appointments, including the Spinoza Prize and the current Presidency of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW).

### **Considerations**

The research master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations has adequately translated its ILOs into a coherent curriculum for all four tracks, offering opportunities for specialisation while also living up to its interdisciplinary aims. The students interact with theory from multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary angles at an advanced level, and methodology training is fully integrated into the curriculum design. The new skills training, designed in response to recommendations made by the previous assessment panel, is considered of very good quality by the panel. The differentiation between the master's level and research master's level is adequately designed. The panel recommends including the thesis tutorial in the thesis contract to better manage expectations for the tutorial and to create greater consistency between the various practices currently used. In general, it considers the programme very open to suggestions. In particular, it wants to commend the Programme Committee on its active role in the programme, which truly results in further strengthening of the programme's course offerings. It concluded that the programme is feasible and that a good system of guidance and support is available to students. In the past, some deadline clashes occurred in particular tracks, but the Programme Committee and Board are taking adequate action, as the panel concluded.

The panel endorses the programme's ambitions to create additional opportunities for international exchange similar to the current model employed in the Egyptology track, which it considers an attractive feature of this particular track. It also recommends exploring new ideas inspired by the programme's own measure taken in response to the lockdown. In particular, exchange with museums and institutions involved in archaeological research could provide new opportunities. The Leiden research environment for students is excellent. The panel verified that the facilities are top of the range, and many interesting collaborations with both cultural institutions and professional organisations are available to the students. A suggestion could be to extend these collaborations to the Faculty of Archaeology with its world-class facilities. In generally, the panel considers the measures taken by the programme in reaction to Covid-19 fitting and in line with its aims.

The staff members cover all necessary disciplines, and their research abilities are a credit to the programme. The panel shares the staff members' concern regarding the potential threat that upcoming retirements may bring to the availability of expertise that now so positively influences the quality of the teaching-learning environment. It found that the students are very positive about the enthusiasm, helpfulness and accessibility of their teachers as well as the study guidance. This positive student feedback also underlines the didactic skills of the teachers involved in teaching in the programme. In particular, the enthusiasm of the staff in the Classics track to try out new teaching models in the classroom is considered best practice by the panel. The staff's teaching credentials and proficiency in English are also up to standard. By offering the programme in English, an international classroom setting is achieved



that is both challenging and meets the expectations of the professional field. The panel concludes that the programme is well-placed for selecting suitable candidates and that its admission criteria are fair and sufficiently transparent. For the Hebrew and Aramaic Studies track, it endorses the ambitions that the programme formulated with respect to its reorientation. This should lead to continuous diversification of the course offering. Combined with the active recruitment of suitable candidates, this will hopefully also result in a larger intake in this track.

### **Conclusion**

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

### **Standard 3: Student assessment**

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

### **Findings**

#### *Assessment policy and system of assessment*

Assessment for the research master's programme CAC is embedded within the regulations and shared assessment practices of the Faculty of Humanities. The Faculty uses one assessment framework for all programmes, which sets out the established procedures. Together with the programme-specific rules and regulations for the Board of Examiners and the programme-specific assessment plan, both annually revised and updated, this framework forms the backbone for the assessment practices within the programme. The panel concluded that the policies and added regulations and assessment plan are complete and provide transparency and reliability of assessment. The Faculty also introduced a standard online evaluation form for the thesis assessment. This adds to the uniformity and transparency of assessment of all programmes under its remit, creating a solid system of assessment.

At the course level, the teachers are assigned a central role in assuring the quality of assessment; as content experts, they know the requirements of the relevant fields. The design of assessments is peer-reviewed and regularly evaluated. The panel concluded that the programme's testing policy is balanced, based on its study of the programme's assessment plan. It combines formative and summative testing, and assignments gradually increase in length and complexity based on the principles of structural alignment. Knowledge acquisition and application are continuously assessed, as are academic and communication skills, resulting in a structured learning path for students to develop their knowledge and skills to the advanced master's level required. The requirements for assessments are transparent, reliable and adequate and so are the assessments, as the panel found in its study of the documentation and examples of assessment. It also ascertained that research skills and ethics are tested in an appropriate manner and noted that the students complete the full research cycle in their thesis trajectories. During the Covid-19 pandemic, assessment and feedback practices at the programme did not fundamentally change, apart from the introduction of a presentation ad viva of research ideas and findings to support their thesis proposal to some staff members. This ensures that the students also practise defending research ideas and gather sufficient support from multiple staff members for their research project.

For the vast majority of the courses that form part of the programme, the assessment takes place through a combination of oral presentations and written assignments. The panel was pleased with the variety of written assignments, especially within some courses in the Classics track. Along with various types of essays, including both longer academic pieces and shorter ones, the students are challenged to record a scientific diary, write text commentaries and compile a portfolio on a specific source, including a text edition with text- and source-critical apparatus, translation, commentary for a student audience and commentary for a specialist audience. These practices are considered exemplary by the panel and very suitable to test the students' abilities in both an academic and professional sense at the required research master's level. This demonstrates the willingness of staff members to search for new assessment methods within this track, and embodies best practices that could inspire other

practices within the programme as well. To create further diversity in testing methods, additional panel suggestions are: peer-review exercises, article writing, abstract writing and group presentations for various audiences.

In conversation with the panel, the students expressed mixed experiences with feedback practices within the programme. In Classics and Aramaic and Hebrew Studies, the feedback was well-organised and structured. For the assessment of assignments, the staff members extensively used the available forms as well as offering oral feedback. Students from Assyriology and Egyptology indicated that they received constructive oral feedback, but could have benefitted from more structured written feedback on their assignments. In general, the students felt that they received sufficient feedback but that the practices could be more uniformly exercised within the programme. This student observation was recognised by the Programme Board and Board of Examiners. The Board of Examiners also noted omissions in the existing assessment dossiers, which it has followed up. During staff meetings and in communications, the Board of Examiners regularly underlines the importance of well-documented assessment dossiers that include written and oral feedback on course assignments. The panel agrees with this line of action.

#### *Assessment in shared modules*

Students of the research master's programme CAC share modules with students from the one-year master's programme CAC for 55 EC of their programme. Differentiation of assessment between the two groups of students is necessary as there can only be 30 EC of overlap between the programmes in terms of level requirements. The assessment panel that reviewed the programme in 2015 formulated some suggestions to differentiate more between the two levels, which have been fully implemented by the programme. Assessment requirements and course objectives are therefore carefully arranged and rigorously monitored by the teaching staff, Programme Board and Board of Examiners to ensure that research master students are able to achieve the learning outcomes of their programme and the advanced level aimed for in a research master's degree.

Since the year 2018-2019, the e-Prospectus has consistently mentioned the differentiated forms of assessment for the research master and one-year master. The panel verified that these are, indeed, structurally listed and that the requirements for the research master students differ substantially from those for one-year master students, and are fitting for the programme objectives in terms of attention paid to research methodology and analysis. Sometimes, these tasks are clearly directed towards an alternative approach to source materials. For example, students from the research master's programme are asked to write a scholarly article with a poem interpretation while one-year master students are asked to present a text, translation of and commentary on one poem. In other cases, research master students are required to put in additional work, for example to write a conference abstract based on their essay or to lead a group discussion. Research master students considered the requirements clear and also appreciated the chance to work together with regular master's students; it broadens their perspectives and allows for further engagement. In their view, the programme paid sufficient exclusive attention to their progress and the development of their research journey – both in the exclusive research master courses and in the shared modules.

The panel agrees with the practice of shared modules, yet is aware that some other programmes under the Faculty of Humanities' remit share fewer modules with the associated one-year master's programme and do not set additional requirements for modules shared between one-year and research master programmes. The current model at the research master's CAC seems to function well, and the students clearly meet the level requirements (see also Standard 4). Nevertheless, the panel is aware that the existing variety of approaches within the Faculty, and perhaps within the University, may create confusion and a level of ambiguity in the expectations raised regarding the attainment level for the students. Hence, communication to research master students is key regarding expectations, assessment criteria and course objectives. Without wanting to blaze a trail for either approach, the panel challenges all programmes associated with the Faculty of Humanities – including the research master's programme CAC – to discuss their approach and to learn from each other's practices and experiences.



### *Thesis assessment*

The theses are assessed by two examiners, who independently fill in an assessment form and assign a grade. The first examiner is also the supervisor, the second examiner is only involved in the assessment as a reader and is independently appointed by the Board of Examiners later. The Board of Examiners actively avoids fixed assessment pairs, mixing up specialisations if necessary. Afterwards, the two examiners calibrate their findings and agree on a final grade, for which substantiation is formulated on a third form. If the first and second reviewers disagree on the final mark, the Board of Examiners will act as a mediator. If a settlement cannot be reached, or if the marks assigned differ by 2.0 points or more, it appoints a third examiner. It indicated that it looks into cases in which examiners differed by 1-2.0 points in their sample checks, as these cases could be very useful in the discussion of assessment practices amongst team members. The panel was pleased with this awareness. The third form with the justification of the grade is handed over to the students. The panel approves this procedure and states that this safeguards the independence of the assessment, while also guaranteeing transparency.

The panel concluded that the thesis assessment procedures are transparent and that the assigned grades were appropriate in all four tracks. The assessments are considered very insightful and complete, for which the panel wants to compliment the staff members. Many students were awarded honours and high grades, which the panel found well-deserved based on its study of a sample of theses (see Standard 4). It noted, however, that the staff members seem reluctant to use the full grading scale up to 10. This may be understandable in a Dutch context; in an international context, it is considered exceptional. Potentially, not making use of the full grading scale could harm a student's chances to obtain a PhD offer from international universities. For this reason, and because of the quality observed, the panel encourages the programme's examiners to start using the full range of the grading scale and to discuss the issue at the Faculty and University levels.

The panel would welcome the development of a more detailed marking scheme that clearly describes the criteria across the marking scale underlying the current grading. This would make the current practices more transparent for the students, especially for those from abroad. The panel suggests tailoring the thesis assessment form more directly to the extra criteria for a research master's programme and creating a better fit with the programme's ILOs. For example, it could include a qualitative reflection on the publishability of the thesis (parts of it), including feedback and/or advice on the format and prospective platforms/media/journals. This would make an ILO dedicated to the level of publishable quality of the thesis explicit while also helping the students on their way towards the publication of their research. Another suggestion is to uphold the word limit of 25,000 words (with a stringently defined allowance for overrunning) as a strict criterion for grading and, potentially, awarding honours as this will, in many cases, force students to write more succinctly and to keep to their original planning. The panel heard that this matter has the programme's attention.

### *Board of Examiners*

The Board of Examiners is responsible for four programmes and one minor: apart from the research master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations, these are the bachelor's programme Classics (Griekse en Latijnse taal en cultuur), the bachelor's programme Ancient Near Eastern Studies (Oude Nabije Oosten-studies), the master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations, and the minor Rhetoric, which is offered to students at the bachelor's level throughout the Faculty. The Board consists of four representatives of the programmes and an external member. It is supported by a secretary, for whom the Board members had high praise. The secretary is, in their eyes, indispensable for her knowledge of regulations and formal procedures; her experience acts as their collective memory and a support for the chair. The panel heartily supports the Board's emphasis on continuous secretarial support. Over the last years, all of the members have invested in further professionalisation, by following training on the legal aspects of their work. The chair and secretary also regularly exchange practices and experiences with other relevant bodies within the Faculty and University organisation.

The panel is very positive about the work of the BoE, which is considered a driving force resulting in the current quality of assessment within the programme. Assessment practices have clearly developed to a higher standard

over the period of assessment, driven by the professionalisation of the entire Faculty and the dedication of the Board members to continuous improvement. The BoE adequately handles its legally mandated tasks. It approves the Course and Examination Regulations proposed by the programmes, assesses requests for additional resits or replacement exams, monitors and addresses cases of academic misconduct, appoints examiners and checks the assessment dossiers to sign off on graduations (including the awarding of cum laude degrees). To guarantee the quality of course assessment, every course and its assessment are reviewed at least once every six years. Recommendations and actions following from these reviews are passed on and carefully monitored.

Being responsible for guaranteeing the quality of the exams and the diplomas, the Board of Examiners annually advises the Programme Board on the text of the Course and Examination Regulations, and ratifies individual study programmes, especially if they deviate from the standard. The latter phenomenon happens less often in the Classics track, but more regularly in Assyriology, Egyptology, and Hebrew and Aramaic Studies due to the specialist nature of these fields and the consequent variety in prior training of their students. The panel heard that this was sometimes experienced as frustrating by individual students, who considered the route towards approval as rather formal. This seems a matter of fine-tuning the communication. Based on its meeting with the Board of Examiners, the panel concluded that the Board is diligent in its approvals and tries to accommodate the students' individual needs and wishes to best of its ability.

The Board of Examiners plays an advisory role during staff meetings and is also in regular contact with the Programme Board and the track leaders about new developments. During the Covid-19 pandemic, it oversaw some of the necessary changes to course assessments – mostly extending deadlines and changes to the assessment of oral assignments – and advised staff members regarding assessment, where necessary and wanted. It indicated that it was against proctoring, as it considered proctoring too much of an invasion of the students' privacy and also communicating a lack of trust in them. In its view, assessment practices need to be founded on trust in the examiners and in the students. Trust in the staff and students is not only the principle that inspires assessment at the programme level, but is also defended by the Board in conversation with the Faculty. The panel heard during the site visit that the Board of Examiners, together with the Programme Board, redrafted the suggested fraud policy presented by the Faculty so that it was better aligned with the underlying principle of trust in the staff and students. The Faculty gracefully took over the redrafted version, communicating it as the final version. In this way, the Board of Examiners demonstrated a keen awareness of the methods to communicate formal procedures suited to the existing academic culture while also contributing to advancing the quality culture.

The panel heard that working relations between the Board of Examiners and staff members are based on respect. It also considered the current quality culture as fully based on a collaborative and cooperative esprit de corps. Staff members may have been less open to change in the past, the panel heard, but over this period of assessment they really were won over and are currently ready to follow up on guidelines towards further improvement. As discussed, assessment dossiers have not always been complete, and some further work is necessary regarding feedback. But the Board members were very positive about the changing attitudes within the team and found the dossiers now more and more complete. They were aware of balancing a fine line; they want to continue to work towards improvement, while also making sure not to crush colleagues with an administrative burden. This is, in the panel's view, the only attitude that will result in further professionalisation and improvement, and it praises the Board for its keen sensitivity.

### **Considerations**

The panel verified that the research master's programme CAC has a well-functioning system of assessment that benefits from the strengthening of the quality culture at the Faculty and the demonstrated effort of staff members at the programme to raise quality standards. The existing assessment policies and protocols in the programme are of good quality. The panel verified that these policies are not only accepted and implemented at the programme, but that the programme also actively contributed to the creation of some of them. The assessment methods used are considered suitable to test the students' abilities, skills and knowledge at the desired research master's level.

Differentiation in assessment methods in modules shared with the one-year master's programme is closely monitored and tailored to the learning objectives of the research master's programme. The panel was pleased by the clear evidence of the willingness to diversify assessment. In particular, the variety in written assessment types in the Classics track was considered inspiring. The panel encourages the programme to also consider adding some additional variety that is based on student involvement and group work, for example peer-review exercises and group presentations.

The panel wants to compliment the Board of Examiners for its keen awareness of the diplomacy needed to advance the quality culture in assessment. Due to the Board's careful handling of procedures and the implementation of necessary changes, the existing quality culture at the programme level improved over the period of assessment to a good level while also ensuring the staff members' willingness to co-operate and change existing practices. As a result, the assessment is transparently organised and solidly grounded in shared Faculty practices, while also acknowledging the initial administrative burden that new procedures sometimes present at their implementation. The panel verified that the members of the Board of Examiners fulfil their formal tasks and responsibilities and work according to transparent procedures. It encourages the Faculty to continue monitoring the Board of Examiners' workload and to pay attention to the continuous need for sufficient secretarial support. It concluded that the programme has an adequate system of student assessment in place that benefits from the good work of the Board of Examiners and the staff working at the various programmes under its remit.

The quality of the assessments at the programme is considered high. The evaluation of theses is fair and transparent. Grades are reasonable and a fair reflection of the variations in quality. However, the panel invites the programme to start using the full grading scale in line with international practices and expectations, especially at the higher end of the scale. Based on its findings, coherent feedback practices on course assignments in the specialisations are a point for attention in the coming period. It fully trusts the programme to act upon this finding, as the Board of Examiners is already actively monitoring and encouraging more consistency. In addition, it sees room for some minor improvements. The transparency of the assessment could be strengthened by the creation of a more detailed marking scheme for thesis assessment. In addition, the programme is advised to introduce a qualitative reflection on the publishability of the thesis (parts of it) on the assessment form for research master theses.

### **Conclusion**

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

#### **Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes**

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

### **Findings**

To assess the quality of the level achieved in the research master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations, the panel studied a sample of seventeen theses. Fifteen were selected from a list containing all finished projects by students who graduated between 2015 and 2019. Two recent theses were added to this in the fall of 2020, to represent the work produced by graduates who finished in 2020 during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Within the selection, the panel took care to assure that all four specialisations of the programme were represented: the sample included seven theses of Egyptology, two of Hebrew and Aramaic Studies, three of Assyriology and five of Classics. As a result, a range of primary source languages (variants of Egyptian, Hebrew, Aramaic, Akkadian, Sumerian, Latin and Greek) was employed and a wide variety of multidisciplinary research approaches covered. Subjects included, for example, hunting in ancient Egypt, tense, aspect and modality in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, an analysis of Mesopotamian Bilingual Inscriptions from the Old Akkadian until the Old Babylonian period, and the re-enactment of pre-Socratic questions in Prometheus Bound. To the panel, the range of topics, use of languages

and various disciplinary approaches is further evidence of the inspiring research environment available to the students of this programme, who benefit from the diverse expertise at the various Leiden research institutes. It also noted a good use of primary source materials in the original languages, in line with the profile, and interesting research into material culture that offers grounds for further collaborations.

The varied and rich sample convincingly demonstrated that the students in the programme live up to the high ambitions outlined in the intended learning outcomes. The studied theses were all impressive in terms of their thoroughness and creativity in addressing new topics and approaches and of high quality, with no really weak theses in evidence. They benefitted from strong research skills and a thorough knowledge of the required languages and literature of the field. According to the panel, many pieces would be acceptable as a first draft of a PhD thesis, also in terms of length. Theses at the lower end of the grading scale were still found to offer fresh perspectives; they were pieces of research that lived up to the intended learning outcomes and also easily met the requirements for the research master's level, offering promising leads for further research.

This positive review of the academic quality of the level achieved is also substantiated by the academic track record of the programme's alumni. The panel noticed clear evidence of progression to the first steps of an academic career. Many theses formed the basis for publications in essay collections and well-regarded journals, for example the *Saqqara Newsletter*, *Roma Aeterna* and *Lampas*. Nearly half of all graduates (20 out of 44) have secured a PhD position at well-regarded research institutes and universities since 2015: in the Netherlands at the University of Groningen (2), Radboud University (2), Leiden University (8) and internationally at Leuven (1), Hamburg (1), Harvard (1), Cambridge (2), Tartu (1), Strasbourg (1) and Vienna (1). Many of these students participate in wider research projects, demonstrating that the research skills and approaches taken are also sought after within the discipline, testifying that the programme offers students the academic skills needed to really contribute to the advancement of research within the discipline. Alumni of the programme who continued in academia praised the programme and the skills they acquired for the advancement of their careers, and also commended the support received from staff members.

Graduates also seem to find jobs outside of academia that allow them to make use of the research and communication skills acquired during the programme: they work as a copy editor, freelance translator, project coordinator at a publishing house, educational and research staff member at higher education institutes, and editor at a well-known Dutch periodical. Alumni indicated that the opportunity to follow an internship as part of the programme was very helpful in terms of preparation for their further careers, although more support in orientation in this respect is always welcome. Some graduates of the programme continued with a one-year master's teacher-training programme; graduates with a specialisation in Classics qualify if their curriculum included at least 45 EC of Greek and Latin literature or linguistics, with at least 10 EC (seminars) for each language. Three recent graduates opted for this career path, and considered the research master's programme an advantage for their teaching practice at the secondary school level as it gave them the means to connect pupils to the advances made in research.

### **Considerations**

The panel concluded that graduates of all four tracks of the research master's programme CAC meet the intended learning outcomes at the required level for a research master's degree. Theses written by recent graduates offer a good representation of the research expertise and interests available in Leiden in the study of Classics and Ancient Civilizations. They embody all elements of the research cycle: from the formulation of a research question to the output of a written report that offers sufficient grounds for publication upon reworking into a suitable format. In their thesis, they have amply proved that they are able to set up an independent research project of high academic quality, and they are able to convey their findings in a suitable manner. The panel also verified that many theses provided leads for future research and publications, which has also been confirmed by PhD positions awarded and actual publications in well-regarded journals and essay collections. It considered many of the studied theses impressive in terms of their thoroughness and creativity, offering perspectives and insights that are relevant for the field. Graduates considered the programme a good preparation for their future careers and also performed well

upon graduation, securing relevant positions in academia and beyond. In this way, the intended learning outcomes are convincingly met, including the criteria of the additional framework for research master's programmes.

**Conclusion**

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

## GENERAL CONCLUSION

The panel assessed standards 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the research master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations as 'meets the standard'. It hereby took the additional aspects for research master's programmes as included in the *Specification of Additional Criteria for Research Master's Programmes* into account. Based on the NVAO decision rules regarding limited programme assessments, it therefore assesses the programme as 'positive'.

**Conclusion**

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



## APPENDICES





# APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

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

## 1. Knowledge and understanding

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

## 2. Applying knowledge and understanding

- a. The ability to apply different methodologies relevant to the specialisation;
- b. The ability to independently identify and collect the relevant literature and historical sources using traditional and modern techniques;
- c. The ability to analyse a problem and formulate a clear and well-founded thesis and to divide it into convenient and manageable parts;
- d. The ability to take on a research topic of substantial size and bring it to a conclusion under expert supervision;

## 3. Judgement

- a. The ability to critically select and assess the relevant primary source material;
- b. The ability to independently study the relevant literature and historical sources and to judge their quality and reliability;
- c. The ability to critically assess the relevant secondary literature and to contribute to scholarly debate.

## 4. Communication

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

## 5. Learning skills

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

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

*1. Knowledge and understanding*

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

*2. Applying knowledge and understanding*

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

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

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

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

*2. Applying knowledge and understanding*

- a. The ability to formulate and discuss research questions concerning the semantics and the communicative and persuasive functions of Greek and Latin texts;
- b. The ability to formulate and discuss research questions concerning literary devices and intertextual relations in Greek and Latin texts, and to assess their influence in a broader literary context;
- c. The ability to formulate and discuss research questions concerning the history of ancient Greece and Rome and / or ancient philosophy;
- d. The ability to interpret cultural phenomena and developments in antiquity and later periods on the basis of primary and secondary sources.

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

*1. Knowledge and understanding*

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

*2. Applying knowledge and understanding*

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

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

*1. Knowledge and understanding*

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

*2. Applying knowledge and understanding*

- a. The skills to apply either linguistic or literary research methods of the field of expertise;
- B. The skills to process source materials in Hebrew or Aramaic, including photographs of manuscripts and/or inscriptions in addition to the customary printed editions.



## APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

### Programme 2019-2020

Year 1	EC	Level
<b>Core courses</b>		
Common course: Libraries in the Ancient World	10	600
<b>Assyriology</b>		
Electives (sem. 1): select from the following courses depending on and in accordance with academic background	10-20	500
<i>Advanced Sumerian</i>		
<i>History writing in and on the Achaemenid Empire</i>		
<i>Middle Assyrian History and Texts</i>		
<i>Scholarly Networks of First Millennium BCE Assyria and Babylonia</i>		
<i>Anatolian Languages: Hittite and Luwian</i>		
<i>Anatolian Historical Linguistics</i>		
<i>Tutorial Akkadian</i>		
<i>The Sumerian Language: Structure and Analysis</i>		
Research School Course (Advanced Cuneiform Epigraphy = OIKOS research school offered at Leiden)	10	500
Electives (sem. 2): select from the following courses	30	500
<i>Biblical Text in Mesopotamian Context</i>		
<i>Old Assyrian Archives</i>		
<i>Legal texts in 1st millennium BCE Assyria and Babylonia</i>		
<i>The Written Legacy of Hittite Anatolia</i>		
<i>Intermediate Sumerian</i>		
<b>Classics</b>		
Electives (sem. 1): select from the following courses	10-20	500
<i>Seminar Greek: Greek Poetry in Rome</i>		
<i>Tutorial Greek: The Athenian Acropolis - Texts, Terms and Topography</i>		
<i>Tutorial Latin: Ennius Tragedies</i>		
<i>Roman Fake News. Documentary Fictions in the Roman World</i>		
<i>Seminar Ancient Philosophy: Time for Plotinus: Enneads III.7 [45] in context</i>		
<i>History writing in and on the Achaemenid Empire</i>		
<i>Material Culture for Ancient Historians</i>		

Research School Course	5-10	600
Electives (sem. 2): select from the following courses	20-25	500
<i>Seminar Greek: Friendship in the Greek World: forms of relationality, from Homer to Aristotle</i>		
<i>Seminar Latin: More Than Civil War: Lucan's Bellum Civile</i>		
<i>Plato's Timaeus and Critias. Cosmology and History in Defense of Political Utopia</i>		
<i>Egypt in Late Antiquity</i>		
<i>Rebel, Prophet, Martyr: Jesus of Nazareth in the Context of his Time</i>		
<i>Epigraphy</i>		
<i>Greek Papyrology</i>		
<i>Palaeography of the Greek Papyri and Edition Technique of Papyrus Documents</i>		
<b>Egyptology</b>		
Egyptology in the Field: Research and Facilities in Egypt	15	500
Electives (sem. 1): select from the following courses, depending on and in accordance with academic background	10-15	500
<i>Egyptian Temple Inscriptions of the Graeco-Roman Period</i>		
<i>Amarna Seminar</i>		
<i>Demotic Papyrology I</i>		
<i>Selected Topics in Egyptian Archaeology</i>		
<i>Introduction to Middle Egyptian and the Hieroglyphic Script</i>		
Electives (sem. 2): select from the following courses	15-20	500
<i>Deir el-Medina Seminar</i>		
<i>Seminar Mastabas/Old Kingdom elite tombs</i>		
<i>Coptic Texts in Context</i>		
<i>Demotic Papyrology II</i>		
<i>Greek Papyrology</i>		
<b>Hebrew and Aramaic Studies</b>		
Electives (sem. 1): select from the following courses	10	500
<i>Historical Grammar of Hebrew and Aramaic</i>		
<i>Cultural History of Aramaic</i>		
<i>History writing in and on the Achaemenid Empire</i>		
Research School Course (Phoenician Language and Texts = OIKOS research school offered at Leiden)	10	500
Electives (sem. 2):	30	500
<i>Advanced Biblical Hebrew Grammar</i>		
<i>Biblical Text in Mesopotamian Context</i>		
<i>Rebel, Prophet, Martyr: Jesus of Nazareth in the Context of his Time</i>		

Year 2	EC	Level
<b>Core courses</b>		
Common course: Libraries in the Ancient World	10	600
Thesis Tutorial	5	600
Thesis Presentation and Research Proposal	5	600
Thesis	25	600
<b>Assyriology</b>		
Electives (sem. 1): select from electives year 1, sem. 1	5-15	500
Research School Course (Advanced Cuneiform Epigraphy = OIKOS research school offered at Leiden)	10	500
<b>Classics</b>		
Electives (sem. 1): select from electives year 1, sem. 1	10	500
Research School Course	5	600
<b>Egyptology</b>		
Electives (sem. 1): select from the following courses	15	500
<i>Documentary Texts from Deir el-Medina and their social and cultural setting</i>		
<i>Amarna Seminar</i>		
<i>Coptic Texts in Context</i>		
<i>Demotic Papyrology III</i>		
<b>Hebrew and Aramaic Studies</b>		
Electives (sem. 1): select one to two of the following courses	10-20	500
<i>Cultural History of Aramaic</i>		
<i>Comparative Semitics</i>		
Research School Course (Phoenician Language and Texts = OIKOS research school offered at Leiden)	10	500





## APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE ONLINE VISIT

AS	Asian Studies
MES	Middle Eastern Studies
CAC	Classics and Ancient Civilizations
LAS	Latin American Studies
AfS	Africa Studies

Dates	Preparatory meetings	Participants
10 December 2020	Preparatory panel meeting (15:30-17:00)	Full panel
18 January 2021	Preparatory panel meeting (10:00-12:00; including office hour)	Full panel

### Day 1: Wednesday, February 3

#### Area Studies & Classics and Ancient Civilizations, Faculty of Humanities

Starts at	Ends at	Activity	Participants	
08:30	09:45	Internal panel meeting (panel only)	Full panel	
09:45	10:00	Break		
10:00	10:30	Meeting with Faculty Board Humanities	Full panel	
10:30	11:00	Meeting with programme chairs FGW	Full panel	
11:00	11:15	Break		
11:15	11:45	<p>Meeting with Programme Board AS and MES</p> <p>Panel:            Prof.dr. Jens-Uwe Hartmann (Munich)            Dr. Gerhard Anders (Edinburgh)            Prof.dr. Thomas Meier (Heidelberg)            Prof.dr. Helena Houvenaghel (Utrecht)</p> <p>Notulist:            Dr. Irene Conradie (Qanu)</p>	<p>Meeting with Programme Board CAC</p> <p>Panel:            Prof.dr. Kristoffel Demoen (Ghent)            Em.Prof.dr. John Healey (Manchester)            Yannick de Raaff, MA (Groningen)</p> <p>Secretary:            Dr. Els Schröder (Qanu)</p>	Parallel sessions
11:45	12:15	Internal panel meeting (panel only)	Full panel	
12:15	13:15	Lunch		
13:15	13:30	Internal panel meeting (panel only)	Full panel	
13:30	14:15	<p>Meeting with staff AS and MES</p> <p>Panel:            Prof.dr. Jens-Uwe Hartmann (Munich)            Em.Prof.dr. John Healey (Manchester)            Prof.dr. Thomas Meier (Heidelberg)            Prof.dr. Helena Houvenaghel (Utrecht)</p> <p>Notulist:            Dr. Irene Conradie (Qanu)</p>	<p>Meeting with students CAC</p> <p>Panel:            Prof.dr. Kristoffel Demoen (Ghent)            Prof.dr. Thomas Meier (Heidelberg)            Yannick de Raaff, MA (Groningen)</p> <p>Secretary:            Dr. Els Schröder (Qanu)</p>	Parallel sessions

14:15	14:30	Internal panel meeting (panel only)		Full panel
14:30	15:15	Meeting with students AS and MES  Panel: Prof.dr. Jens-Uwe Hartmann (Munich) Dr. Gerhard Anders (Edinburgh) Yannick de Raaff, MA (Groningen)  Notulist: Dr. Irene Conradie (Qanu)	Meeting with staff CAC  Panel: Prof.dr. Kristoffel Demoen (Ghent) Em.Prof.dr. John Healey (Manchester) Prof.dr. Thomas Meier (Heidelberg)  Secretary: Dr. Els Schröder (Qanu)	Parallel sessions
15:15	15:30	Break		
15:30	17:00	Internal panel meeting AS, MES, CAC (panel only)		Full panel
17:00	17:45	Alumni AS, MES, CAC		Full panel
17:45	18:15	Internal panel meeting wrap up day 1/preparation day 2 (panel only)		Full panel

## Day 2: Thursday, February 4

### Latin American Studies & African Studies, Faculty of Humanities

Starts at	Ends at	Activity	Participants	
09:00	09:15	Internal panel meeting (panel only)		Full panel
09:15	09:45	Meeting with Programme Board LAS  Panel: Prof.dr. Helena Houvenaghel (Utrecht) Prof.dr. Kristoffel Demoen (Ghent) Em.Prof.dr. John Healey (Manchester) Yannick de Raaff, MA (Groningen)  Notulist: Dr. Irene Conradie (Qanu)	Meeting with Programme Board AfS  Panel: Dr. Gerhard Anders (Edinburgh) Prof.dr. Jens-Uwe Hartmann (Munich) Prof.dr. Thomas Meier (Heidelberg)  Secretary: Dr. Els Schröder (Qanu)	Parallel sessions
09:45	10:00	Internal panel meeting (panel only)		
10:00	10:45	Meeting with students LAS  Panel: Prof.dr. Helena Houvenaghel (Utrecht) Prof.dr. Kristoffel Demoen (Ghent) Em.Prof.dr. John Healey (Manchester) Yannick de Raaff, MA (Groningen)  Notulist: Dr. Irene Conradie (Qanu)	Meeting with staff AfS  Panel: Dr. Gerhard Anders (Edinburgh) Prof.dr. Jens-Uwe Hartmann (Munich) Prof.dr. Thomas Meier (Heidelberg)  Secretary: Dr. Els Schröder (Qanu)	Parallel sessions
10:45	11:00	Break		
11:00	11:15	Internal panel meeting (panel only)		
11:15	12:00	Meeting with staff LAS	Meeting with students AfS	Parallel sessions

		<p>Panel: Prof.dr. Helena Houvenaghel (Utrecht) Prof.dr. Kristoffel Demoen (Ghent) Em.Prof.dr. John Healey (Manchester)</p> <p>Notulist: Dr. Irene Conradie (Qanu)</p>	<p>Panel: Dr. Gerhard Anders (Edinburgh) Prof.dr. Jens-Uwe Hartmann (Munich) Prof.dr. Thomas Meier (Heidelberg) Yannick de Raaff, MA (Groningen)</p> <p>Secretary: Dr. Els Schröder (Qanu)</p>	
12:00	12:15	Internal panel meeting (panel only)		
12:15	13:15	Lunch		
13:15	14:00	Internal panel meeting (panel only)		Full panel
14:00	14:20	<p>Meeting with all chairs + representatives BoE FGW</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fraud procedures</li> <li>- Faculty support</li> <li>- Quality assurance policies</li> </ul>		Full panel
14:20	14:30	Internal deliberation (panel only)		Full panel
14:30	14:50	<p>BoE AS and MES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assessment strategies</li> <li>- Improvements/Changes</li> <li>- Appointment examiners</li> <li>- Final check diploma</li> </ul> <p>Panel: Prof.dr. Jens-Uwe Hartmann (Munich) Dr. Gerhard Anders (Edinburgh) Prof.dr. Thomas Meier (Heidelberg) Prof.dr. Helena Houvenaghel (Utrecht)</p> <p>Notulist: Dr. Irene Conradie (Qanu)</p>	<p>BoE CAC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assessment strategies</li> <li>- Improvements/Changes</li> <li>- Appointment examiners</li> <li>- Final check diploma</li> </ul> <p>Panel: Prof.dr. Kristoffel Demoen (Ghent) Em.Prof.dr. John Healey (Manchester) Yannick de Raaff, MA (Groningen)</p> <p>Secretary: Dr. Els Schröder (Qanu)</p>	Parallel sessions
14:50	15:10	<p>BoE LAS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assessment strategies</li> <li>- Improvements/Changes</li> <li>- Appointment examiners</li> <li>- Final check diploma</li> </ul> <p>Panel: Prof.dr. Helena Houvenaghel (Utrecht) Em.Prof.dr. John Healey (Manchester) Yannick de Raaff, MA (Groningen)</p> <p>Notulist: Dr. Irene Conradie (Qanu)</p>	<p>BoE AfS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assessment strategies</li> <li>- Improvements/Changes</li> <li>- Appointment examiners</li> <li>- Final check diploma</li> </ul> <p>Panel: Prof.dr. Kristoffel Demoen (Ghent), Dr. Gerhard Anders (Edinburgh) Prof.dr. Jens-Uwe Hartmann (Munich) Prof.dr. Thomas Meier (Heidelberg)</p> <p>Secretary: Dr. Els Schröder (Qanu)</p>	Parallel sessions
15:10	15:30	Break		
15:30	16:00	Internal panel meeting BoEs (panel only)		Full panel
16:00	16:45	Alumni LAS and AfS		Full panel
16:45	18:00	Internal panel meeting LAS, AfS (wrap up day 2) (panel only)		Full panel

**Day 3: Friday, February 5**  
**Archaeology, Faculty of Archaeology**

Starts at	Ends at	Activity	Participants	
09:00	09:30	Final interview with management all programs / Faculty Board / academic directors of institutes FGW	Full panel	
09:30	10:00	Internal panel meeting (panel only)	Full panel	
10:00	10:45	Meeting with faculty management Archaeology + Programme Board + chair admission board and coordinator of studies	Full panel	
10:45	11:00	Break		
11:00	11:30	Meeting with students Archaeology	Full panel	
11:30	11:45	Internal panel meeting (panel only)	Full panel	
11:45	12:15	Meeting with staff Archaeology  Panel: Prof.dr. Kristoffel Demoen (Ghent), Prof.dr. Thomas Meier (Heidelberg), Prof.dr. Jens-Uwe Hartmann (Em.Prof.dr. John Healey (Manchester) Munich)  Notulist: Victor van Kleef, MA (Qanu)	Meeting with Board of Examiners Archaeology  Panel: Prof.dr. Helena Houvenaghel (Utrecht) Dr. Gerhard Anders (Edinburgh) Yannick de Raaff, MA (Groningen)  Secretary: Dr. Els Schröder (Qanu)	Parallel sessions
12:15	12:30	Internal panel meeting (panel only)	Full panel	
12:30	13:30	Lunch		
13:30	14:00	Presentation facilities/research opportunities Preparation: Film 3D tour FdA <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5IL4bnpS4qo">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5IL4bnpS4qo</a>  Panel: Prof.dr. Thomas Meier (Heidelberg) Em.Prof.dr. John Healey (Manchester) Prof.dr. Jens-Uwe Hartmann (Munich) Yannick de Raaff, MA (Groningen)  Notulist: Victor van Kleef, MA (Qanu)	Alumni Archaeology  Panel: Prof.dr. Kristoffel Demoen (Ghent) Prof.dr. Helena Houvenaghel (Utrecht) Dr. Gerhard Anders (Edinburgh)  Secretary: Dr. Els Schröder (Qanu)	Parallel sessions
14:00	15:00	Internal panel meeting Archaeology (wrap up) (panel only)	Full panel	
15:00	15:15	Break		
15:15	15:45	Preparations final interview (panel only)	Full panel	
15:45	16:15	Final interview with Faculty management and programme FA	Full panel	
16:15	16:30	Break		
16:30	17:30	Deliberations panel, formulating preliminary findings and conclusions (panel only)	Full panel	
17:30	18:00	Feedback of preliminary findings FA / FGW	Full panel	

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

### Thesis selection

Prior to the online site visit, the panel studied seventeen theses and assessment forms of the research master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations. The thesis selection consisted of fifteen theses and their assessment forms for the programme, based on a provided list of graduates between 2018 and 2020, including information on the 4 tracks. In addition, the panel studied two theses that were completed in the second half of 2020. A variety of topics and a diversity of examiners were included in the selection. The project manager and panel chair assured that the distribution of grades in the selection matched the distribution of grades of all available theses.

Track/variant	Total theses	Thesis selection
Classics	11	5
Assyriology	5	3
Egyptology	13	7
Hebrew and Aramaic Studies	3	2
Total	32	17

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

### Programme documents

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

#### *Frameworks and documents pertaining earlier assessments*

- NVAO Accreditation Framework 2018;
- Additional Criteria Research Master 2016;
- Assessment reports and Decisions NVAO for Research master's programmes Classics and Ancient Civilizations (2015), Middle Eastern Studies (2015), Asian Studies (2015), Archaeology (2015), Latin America Studies (2015 and 2017) and African Studies (2016).
- Review reports according to the Standard Evaluation Reports for the review period 2012-2017 for the African Studies Centre Leiden (ASCL), Leiden Institute for Area Studies (LIAS), Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society (LUCAS), Leiden University Centre for Linguistics (LUCL), Leiden University Institute for History (LUIH), Leiden University Institute for Philosophy (LUIP) and the Faculty of Archaeology.

#### *Faculty Documents Faculty of Humanities (FGW)*

- Guide to Teaching Quality FGW;
- Manual Board of Examiners FGW;
- Manual Programme Committees FGW;
- Quality Assurance of Assessment – in Dutch;
- Rules and Regulations of the Board of Examiners;
- Tips for Tests;
- Vision on Teaching and Learning: Learning @Leiden University.

#### *Programme Documents Classics and Ancient Civilizations*

- Self-evaluation report (Spring 2020) and Programme Covid update (January 2021);

- Answers to preliminary questions as formulated by the panel prior to the digital site visit per programme;
- Opleidingskaart;
- Onderwijs- en Examenreglement 2019-2020 en 2020-2021;
- Annual reports Boards of Examiners;
- Annual reports Programme Board;
- Minutes meetings Opleidingscommissie
- Assessment plan (part I and II);
- NSE report 2019 (student evaluation);

*Study materials Classics and Ancient Civilizations (including examples of assessment) and evaluations for the following courses:*

- Thesis Presentation and Research Proposal (2018-2019 and 2019-2020)
- Biblical Text in Mesopotamian Context (2019-2020)
- Common Course: Libraries in the Ancient World (2019-2020)
- Seminar Greek: Friendship in the Greek World: forms of relationality, from Homer to Aristotle (2019-2020)