



**HISTORY: CLASSICAL,
MEDIÉVAL AND EARLY
MODERN STUDIES**

FACULTY OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN

Qanu
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

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

Project number: Q0770

© 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 MASTER'S PROGRAMME HISTORY (RESEARCH) OF UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN.....	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION	5
COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	5
WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	6
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT	9
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENTS	11
APPENDICES	21
APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES	23
APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM.....	24
APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT	25
APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL	26

This report was finalised on 31 May 2021

REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME HISTORY (RESEARCH) OF UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN

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

Master's programme History

Name of the programme:	History (Research)
CROHO number:	60139
Level of the programme:	master's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	120 EC
Specializations or tracks:	Classical, Medieval and Early Modern Studies (CMEMS)
Location(s):	Groningen
Mode(s) 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 digital visit of the assessment panel History and International Relations to the Faculty of Arts of University of Groningen took place on the 23 and 24 November 2020.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

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

COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The NVAO has approved the composition of the panel on 18 August 2020. The panel that assessed the master's programme History consisted of:

- Prof. dr. W.P. (Wim) van Meurs, Professor and chair of the Political History section at Radboud University [chair];
- Prof. dr. G.D. (Greg) Woolf, Professor of Classics and Director of the Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London (Great Britain);
- Prof. dr. A. (Anne-Laure) Van Bruaene, professor in Early Modern Cultural History at Ghent University (Belgium);
- Dr. J. (Jorg) Kustermans, associate professor of International Relations at the Department of Political Science at the University of Antwerp (Belgium).
- J.E. (Caroline) Schep, BA, research master's student at Leiden University [student member];

The panel was supported by A.P. (Anke) van Wier MA, who acted as secretary.

WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The visit to the master's programme History at the Faculty of Arts of University of Groningen was part of the cluster assessment History/International Relations Research Masters 2020. Between September 2020 and July 2021 the panel assessed 5 programmes at 4 universities. The following universities participated in this cluster assessment: Leiden University, University of Amsterdam, University of Groningen and University of Utrecht.

On behalf of the participating universities, quality assurance agency Qanu was responsible for logistical support, panel guidance and the production of the reports. A.P. (Anke) van Wier MA was project coordinator for Qanu. A.P. (Anke) van Wier MA and Jaïra Azaria MA, acted as secretary in the cluster assessment. During the visit at the University of Groningen, the panel was supported by A.P. (Anke) van Wier MA, a certified NVAO secretary.

The programmes of the four universities were scheduled to be assessed between April 2020 and June 2020. Unfortunately, the COVID-19 pandemic made site visits impossible, and all assessments were rescheduled for more suitable dates in the fall and winter of 2020 and spring 2021. The project coordinator and the representatives of the programmes agreed to schedule digital assessments, unless a site visit became possible at that time.

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. dr. W.P. (Wim) van Meurs, professor and chair of the Political History section at Radboud University [chair];
- Prof. dr. B. (Benjamin) Kaplan, professor of Dutch History at University College London (Great Britain);
- Prof. dr. C.G. (Catrien) Santing, professor in Medieval History at the University of Groningen;
- Prof. dr. A. (Anne-Laure) Van Bruaene, professor in Early Modern Cultural History at Ghent University (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. M.F. (Mark) Gilbert, professor of History & International Studies at the John Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies (Italy);
- Prof. dr. G.D. (Greg) Woolf, professor of Classics and Director of the Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London (Great Britain);
- Prof. dr. J. (Jan) Ziolkowski, professor in Medieval Latin at Harvard University (United States);
- Prof. dr. V. (Violet) Soen, associate professor in Early Modern Religious History at KU Leuven (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. M. (Marjolein) 't Hart, professor of the History of State Formation in Global Perspective at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and Senior Researcher at the Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands in The Hague;
- Prof. Dr. J. (Johannes) Hahn, professor of Ancient History at the University of Münster (Germany).
- Dr. J. (Jorg) Kustermans, associate professor of International Relations at the Department of Political Science at the University of Antwerp (Belgium).
- S.G.J. (Siebren) Teule, MA, graduated research master's student at Utrecht University and junior lecturer at the Faculty of Humanities of Utrecht University [student member];
- J.E. (Caroline) Schep, BA, research master's student at Leiden University [student member];
- Prof. dr. M. (Máire) Ní Mhaonaigh, professor of Celtic and Medieval Studies at the University of Cambridge (Great Britain) [referee].

Preparation

At the end of March 2020, it became clear that due to the COVID-19 pandemic, all universities would be closed until further notice. The RUG indicated an interest in organizing a digital site visit since a conventional site visit was unlikely given travel policies as well as the applicable university standards and guidelines. The project coordinator asked the panel chair, Prof. van Meurs, whether he would be willing to lead a digital assessment. He consented to chair a digital assessment on 26 August 2020.



On the 24th of January 2020, the panel chair was briefed by Qanu on his role, the assessment framework, the working method, and the planning of site visits and reports. A preparatory panel meeting was organised on the 7th of February. During this meeting, the panel members received instruction on the use of the assessment framework(s). The panel also discussed their working method and the planning of the site visits (physical and online) and reports. When it became clear that a physical site visit could not take place, the panel members involved also confirmed their consent to partake in a digital assessment in October 2020. Their confirmations have been archived by Qanu and can be provided upon request.

A date was set for a digital visit on 23 and 24 November 2020. Before the site visit to the University of Groningen, Qanu received the self-evaluation report of the programme and sent it to the panel. After studying the existing documentation, the panel chair communicated a 'go' to the project coordinator. The project coordinator then composed a schedule for the online site visit in consultation with the Faculty. Prior to the digital site visit, the Faculty selected representative partners for the various interviews. See Appendix 3 for the final schedule.

A thesis selection was made by the panel's chair and the project coordinator. The selection consisted of 15 theses and their assessment forms for the programme, based on a provided list of graduates between 2016 and 2019. A variety of topics and tracks and a diversity of examiners were included in the selection. The project coordinator and panel chair ensured that the distribution of grades in the selection matched the distribution of grades of all available theses. The programme has no dedicated tracks, but the chair ensured that a variety of topics were included in the selection.

After studying the self-evaluation report, theses and assessment forms, the panel members formulated their preliminary findings and questions. The secretary collected all initial questions and remarks and distributed them amongst all panel members. A preparatory panel meeting was organized on 18 November 2020. In this meeting, the panel discussed its initial findings on the self-evaluation report and the theses, and decided on the division of tasks during the digital site visit.

Site visit

The online site visit to University of Groningen took place on 23 and 24 November 2020. Before and during the site visit, the panel studied the additional documents provided by the programmes. An overview of these materials can be found in Appendix 4. The panel conducted interviews with representatives of the programmes: students and staff members, the programme's management, alumni and representatives of the Board of Examiners. It also offered students and staff members an opportunity for confidential discussion during a consultation hour. No requests for private consultation were received.

The panel used the final part of the site visit to discuss its findings in an internal meeting. Afterwards, the panel chair publicly presented the panel's preliminary findings and general observations. During the visit, the panel decided to ask for additional clarification on standard 3, Student Assessment, and to await further information from the programme before finalising its conclusions. After reviewing the additional material, the panel completed the final draft of the report in April 2021.

The panel agreed with the programme to hold the Development Dialogue after the finalisation of the report. This session is scheduled later in 2021; its outcomes will be reported in a separate document and have no influence on the findings from the site visit or the considerations and conclusions in this report.

Consistency and calibration

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

1. The panel composition ensured regular attendance of (key) panel members, including the chair;
2. The coordinator was present at the panel discussion leading to the preliminary findings at all site visits.



Report

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

Definition of judgements standards

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

Generic quality

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

Meets the standard

The programme meets the generic quality standard.

Partially meets the standard

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

Does not meet the standard

The programme does not meet the generic quality standard.

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

Positive

The programme meets all the standards.

Conditionally positive

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

Negative

In the following situations:

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

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 in History at the University of Groningen has one track: Classical, Medieval and Early Modern Studies or CMEMS. The panel is very positive about the programme's chosen profile. It strikes an excellent balance between disciplinary specialisation and interdisciplinary exchange. Its aims align with current expectations in the field, and it fits the Faculty of Arts' strong research profile in these fields. The programme is attuned to students who want to continue in academia, but also to those who want to pursue societal careers. The panel established that the intended learning outcomes are in line with the Dublin Descriptors, meet the standards that one can expect from a RMA programme, and are aimed at the attainment of the relevant skills and knowledge.

The curriculum and the teaching-learning environment of the research master's programme are designed and implemented in such a way that the students are enabled to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The programme manages to strike a good balance between flexibility and coherence. Its students are very positive about the programme, they appreciate the intellectual freedom they are offered, they value the presence of disciplines other than their own in the programme, and they indicated that their perspectives and outlook are truly broadened. Teaching in the programme is research-based and student-centred and flourishes in the small-scale setting the programme offers. The panel considers the choice for an English-language teaching environment and programme name appropriate and states that the international classroom is an asset for the programme. It concludes that in terms of level and orientation, the curriculum is fitting to the RMA level.

The students receive training in relevant and modern skills and methodologies. The skills trained in the programme not only prepare them properly for academic careers, but are also useful for careers outside of this context. Research skills, including ethics, are taught throughout the entire programme, both in special skills courses and in courses that focus on knowledge in a particular field. Thus, during the two-year programme, the students are gradually and thoroughly prepared to undergo a full cycle of research, including a research internship, resulting in a final thesis of substantial size.

The research environment of the Groningen Research Institute for the study of Culture was graded as very good by the latest research reviews, and gives the students a unique opportunity to learn from prominent researchers. The panel is impressed by the quality of the teachers and praises the staff members' commitment to the students and the constant development of the programme. It verified that the staff's didactic skills, command of English and research credentials contribute to an engaged classroom interaction, with a strong focus on research. There is a large number of senior researchers involved in the programme. The panel is positive about plans to integrate further the PhD and RMA communities at the Faculty of Art, and thinks this will strengthen the CMEMS research community. The selection procedure and requirements are sound and suitable for the high level of a research master.

The programme is intensive but inspiring and feasible, and the students are excellently supported and supervised. Completion rates remain a concern for the programme. The panel sees that steps have been taken, and the previous panel's feedback has been adequately addressed. The first signs show that completion rates are improving. It encourages the programme to keep this issue on the agenda and monitor the impact of recent interventions.

Student assessment in the RMA is embedded in the policy and regulations of the university and the faculty. The assessment methods are varied and suitable to assess the students' development towards achieving the learning outcomes. While RMA students receive some kind of differentiated treatment when they take – and are assessed on – courses together with regular MA students, the panel thinks these arrangements can be stipulated more precisely and in a uniform way across all courses.

While the panel overall agreed to the scores on the respective theses, it did judge the assessment procedure could be improved with regard to transparency and reliability. In particular, the panel found that the thesis evaluation form could be improved by offering the second examiner a fully separate 'voice' in the thesis assessment. Following the panel's comments, the programme developed a new and harmonised approach, which will be effective as of



September 2021. The panel considers that the new evaluation approach takes away its initial concerns and allows for more independence and transparency in thesis assessment.

The assurance of assessment quality in the CMEMS programme rests with the Faculty-wide Board of Examiners, whose structure was recently adjusted. The new structure is a positive development, according to the panel, as it allows for further harmonisation across programmes. Moreover, the Board of Examiners has elaborated a relevant work plan for the future, for which it has the explicit support of the Faculty Board. The recent initiatives regarding thesis evaluation align with the work plan of the Board of Examiners. The panel considers that these developments will further strengthen the Board's position within the Faculty and among the programmes.

Based on the high overall level of the theses and the performance of the graduates, the panel concluded that the graduates achieve the programme's intended learning outcomes. In its view, the high proportion of graduates proceeding to PhDs, the fact that graduates also function well in other professional contexts and education, the quality of the theses examined (many of which could be used as a basis for future publications) are all evidence of their research qualities and the achievement of relevant professional skills. Based on the evidence gathered from the theses, the panel also concluded that the RMA students are fully embedded within the local research environment.

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 History - Classical, Medieval and Early-Modern Studies:

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

The chair, prof. dr. W.P. (Wim) van Meurs, and the secretary, A.P. (Anke) van Wier MA, of the panel hereby declare that all panel members have studied this report and that they agree with the judgements laid down in the report. They confirm that the assessment has been conducted in accordance with the demands relating to independence.

Date: 31 May 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

Profile

The RMA History at the RUG has one track: Classical, Medieval and Early Modern Studies or CMEMS. In practice, the programme is known under the name of this track. Hence, this report will use CMEMS to refer to the degree programme RMA History. CMEMS is founded on three constituent disciplines – Classics and Ancient Civilizations, Premodern History and Literary Studies – which all feed into the programme and allow the students to adopt a disciplinary grounding and an interdisciplinary approach/perspective. The programme's temporal scope ranges from Classical Antiquity and the Middle Ages to the Early Modern period, while in terms of geography, the programme focusses on Europe and the Middle East. It calls its concept the *longue durée*-approach, meaning that developments are dealt with in a diachronic fashion, and that methodology and theory are the focus for historical study rather than the instances of historical events. It is internationally oriented and integrates both disciplinary and interdisciplinary perspectives. It is designed to train and educate students to become researchers in the field of history, languages and culture. The students consider the combination of the different disciplines and perspectives challenging, the profile distinctive and the programme attractive. They appreciate that the programme allows them to gain an interdisciplinary perspective while also leaving them free to specialise in one of the constituent disciplines, Classics and Ancient Civilizations, Premodern History and Literary Studies.

The panel is very positive about the interesting combination of the disciplines of history, languages and literature, and cultural studies, and is pleased that the previous assessment panel's recommendation to integrate these further has been taken up. It had some difficulty assessing to what extent the *longue durée*-approach serves as a strong theoretical underpinning of the programme, or if it simply indicates that the programme adopts a broad temporal perspective. It considers the programme to be especially strong in training students in source-based research. The programme builds on strong and internationally renowned research in the Faculty of Arts, and it benefits from collaborations with national research schools, museums, libraries and archives in the field.

The panel is particularly satisfied with the extent to which the programme prepares students for their future careers, within the academic world and beyond. The programme management aims to train researchers, not necessarily PhD students. It gives students the necessary preparation for an academic career, but also ensures that the acquired research skills and knowledge can be used in various research-based professions as well, for example in libraries, cultural organisations, archives and heritage institutions.

Intended learning outcomes

The panel studied the programme's intended learning outcomes (ILOs). In its opinion, the ILOs are at a level that suits a research master: they offer a very solid preparation for a research career by paying ample attention to research skills, analysing sources, working with theory and critical thinking. In addition, the ILOs are formulated in line with the Dublin Descriptors and reflect the interdisciplinary nature of the programme. The ILOs tie into the general expectations in the respective fields of history, literature and languages and the related professions. The panel is satisfied with the way the programme has responded to the previous assessment panel's recommendation to tailor the ILOs more prominently to skills that are useful for careers outside of academia, and states that both career paths are now on an equal footing in the ILOs.



Considerations

The panel is very positive about the programme's chosen profile. It strikes an excellent balance between disciplinary specialisation and interdisciplinary exchange. Its aims align with current expectations in the field, and it fits the Faculty of Arts' strong research profile in these fields. The programme is attuned to students who want to continue in academia, but also to those who want to pursue societal careers. The panel established that the intended learning outcomes are in line with the Dublin Descriptors, meet the standards that one can expect from a RMA programme, and are aimed at the attainment of the relevant skills and knowledge.

Conclusion

Master's programme History (research): 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

Didactic approach

Teaching in the RMA Classical, Medieval and Early Modern Studies is based on four core principles that aim to create an inclusive learning environment in which students are methodologically and interdisciplinary aware, and trained to be independent scholars in their own right with a solid disciplinary foundation. To meet these ambitions, all core courses are co-developed and taught by at least two staff members from different disciplinary backgrounds. This ensures that all common courses are multi- or interdisciplinary and reflect the chosen didactic approach.

Cohorts in the RMA varied in size between 6 and 14 students in the period under review, with the programme aiming for between 10 and 15 students. The panel ascertained that even in a small cohort of 8 students, the students indicated that the in-class debates are fruitful and stimulating. They appreciate the individual attention they receive, and say the teaching is activating and challenges them to reconsider their perspectives. With the three fields of classical studies, pre-modern history and literary studies represented in the programme, they confirmed that the programme generally succeeds in offering interdisciplinary teaching while also offering sound disciplinary training. They expressed the concern that some course units run the risk of being either too general or too specific, but that the programme overall manages to cater to both students with a specific (disciplinary) research interest and those who prefer the broader perspective. The panel recognised that the balance between disciplinary deepening and interdisciplinary broadening is the main tension of the programme; it is at once its great strength and its greatest weakness. It believes that the programme currently strikes the right balance.

Curriculum

The RMA CMEMS is a two-year, 120 EC programme. It comprises four elements: the common courses (30 EC), individually chosen research modules (35 EC), the specialisation phase (25 EC) and the thesis (30 EC). The core courses in the first year form the basis for the specialisation, individual components and thesis. In response to the recommendation by the previous assessment panel to strengthen the common core, 10 EC have been transferred from the individual modules to the common core, which the panel appreciates.

The common core consists of four separate courses, three of which are located in year one and the final course in year two. The students start with the Approaches to Antiquity, Middle Ages and Early Modern Times course (10 EC). This course is considered quite challenging by many students as it extensively introduces the interdisciplinary elements of the programme, taking not events or periods as its central focus, but rather theories and approaches. During this course the students also go on a study trip to Rome. The Digital approaches to the Premodern world course (5 EC) is an introductory course on digital humanities theories, tools and practices that was introduced in 2017. For the CMESM seminar (10 EC), the students prepare an interdisciplinary discussion related to an academic



and social debate on a topic of their choice and prepare a presentation on their own work and link this to that of other students. This course not only trains the students' research and presentation skills, it also introduces them to the practical elements of organising a conference. The final common course is the second-year Careers in research and Society course (5 EC). This new course, introduced in the 2018-2019 academic year, asks the students to reflect on the skills they have learnt during their studies and how they relate to the academic and professional job markets. It includes teaching on how to write a PhD proposal and on how to write a CV.

The so-called research modules are all located in the first year. Together with the Director of Studies (DoS), the students select courses from those on offer at the University of Groningen (25 EC) and at the national research schools (10 EC). The courses they take in Groningen are offered by regular master's programmes. In principle, they follow courses within the Faculty of Arts, but they can also look outside of this faculty, for example to the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies. The research schools offering courses include the Research School for Medieval Studies, OIKOS, the Huizinga Institute for the Study of Culture and the Posthumus Institute.

The specialisation phase takes place in the second year. This can take a number of forms; the students can follow individual or small-group tutorials for research projects, *privatissima* (small-scale courses), or conduct a research-based internship. Another option is to stay at a foreign university to follow specialised courses, or to follow additional courses in Groningen, the research schools or other universities in the Netherlands. The choices the students make for this phase are discussed with the DoS and the student's academic tutor, and they are checked by the Board of Examiners to ensure they are in line with the programme's intended learning outcomes and of the appropriate level and orientation for a RMA.

The final phase consists of the thesis. During the thesis project, the students realise a full research cycle; from the formulation of a solid research question to the output of a written report. They select a topic that fits the programme's research context, formulate a suitable research question, choose the best research method, and communicate their approach through a research plan. Though the programme stimulates them to adopt a multi- or interdisciplinary approach, they are also free to focus on one of the programme's disciplines. After receiving suggestions and (peer)feedback, RMA students conduct their research and write a 20,000-30,000 word thesis that is subsequently presented for assessment. The quality of the research presented in the thesis should be such that it can be reworked into an article for an academic journal. The panel considers this trajectory sufficient proof of the students' mastery of the full research cycle.

The students indicated that they find the breadth and flexibility of the programme attractive, and that it allows them to specialise while still benefiting from the exposure to its interdisciplinary environment. They are positive about the progression and coherence of the programme, and stated that the earlier courses helped them prepare for their thesis. They appreciate the option the programme allows for studying abroad, conducting internships and following courses at the national research schools. They are also pleased about the programme's annual trip to Rome. The panel is overall very positive about the curriculum, in terms of both contents and structure. It reviewed a number of courses and spoke to both staff and students about the stimulating teaching and learning environment. The programme has dealt adequately with the previous assessment panel's recommendation to improve its coherence. It offers a truly interdisciplinary curriculum and allows its students to study the premodern world in a broad perspective.

When it comes to skills and methods, the panel is equally satisfied. Sufficient attention is paid to the accepted research skills and methodologies in the field, and these are offered in an integrated manner in the content courses. The panel is furthermore pleased with the way research ethics is covered in various core courses. The programme trains transferable skills as well, for example by having students organise a conference in the CMEMS seminar, where they also practise their presenting skills by presenting their own work. Alumni confirmed that the programme trained them in analytical, writing and critical-thinking skills. The panel is very positive about the course on digital humanities, which not only introduces the students to state-of-the-art methods in academic research, but also teaches valuable skills for the professional job market. The course on Careers in research and society is still quite new and under development, but the panel believes this is a valuable addition to the curriculum and helps in



preparing the students for both job markets by making them aware of their skills and how they can highlight when applying for jobs.

Teaching staff and research context

The CMEMS programme is embedded within the Groningen Research Institute for the study of Culture (ICOG). The research quality of the ICOG has been judged very good in their Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) research evaluation in 2017. The ICOG is constituted of multiple research groups, and the programme draws from several of them, which means that the students in this broad programme can always find a thesis supervisor who fits their specific research interest. The programme is therefore embedded in a very high-quality research environment. The programme management indicated that the programme is designed to mirror current research going on at the faculty by young (PhD) researchers and by more senior staff, something the panel clearly recognised in the programme's curriculum and contents. CMEMS' core teaching team is composed of at least six full professors, ensuring that students are exposed to a considerable number of senior researchers in the field in both their core courses and individual thesis trajectories. During the site visit, it learnt about the faculty's plans to bring together students from all the faculty's RMA programmes and PhD candidates by creating buddy systems between PhDs and RMA students, and by setting aside a special room where these groups can meet. The panel supports this idea and considers it a good way to further strengthen the programme's research environment.

The students greatly appreciate their teachers. They said the teaching staff makes them feel part of a true research community, and that their teachers are approachable, committed and knowledgeable. The panel verified that the research credentials of the teaching staff are very good to excellent, and many staff members are engaged in cutting-edge research in their field. Within the composition of the teaching team, the programme offers an impressive range of specialisations, something the students indicated that they appreciate. The panel also verified that the programme ensures coherence by working with a small team for the core courses and a broader team for the specialisations. The teaching staff receive sufficient training, and all have obtained their university teaching certificate (Basiskwalificatie Onderwijs, BKO). The panel verified that the staff members are qualified to teach in English; they receive sufficient training, if necessary, and their language skills are tested accordingly.

The panel is very impressed by the programme's teaching staff. They are incredibly dedicated, and the panel appreciates that staff make time for one-on-one teaching in the tutorials, despite the high work pressure they face. The system of co-teaching works well, and the panel appreciates the staff's extra efforts to make this work. It found the staff's commitment to the constant improvement of the programme inspiring. The core team is constantly developing and reconsidering elements of the programme, and is highly responsive to student feedback on courses and the teaching in general. The panel wishes to compliment the team on the recent changes they made, for example integrating the digital humanities and increasing the career preparation for students, considering them very valuable additions to the programme.

Admissions, study guidance and feasibility

The panel studied the programme's admission procedure and entry requirements and found them to be robust and fitting for a research master's programme. Due attention is paid to the candidate's academic track record, prior training at the content level, research skills and research interests to guarantee a good match between the prospective student and the programme. The panel appreciates that the intake committee also engages in expectation management and takes care to discuss the required mindset and workload with prospective students. The programme has both a September and a February intake, which combined resulted in 6 to 14 admissions per year over the 2015-2020 period.

All students have a formal introduction meeting with the Director of Studies before the start of the programme. Here they discuss the programme itself and the selection of individual modules and national research schools. The students are assigned an academic tutor, a member of staff from their own discipline who helps them with choices regarding their specialisations and research focus. The students regularly meet with their tutor, the DoS and the study advisors throughout their programme. The students and alumni the panel spoke to during the site visit



appreciated the intensive system of study guidance and the support they received. They especially praised the commitment of the tutors and supervisors, who maintain contact and regularly check in when students are taking internships or courses abroad.

The completion rates remain a source of worry for the programme: 30% of the students finish within two years' time, and another 30% within three years, with most delays occurring during the specialisation phase in the second year. The students and alumni the panel spoke to during the site visit indicated that while the work pressure is high, the programme is feasible. This is aided by the committed support from the teaching staff and the good atmosphere among the students themselves. In response to the issue of completion rates, the programme has taken a number of steps to reduce the delays since the previous accreditation. The most recent one is the adoption of a more streamlined thesis trajectory and a modified thesis contract that specifies the planning of research activities and output. All in all, the panel is positive about the programme's response to the previous assessment panel's worries about completion rates, and it applauds the steps taken. The first signs show that the number of delayed students is reducing. The issues of completion, work pressure and feasibility will require continuous monitoring, however, and should remain on the agenda. The students are generally positive about the programme's response to the Covid-19 pandemic, and how the shift to online education has been managed.

Language and programme name

All modules offered in the programme are taught in English. This choice is considered appropriate by the panel given the programme's ambitions to train students for the academic and professional job market of the future. English is the lingua franca of research in the programme's constituent disciplines; research in these fields has become highly international in its outlook and orientation. It is often based on international collaboration, just as the source material and reference texts are often multilingual. Some students write their thesis in the language they study (e.g. French). Teaching the programme in English furthermore allows the programme to build an international classroom and to draw on the expertise of non-Dutch staff members, both of which the panel considers an asset for the programme. It therefore considers the choice for English as the language of instruction, and an English programme name, appropriate and of added value for students.

Considerations

The curriculum and the teaching-learning environment of the research master's programme are designed and implemented in such a way that the students are enabled to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The programme manages to strike a good balance between flexibility and coherence. Its students are very positive about the programme, they appreciate the intellectual freedom they are offered, they value the presence of disciplines other than their own in the programme, and they indicated that their perspectives and outlook are truly broadened. Teaching in the programme is research-based and student-centred and flourishes in the small-scale setting the programme offers. The panel considers the choice for an English-language teaching environment and programme name appropriate and states that the international classroom is an asset for the programme. It concludes that in terms of level and orientation, the curriculum is fitting to the RMA level.

The students receive training in relevant and modern skills and methodologies. The skills trained in the programme not only prepare them properly for academic careers, but are also useful for careers outside of this context. Research skills, including ethics, are taught throughout the entire programme, both in special skills courses and in courses that focus on knowledge in a particular field. Thus, during the two-year programme, the students are gradually and thoroughly prepared to undergo a full cycle of research, including a research internship, resulting in a final thesis of substantial size.

The research environment of the Groningen Research Institute for the study of Culture was graded as very good by the latest research reviews, and gives the students a unique opportunity to learn from prominent researchers. The panel is impressed by the quality of the teachers and praises the staff members' commitment to the students and the constant development of the programme. It verified that the staff's didactic skills, command of English and research credentials contribute to an engaged classroom interaction, with a strong focus on research. There is a large number of senior researchers involved in the programme. The panel is positive about plans to integrate further



the PhD and RMA communities at the Faculty of Art, and thinks this will strengthen the CMEMS research community. The selection procedure and requirements are sound and suitable for the high level of a research master.

The programme is intensive but inspiring and feasible, and the students are excellently supported and supervised. Completion rates remain a concern for the programme. The panel sees that steps have been taken, and the previous panel's feedback has been adequately addressed. The first signs show that the completion rates are improving. It encourages the programme to keep this issue on the agenda and monitor the impact of recent interventions.

Conclusion

Master's programme History (research): 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 RMA follows the assessment regulations as specified in the Teaching and Examination Regulations, which include the programme's intended learning outcomes, the assessment plan and the matrix that contains the learning outcomes of course units. The procedures for all assessments are specified in the assessment protocol and in the syllabi of the individual courses. Thesis assessment is explained in a special thesis manual. In terms of approach, assessment in the programme builds on the didactic philosophy of student-centred and research-oriented teaching. This means that the programme adopts a holistic approach towards assessment, with the students being asked to reflect on their own learning trajectory, and assessment is aimed at gradually increasing the students' independence as researchers.

The panel observed that the assessment methods are sufficiently varied and suitable for the learning outcomes they are meant to assess. Research skills and ethics are tested in an appropriate manner, and the students go through the full research cycle in their thesis trajectories. The assessments can be formative or summative and clearly reflect the programme's level. The programme uses classical forms of assessment such as class participation, presentations, small assignments (such as book reviews, etc.) and term papers, but also more innovative forms such as digital presentations, portfolios, literature reflections, case studies and the writing of a PhD project proposal. The panel is impressed by the range of assessment forms used, but asks the programme to keep the students' workload in mind when developing these forms. All tests are checked by at least two staff members, while the DoS and BoE also keep an eye on the assessment quality. For courses outside of the programme's core, the students are required to submit the syllabus and a work report stating what they did for this course. In this way the BoE and DoS keep an eye on each student's progression towards the programme's ILOs. The panel considers this a satisfactory solution.

The panel understood that the programme aims at some form of differentiation for RMA students when they take courses with regular MA students, but was unable to pin down what the exact system was. It heard that this is mostly approached on a case-by-case basis, which seems to work to the satisfaction of the students and staff. It would recommend that the programme formalise this system more, to ensure alignment between the programme's ILOs and the students' individual trajectories. It heard about a proposal in which the students are asked to write short reflections on their learning in the individual courses, and to relate this to the programme's overall aims. It considers this a valuable approach, and asks the programme to consider a uniform approach to these types of courses.

Thesis assessment

The panel reviewed 15 theses before the site visit. A number of them significantly exceeded the 20,000-30,000 word limit. In speaking with the BoE and the programme management, the panel learnt that students are not to exceed this limit, in principle. It understood from the BoE that there are grounds for an exemption of this limit, but it remains unclear what these grounds are. It recommends that the programme and the Board of Examiners set clear standards



for the grounds on which such exemptions may be granted. It furthermore thinks the 10,000-word range in the word count is very large, and recommends fixing this limit on the upper margin at 30,000 words.

While the panel overall agreed to the scores on the respective theses, it did judge the assessment procedure could be improved with regard to transparency and reliability. In particular, the panel found that the thesis evaluation form could be improved by offering the second examiner a fully separate 'voice' in the thesis assessment. In the form, the second examiner is asked whether s/he agrees with the assessment by the first examiner, who is also the supervisor. Such form, according to the panel, impedes an independent assessment by the second examiner. Moreover, the panel found that the way in which the second examiner is appointed could be more formalized. Although this is a legal task of the Board of Examiners, the panel heard about cases in which the supervisor and student together suggested or proposed a second examiner.

After discussion with the panel, the programme and the Board of Examiners developed a new assessment procedure for the thesis, which was presented to the panel in spring 2021. The panel understood from the document that these changes will be implemented across all bachelor and master programme theses in the Faculty of Art. According to the new procedure, the supervisor will assess and score the thesis on one evaluation form, followed by the second examiner who will independently assess the thesis on a second evaluation form and this without knowing the assessment or the score of the first examiner. Then, both examiners together agree on a final assessment, which will be written down on a third evaluation form, signed by both examiners and provided to the student. All forms will be archived in the assessment dossier. Furthermore, the panel welcomes the programme plans to avoid fixed 'grading pairs' of examiners. The panel acknowledges the proposed changes and thinks they indeed improve the independence and transparency for the thesis assessment.

Board of Examiners

The assurance of assessment quality within CMEMS rests with the Board of Examiners that is responsible for the assessment of all programmes in the Faculty of Arts. As of January 2019, the Board of Examiners oversees six expert teams for different disciplines within the Faculty, merging the former separate boards. The chairs of the constituent expertise teams sit on the new central Board, along with a professional assessment expert. The research master's programme falls under the remit of the expert team for the research masters, consisting of four staff members. The panel learnt that the BoE wants to work on the standardisation of policy, procedures and assessment forms across the faculty.

The Board of Examiners appoints examiners for the programme, monitors the programme's compliance with its Teaching and Examination Regulations, and assures the quality of the assessment in individual courses and theses. The relevant expert team of the BoE regularly selects courses and theses for evaluation, trying to give as many courses as possible an evaluation once every three years. For these assessments, the expert team follows the protocol drawn up by the BoE: ensuring that the learning objectives stated in the assessment plan are assessed for each course and that the assessment is valid, reliable and transparent. The evaluations take place on the basis of the assessment portfolios supplied by the course co-ordinators and lecturers. These contain study instructions, papers/exams and assessment forms, possible resits, answer models, and result lists with partial and final grades. While students initially seemed to have some trouble finding the new BoE, the panel learnt that this problem has been addressed, which it considers a positive step.

The panel is positive about the new structure with the faculty-wide Board of Examiners. It commends the Board's intention to work on standardisation and formalisation, and verified that it has the support of the Faculty Board in this regard. In some regards, for example regarding the appointment of second examiners, it considers the BoE too timid. It would like to encourage the Board to be more proactive and to implement common procedures and rules where this makes sense in its view, while of course keeping an eye on the principle of subsidiarity.



The panel understands from the clarifications provided by the programme on the thesis assessment process that these plans have been discussed with the Faculty Board and were validated by the Board of Examiners. According to the Board of Examiners, the announced procedures concur with its ongoing work regarding standardisation and formalisation. As of the academic year 2020-2021, all thesis examiners will be appointed by the Board of Examiners or by its delegated expert representing the research master's programmes. The panel welcomes the proposed changes and their alignment with the work of the Board of Examiners as independent 'watchdog'.

Considerations

Student assessment in the RMA is embedded in the policy and regulations of the university and the faculty. The assessment methods are varied and suitable to assess the students' development towards achieving the learning outcomes. While RMA students receive some kind of differentiated treatment when they take – and are assessed on – courses together with regular MA students, the panel thinks these arrangements can be stipulated more precisely and in a uniform way across all courses.

While the panel overall agreed to the scores on the respective theses, it did judge the assessment procedure could be improved with regard to transparency and reliability. In particular, the panel found that the thesis evaluation form could be improved by offering the second examiner a fully separate 'voice' in the thesis assessment. Following the panel's comments, the programme developed a new and harmonised approach, which will be effective as of September 2021. The panel considers that the new evaluation approach takes away its initial concerns and allows for more independence and transparency in thesis assessment.

The assurance of assessment quality in the CMEMS programme rests with the Faculty-wide Board of Examiners, whose structure was recently adjusted. The new structure is a positive development, according to the panel, as it allows for further harmonisation across programmes. Moreover, the Board of Examiners has elaborated a relevant work plan for the future, for which it has the explicit support of the Faculty Board. The recent initiatives regarding thesis evaluation align with the work plan of the Board of Examiners. The panel considers that these developments will further strengthen the Board's position within the Faculty and among the programmes.

Conclusion

Master's programme History (research): the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

Theses

The panel read a representative sample of 15 final theses and was very impressed with their quality. Many were of an excellent level, highly professional in their presentation, and dealt with highly relevant issues. Even the theses of more 'average' quality displayed the basic quality that might be expected at the RMA level, were well-written and -structured and showed a good command of academic English. The variety of topics mirrored the broad scope of the programme. All of the studied theses were based on comprehensive work on primary sources and engaged extensively with the literature on the topic. It did not surprise the panel that many theses had won national and even international thesis prizes and their authors graduated with distinction.

The panel noted that the theses were mostly strong pieces of disciplinary research but, reflecting to the previous assessment panel's findings, did not really produce the methodologically innovating or interdisciplinary research that might be expected by looking at the programme's aims. It does not consider this to be overly problematic, since the disciplinary theses still displayed a broad awareness of larger trends in the humanities as a whole as a



result of the exposure to the programme's interdisciplinary environment. It is also clear from the studied theses that the students work alongside the excellent research conducted at the Faculty of Arts in these fields. The panel hopes that with the addition of the digital humanities, future pieces of work will also include this dimension and/or adopt methodologies from this toolkit. Most theses are very suitable to serve as a basis for future publications. The panel read one thesis that focussed on the modern rather than the pre-modern period. It was assured that this constituted an exception, but advises the programme to keep ensuring that the thesis topics fit the programme's profile.

The panel believes that the final project enables the students to go through a full research cycle, but does recommend fixing the word count at the upper limit currently in use. On the whole, it thinks that the students show that they attain the high level of knowledge and skills the programme aims at, and that the intended learning outcomes and thus the research master's level are achieved.

Alumni

Another sign of the programme's quality is the employment record of graduates in research. The panel found that this record is relatively high, around 42% of the alumni between 2014-2019 continue in academic research, 19% in the public and/or cultural sector, 14% continue in work related to or in support of the academic sector and 14% are teachers in secondary education. The panel is impressed with the employment record of the programme's alumni, and noted that they do well in both labour markets. The skills taught by the programme are valued in a range of different environments. This was confirmed in the interview with alumni, who conveyed the advantages of their research background in a clear manner for their career paths outside of academia. The panel is pleased with the programme's efforts to improve awareness of the various options for societal careers to the students. It learnt that some of the alumni in professional careers are now asked to speak to current students, which is a good step. It encourages the programme to continue these efforts.

Considerations

Based on the high overall level of the theses and the performance of the graduates, the panel concluded that the graduates achieve the programme's intended learning outcomes. In its view, the high proportion of graduates proceeding to PhDs, the fact that graduates also function well in other professional contexts and education, the quality of the theses examined (many of which could be used as a basis for future publications) are all evidence of their research qualities and the achievement of relevant professional skills. Based on the evidence gathered from the theses, the panel also concluded that the RMA students are fully embedded within the local research environment.

Conclusion

Master's programme History (research): 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 History 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 *master's programme History (research)* as 'positive'.



APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

Research Master's programme in Classical, Medieval and Early Modern Studies

Knowledge and understanding

- Students have a thorough and up-to-date knowledge of one of the CMEMS areas of specialisation, its historical development and structure; they must be able to grasp the relationships between its various branches.
- Students are familiar with the formulation of theories, with the interpretations, methodologies and techniques of their area of specialisation and are able to evaluate these critically.
- Students have at least a working knowledge of the primary sources relevant to the specialisation chosen.
- Students have knowledge and understanding of the meaning and function of premodern and early modern texts and artefacts, in their historical and contemporary context.

Applying knowledge and understanding

- Students have the skills to apply methodologies and techniques when conducting independent research and understand how to use research results to develop advanced ideas and practical applications.
- Students are able to make use of and critically evaluate research carried out by others and to critically evaluate methods and theories, methodologies and techniques relevant for their area of specialisation.
- Students are familiar with the development of theory in the humanities, as well as with the various academic schools and traditions. This includes the ability to recognise the characteristics of a wider intellectual tendency in individual publications as well as form scholarly opinion on the application of theories.
- Students are able to develop an understanding of the hermeneutics of classical, medieval and early modern studies, and their foundation in intellectual integrity coupled with an awareness of the following central tenets of scientific ethics: universalism, public debate, disinterestedness and systematic scepticism.

Making judgements

- Students are able to critically evaluate the interpretations, methodologies and techniques of their specialisation in relation to other disciplines.
- Students are able to make an original contribution to knowledge (albeit limited in scope) in at least one branch of the specialisation chosen, assessed by means of the MA thesis.
- Students are able to analyse and formulate an academic problem independently, and in so doing, to select, apply and where necessary adapt an adequate theoretical framework and one or more relevant research methods.
- Students are able to make connections between the own specialist knowledge of the specialization chosen and related other disciplines, in the field of pre-modern studies e.g. archaeology, art history, law, religion, philosophy.

Communication

- Students are able to participate actively and creatively in a research group working on an academic project.
- Students are able to participate in academic debate in the chosen area of specialization and to present a scientific problem convincingly in appropriate English, both orally and in writing.
- Students are able to develop a research project in an explicit multidisciplinary and cross-disciplinary context.
- Students are able to convincingly present their expert knowledge in various academic and other professional settings in which such knowledge is required.

Learning Skills

- Students are able to keep abreast of the latest developments in their specialisation and broaden and deepen their knowledge and understanding.
- Students are able to independently formulate a research proposal and critically evaluate their own research.



APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Master's programme History (research)

No.	Course unit	Student workload in ECTS
	Year 1	
1	Approaches to Antiquity, Middle Ages and Early Modern Times	10 ECTS
2	CMEMS - Seminar	10 ECTS
3	Digital Approaches to the Premodern World	5 ECTS
4	Research Seminar I and/or Course(s) at a National Research School*	35 ECTS
5	Research Seminar II	
6	Research Seminar III	
For Research Seminar I-III, students must select courses from the following options:		
	- research seminars from the offer of the regular master History	
	- research seminars from the offer of the regular master Classics	
	- one of the interdisciplinary research seminars	
	- course Greek Epigraphy (within the Classics specialization)	
	- course Living with the Gods in the Greek World (within the Classics specialization)	
	- course Script, Manuscript and Print I	
	- course Script, Manuscript and Print II	
	- course Medieval Latin I	
	- course Medieval Latin II	
	- course Latin for Research	
	- course Heritage in Crisis	
	Year 2	
7	CMEMS: Specialization I	10 ECTS
8	CMEMS: Specialization II	10 ECTS
9	CMEMS: Specialization III	5 ECTS
10	Careers in Research and Society	5 ECTS
11	ReMa Thesis in CMEMS	30 ECTS

* Students must choose at least 10 ECTS worth of course units offered by a National Research School. In case the courses on offer by the National Research Schools do not suffice or are incompatible with the student's research orientation, students can choose a research seminar from the options mentioned in the table above, always in consultation with the Director of Studies.



APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

DAY 1		MHIR
08.30	9.15	Internal meeting
09.15	09.30	Welcome by Faculty Board
09.30	10.15	Meeting management MHIR
10.15	10.30	Break
10.30	11.15	Meeting students MHIR (including PC members)
11.15	11.30	Break
11.30	11.45	Internal Meeting
11.45	12.30	Meeting staff MHIR (including PC members)
12.30	13.15	Lunch
13.15	13.30	Internal meeting
13.30	14.15	Meeting Board of Examiners (both MHIR and CMEMS)
14.15	14.30	Break
14.30	14.45	Internal meeting
14.45	15.30	Final interview management
15.30	15.45	Break
15.45	16.45	Deliberations panel, formulating preliminary findings and conclusions

DAY 2		CMEMS
09.00	10.00	Preparation panel
10.00	10.45	Meeting management CMEMS
10.45	11.00	Break
11.00	11.45	Meeting students CMEMS (including PC members)
11.45	12.00	Break
12.00	12.45	Meeting staff CMEMS (including PC members)
12.45	13.30	Lunch
13.30	13.45	Internal meeting
13.45	14.30	Meeting alumni (both MHIR and CMEMS)
14.30	14.45	Break
14.45	15.00	Internal meeting
15.00	15.45	Final interview management
15.45	16.45	Deliberations panel, formulating preliminary findings and conclusions
16.45	17.00	Preparation preliminary report chair
17.00	17.30	Presentation preliminary findings by chair (open to all interested parties)

APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

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

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

Course syllabi:

- MHIR
 - o Thesis preparation class Syllabus 19-20
 - o Theory of Modern History and IR Syllabus 19-20
 - o Themes Trends and Topics Syllabus 19-20
 - o Specialisation phase Syllabus 20-21
 - o Methodology research practice Syllabus 20-21
 - o Master thesis Syllabus 20-21
 - o Advanced methodology IR Syllabus 20-21
 - o Advanced methodology IR Syllabus 19-20
 - o
- CMEMS
 - o Seminar Syllabus 19-20
 - o Passion of the Soul Syllabus 19-20
 - o Digital Approaches Syllabus 19-20
 - o Careers in Research and Society Syllabus 18-19
 - o Approaches Syllabus 20-21
 - o Approaches Syllabus 19-20

Annual reports

- Programme committee
 - o ReMa MHIR 19-20
 - o ReMa MHIR 18-19
 - o ReMa CMEMS 19-20
 - o ReMa CMEMS 18-19
 - o ReMa CMEMS 17-18
 - o PC MHIR minutes 28.11.2019
 - o PC MHIR minutes 23.06.2020
 - o PC MHIR minutes 20.02.2020
 - o PC MHIR minutes 09.11.2020
- Board of Examiners
 - o Expertise Team ReMa's 17-18
 - o Expertise Team ReMa's 16-17
 - o Expertise Team ReMa's 15-16
 - o Board of Examiners 18-19

Impact COVID-19 on (online) teaching and examination:

- Update ReMa CMEMS (as an addition to the self-evaluation report)
- Update ReMa MHIR (as an addition to the self-evaluation report)
- Thesis Regulations Research Master Track CMEMS 2020-21
- Memo on assessment and social distancing (October 2020 update)
- Code of Conduct for students for online teaching and student examinations



- ReMa International Relations – Reform Proposal
- MHIR colloquium plan
- MHIR assessment form for specialization tutorials

General information:

- General strategy and policy
 - o Education policy University of Groningen
 - o Strategic plan University of Groningen 2015-2021
 - o Strategic Plan Faculty of Arts 2016-2020
 - o Vision for Education Faculty of Arts 2018
- Education (information on:)
 - o Information Institute of Education
 - o Teaching and Examination Regulations
 - o Faculty Committees
 - o Network of Arts
- Cluster organization Faculty of Arts
 - o Organization Faculty of Arts
 - o Memo Towards a flexible Faculty of Arts
- Pressure of work
 - o Memo Kwaliteitsafspraken Faculteit der Letteren
- NVAO assessment and accreditation 2012-2016
 - o Reports and decisions accreditation degree programmes
- Employability
 - o Memo Advisory Boards at the Faculty of Arts
- Minors at the Faculty of Arts
 - o Minors manual Faculty of Arts
- Internal quality assurance
 - o Board of Examiners
 - o Programme Committees
 - o Educational quality in the Faculty
- Assessment
 - o Assessment policy University of Groningen
 - o Regels en verantwoordelijkheden toetsing Faculteit der Letteren
 - o Assessment plan Faculty of Arts
- Internationalization
 - o Internationalization
 - o Language policy
 - o International classroom