BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME

INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

LEIDEN UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS

This report was finalised on 5 March 2020

REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME INTERNATIONAL STUDIES OF LEIDEN UNIVERSITY

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

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

Bachelor's programme International Studies

Name of the programme: International Studies
International name: International Studies
CROHO number: 59316
Level of the programme: bachelor's
Orientation of the programme: academic
Number of credits: 180 EC
Specialisations or tracks: -
Location: Leiden
Mode of study: full time
Language of instruction: English
Expiration of accreditation: 01/01/2021

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

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

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

COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The NVAO has approved the composition of the panel on 4 March 2019. The panel that assessed the bachelor's programme International Studies consisted of:

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

- Prof. dr. H. (Harco) Willems, professor in Egyptology at KU Leuven (Belgium) and director of the excavation in Dayr al-Barshā (Egypt) [referee Ancient Near East Studies].

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

WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The panel also studied a selection of 15 theses and their assessment forms, based on a provided list of graduates between 2016-2018 (see Appendix 4).

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

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

During the site visit, the panel studied additional materials about the programmes and exams, as well as minutes of the Programme Committee and the Board of Examiners. An overview of these materials can be found in Appendix 4. The panel conducted interviews with representatives of the programmes: students and staff members, the programme's management, alumni and representatives of the Board of Examiners. Members of the Programme Committee were included as part of the interviews with staff and students. It also offered students and staff members an opportunity for confidential discussion during a consultation hour. Two persons requested a consultation concerning the bachelor's programme International Studies.

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

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

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

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

Meets the standard
The programme meets the generic quality standard.

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

Does not meet the standard
The programme does not meet the generic quality standard.

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

Positive
The programme meets all the standards.

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

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

SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes
Leiden University has a longstanding tradition of cultivating knowledge of many languages and cultures; it is an essential part of its identity and gives the university a unique position in the Netherlands. The Faculty is committed to keeping this tradition alive and protecting minor fields. The panel wholeheartedly supports this ambition in the interests of Dutch society as a whole. The programme International Studies embodies Leiden's commitment to the relevance of the humanities as a discipline for understanding and interpreting global events and trends and is, in this way, crucial to the support of other small programmes within the Faculty. The panel considers its profile to be attractive and unique, filling a niche in the international field. The combination of disciplinary knowledge and linguistic training coupled to the global perspective and multidisciplinary approaches is considered an asset by the panel, as is the distinctive international classroom. Consultancy as an optional labour market perspective for graduates should be featured more prominently in the profile.

The programme's intended learning outcomes (ILOs) tie in with the level, profile and orientation of the programme. They have been related to the Dublin Descriptors in a clear and concise manner and thus meet international requirements. The panel considers recent changes to the ILOs an improvement, but still sees room for fine-tuning. It suggests defining the applicability of language skills obtained in the programme in more detail, as the current formulation creates a sense of ambiguity which also results in disappointment amongst students and graduates regarding the language skills achieved within the degree programme. It also recommends defining clearly what the programme sees as the benefits of its multi- and interdisciplinary approach in terms of the skills obtained. A definition of what these concepts entail should preferably be part of this addition.

Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment
The panel ascertained that the bachelor's programme International Studies creates a fertile and engaging teaching-learning environment in an international classroom setting that is conducive to obtaining the ILOs. The programme's curriculum design and structure enable multidisciplinary learning, language acquisition and skills training in a setting that allows for specialisation in certain target regions within a global context. The teaching methods are adapted to the students' learning trajectory and clearly reflect the programme's educational concept and main goals. All staff involved in the programme are committed to it. The lecturers involved in the programme are motivated and well qualified. The core staff of the programme sufficiently safeguards the adequate training and supervision of the tutors.

The students of the programme are active and involved. They actively contribute to the programme's quality, success and community building, for which the panel applauds them. They were also positive in general about the quality of the staff and the advice and support received from lecturers, tutors and support staff. The programme has demonstrated that it is very adaptable to student feedback and suggestions by external reviewers, responsive to suggestions and complaints, and highly dedicated to its continued development. Communication regarding student expectations and attention to less vocal students are considered key points requiring attention by the panel.

The panel shares the Programme Board's wish for stability within the programme, starting with its personnel. Growth of the core staff and stability in the tutor team are considered crucial by the panel, as are further opportunities for students to interact with teachers with an active research background in their second and third years. The panel verified that the programme aims to invest in its staff members and pursued the right match between staff and programme in its recent hires. In addition, workload monitoring needs continuous attention at the Faculty level, as does a fair distribution of allocated hours for certain tasks.

Additionally, the panel offered some suggestions with respect to the second and third years to free up additional space for students to tailor their individual study programmes more to their needs, without compromising the attainment of the ILOs. Methodological training in the thesis trajectory

and the match between supervisors and supervisees in thesis seminars will continue to be a point of interest in the coming years. Facilities at The Hague Campus, especially access to mental support and student work space, also need to be strengthened, according to the panel. It trusts the programme to take these suggestions up at the appropriate time, as it agrees that a period of consolidation should be allowed after the recent extensive programme-building and rapid expansion.

Standard 3: Student assessment
According to the panel, the assurance and monitoring of the quality of assessment are sufficiently guaranteed for the bachelor's programme International Studies. The assessment policies and protocols used in the programme are well designed and extensive, resulting in a regulated system of assessment. The Board of Examiners for International Studies (hereafter: BoE) is supported by the Faculty in the development and professionalisation of its assessment practices. The panel approves of the noted tendency towards standardisation of the evaluation and feedback practices. In addition, it advises clearly communicating the faculty guidelines regarding fraud to all Boards of Examiners within the Faculty, and adjusting them if and when necessary to avoid diversity of practice amongst the programmes. It verified that these practices are up to standard with respect to the programme International Studies.

In the panel's view, the programme should now concentrate on the diversification of assessment in the second year. Here, improvements could be made to reflect more pronouncedly the shift to the academic aptitude needed for second-year module assessments. In addition, the panel points out the need for increased clarity in communication to the students in terms of the way in which assessment within modules is organised to address student concerns regarding grading differences. A similar conclusion is reached with regard to thesis assessment. The panel found that the transparency and reliability of the thesis assessments could be strengthened. It verified that the Programme Board and BoE are aware of these concerns, share them and have already proactively acted upon them to address the irregularities they found during their sample checks and reassessments. In this respect, the internal quality control cycle is not compromised, establishing sufficient trust in the programme's ability to meet the challenges. Nevertheless, the BoE needs additional time and support to be allowed to extend its current sample checks and act upon its findings. Therefore, the panel strongly advises finding the necessary resources for the BoE to enhance its monitoring task in this matter.

As a multidisciplinary, international, very diverse and relatively new programme, International Studies is still in the process of fully defining and settling the working practices of its assessment system. The panel ascertained that the Programme Board and the responsible BoE are committed to doing so and also aware and proactive with regard to improving the current quality control. The BoE has developed protocols and actively monitors and follows up on established irregularities within the programme as well as on recommendations, both its own and those of external reviewers. The panel verified that the internal quality control cycle functions effectively. Based on its findings, it fully trusts the BoE and the Programme Board to continue their current course of improving the programme's system of assessment. Hence, it concludes that the quality of assessment is sufficiently guaranteed at the programme level.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes
The panel ascertained that graduates of the programme International Studies achieved the intended learning outcomes. The theses reflected an adequate achievement level for a bachelor's degree programme and also communicated clearly the programme's defining features: a global perspective, an approach based on various disciplines within the humanities, and a knowledge of and engagement with the chosen target regions. Evidence so far suggests that graduates of the programme are able to enrol in master's programmes within the Humanities without facing too many obstructions or delays. Also, graduates seem to be able to find their way to the labour market in professional fields in which a broad, multi- and interdisciplinary training could be seen as an advantage.

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

Bachelor's programme International Studies

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

General conclusion   positive

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

Date: 5 March 2020

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

Context

The bachelor's programme International Studies (hereafter: IS) is one of 24 bachelor's programmes offered by the Faculty of Humanities at Leiden University. The faculty is designed as a matrix of study programmes and institutes. Teaching staff of the bachelor's programme IS are based at various institutes within the Faculty. The institutes harbour research and appoint academic staff members. The study programmes are the units in which the teaching is organised. The bachelor's programme is led by a Programme Board, which falls under the direct responsibility of the Faculty Board. It consists of a Chair from the academic staff, the Programme Manager and two students. The Programme Board is advised by a Programme Committee, consisting of equal numbers of lecturers and students. Programme assessment at IS is monitored and assured by a programme-specific Board of Examiners, which works closely together with the Faculty.

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 bachelor's programme International Studies (hereafter: IS) was established in 2012 as the first Leiden University Humanities programme in The Hague. The programme aims to provide students with the tools to investigate globalisation and its regional effects from a humanities perspective. Four disciplinary approaches lay at the basis of a multidisciplinary perspective on the study of these effects: Cultural Studies, History, Politics and Economics. Students learn to apply the acquired knowledge of these disciplinary approaches in the analysis of a world region of their choice out of eight focal regions: Africa, Europe, Latin America, Middle East, North America, Russia and Eurasia, East Asia, South Asia and Southeast Asia. Acquisition of a language spoken within the focal area is part of the acquired instruments for study along with multidisciplinary research skills and clearly transferable skills, relevant for a professional career. The programme also intentionally aims to produce an international classroom setting, in which students from various backgrounds and nationalities create an engaged community of learners.

The panel considers the profile of IS attractive. The programme has clearly struck a chord with students and its intake is stable around 500 students per year. Students were able to clearly communicate the differences between this programme and ones in International Relations and/or Global Studies, naming language acquisition and specialised pathways focusing on a specific area as distinctive features. These testimonies hint at the unique profile of the programme, not only in the Netherlands but also in an international context. This distinctive profile is supported by several benchmarking efforts undertaken by the programme. These activities were done in reaction to earlier recommendations by the midterm review, in which a need for further clarification and justification of the programme's name and profile was pointed out. The panel is pleased with the programme's response to earlier recommendations, which has resulted in a more distinctive rationale that is also communicated to prospective and current students in an effective way.

The combination of disciplinary knowledge and linguistic training coupled with the global perspective and multidisciplinary approaches is considered an asset by the panel, just like the distinctive international classroom. The programme's focus on perspectives from the humanities also clearly draws on one of Leiden University's strengths: it showcases the University's dedication to upholding a diverse profile which gives a prominent role to the study of languages, cultures and societies in their multifaceted contexts, including expertise in languages and cultures that are otherwise not well-

represented at Dutch universities. This dedication is of vital importance, the panel emphasises, not only to Leiden University but to the academic field and the international outlook of the Netherlands as a whole. The programme IS embodies Leiden's commitment to the relevance of the humanities as a discipline for understanding and interpreting global events and trends and is, in this way, crucial to the support of small programmes within the Faculty.

The panel supports the programme's focus on the acquisition of a generalist's viewpoint and transferable and language skills coupled to specialisation in a certain area. During the site visit, however, some students and alumni mentioned that they felt slightly disappointed by the extent of their specialist base. According to the panel, two dimensions play into this disappointment. First, the programme needs to be crystal clear in its communication to prospective and current students concerning the limitations within which specialisation takes place. Due to time constraints, specialisation needs to be supplementary to the generalist approach. This is reasonable, in the panel's opinion, but needs to be communicated plainly. Second, specialisation goals need to be communicated in a more transparent manner than currently is the case. This mostly relates to the ways in which language acquisition and applicability are integrated and multi- and interdisciplinary skills are defined in the programme's aims, as discussed below.

The panel appreciates that the current programme also includes an option to add consultancy practices to the skills trained in the programme. This is considered a valuable and distinctive feature that may add to the students' employability, especially for international students who do not necessarily aim to continue their studies with a master's degree programme. As such, consultancy as a career option could be more distinctively featured as an optional outlook for graduates.

Intended learning outcomes
The panel studied two sets of intended learning outcomes (hereafter: ILOs) of the programme: those for students who started before 2017-2018 and those for students who started in or after 2017-2018. Both sets clearly take the Dublin Descriptors as their basis, by presenting the ILOs in two parts. Part A describes the ways in which knowledge and understanding are part of the programme's aims. Part B lists specific academic skills aimed for, including outcomes regarding the obtained language skills per language option offered. Both sets of ILOs include general academic skills (Appendix A) with a clearly defined set of transferable skills, which also fit the profile of a programme intending to create generalists. According to the panel, both sets of ILOs meet the requirements for a bachelor's degree programme.

The new ILOs were adjusted to take recommendations of the midterm review committee into account and are an improvement, in the panel's view. They are more detailed in the sense that they try to incorporate an end goal with respect to the applicability of language skills (ILO B.4), and they set a more clearly defined range of two disciplines in which students should be able to apply their research methods, which is relevant to the way in which multi- and interdisciplinary approaches are part of the programme (ILO B.5). As the new ILOs are the basis of the current programme, the panel took them as its focal point for further suggestions.

Language acquisition and applicability are formulated in the ILOs per language on offer. These objectives vary due to differences in terms of difficulty and complexity of the specific language and prior training of the incoming students. Language objectives range between A1+ to B1+ level according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (hereafter: CEFR) and are divided into reading, writing, listening and speaking goals. During the site visit, students and graduates indicated that some of the more demanding languages such as Mandarin and Arabic, in which students aim for A1+/A2 level in reading and listening, do not necessarily result in the ability to work with written and audio(visual) sources in this particular language connected to the chosen area (which is ILO B.4), with the complexity and academic depth needed for a bachelor's thesis or research project. This feedback was also noted by the panel in its scrutiny of student theses.

The panel is aware that neither ILO B.4 nor any other ILO currently states that students have to use original sources in their theses. As such, these observations do not present a problem in terms of degree achievement or target level. Nevertheless, it feels, just like the students and graduates, that there is now an ambiguity in the way in which the end goals are formulated with respect to the applicability of language skills. Language as an objective in practice is desirable in light of the programme's profile. Additionally, the students' expectation that they will be able to function in their chosen language at a certain level seems justifiable. The current ILOs do not sufficiently communicate what could be expected in this regard; ILO B.4 is not specific enough and therefore creates confusion. In the panel's view, resolving this dilemma could involve the reformulation of the minimum requirements for languages (connected to curriculum changes). Another option would be to fine-tune this specific ILO with respect to the applicability of the chosen language by referring back to the target CEFR levels for each language, including a formulation of what they entail. This may help to communicate clearly what is expected in terms of achievement level while simultaneously manage student expectations.

With respect to ILO B.5, the panel noted that it now clearly defines that students achieve the ability to apply research methods current in at least two of the disciplines offered in the programme. It approves of this specification as it limits the scope of multi- and interdisciplinary skills obtained in the programme to a manageable and realistic level for bachelor students. Nevertheless, a clear definition in the ILOs of what multi- and interdisciplinarity means, as a methodology or approach, for the obtained skills of the programme's graduates is missing. A clear definition of what multi- and interdisciplinarity entails combined with what it means in terms of the graduates' achieved skills would provide further clarity and background to the specific programme aim listed in ILO B.5. The panel recommends adding this definition, and the relevant skills obtained, to the current set of ILOs. This could be added, for example, to Appendix A. The panel also recommends that, both in terms of language acquisition and in terms of the acquisition of multi- and interdisciplinary skills, the profiling of the programme would correspond better to the results achieved and would make a better match with the real outcome after having completed the study. This more accurate and realistic profiling includes making a clearer distinction between the results achieved in a region-specific programme and the results achieved in an international programme.

Considerations

Leiden University has a longstanding tradition of cultivating knowledge of many languages and cultures; it is an essential part of its identity and gives the university a unique position in the Netherlands. The Faculty is committed to keeping this tradition alive and protecting minor fields. The panel wholeheartedly supports this ambition in the interests of Dutch society as a whole. The programme International Studies embodies Leiden's commitment to the relevance of the humanities as a discipline for understanding and interpreting global events and trends and is, in this way, crucial to the support of other small programmes within the Faculty. The panel considers its profile to be attractive and unique, filling a niche in the international field. The combination of disciplinary knowledge and linguistic training coupled to the global perspective and multidisciplinary approaches is considered an asset by the panel, as is the distinctive international classroom. Consultancy as an optional labour market perspective for graduates should be featured more prominently in the profile.

The programme's ILOs tie in with the level, profile and orientation of the programme. They have been related to the Dublin Descriptors in a clear and concise manner and thus meet international requirements. The panel considers recent changes to the ILOs an improvement, but still sees room for fine-tuning. It suggests defining the applicability of language skills obtained in the programme in more detail, as the current formulation creates a sense of ambiguity which also results in disappointment amongst students and graduates regarding the language skills achieved within the degree programme. It also recommends defining clearly what the programme sees as the benefits of its multi- and interdisciplinary approach in terms of the skills obtained. A definition of what these concepts entail should preferably be part of this addition.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme International Studies: the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment
The curriculum, the teaching-learning environment and the quality of the teaching staff enable the incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Findings

Programme language and name
In principle, the University of Leiden offers its bachelor's programmes in Dutch. The programme IS is an exception to this rule. Its philosophy focuses on understanding global developments through a humanities perspective, based on the materials studied in the classroom but also on the viewpoints encountered within the classroom. A diverse, international classroom is a decisive programme aim and part of its identity: both students and staff come from various international backgrounds. Currently, half of the student population has an international background, similar to the programme's staff. To make it possible for all staff and students to fully participate in the programme, the lingua franca and official programme language is therefore English, as is its name.

Entry requirements for the programme also stipulate a prior command of English equal to the Dutch pre-university diploma, which can be replaced by a foreign equivalent as well as a Test of English as a Foreign Language level (hereafter: TOEFL level) of 6.5 for international prospective students. The programme pays attention to the specific needs of international students: it provides them with additional support and guidance, for example through the Academic Language Centre and The Hague information desk. According to the panel, the choice for English as the programme's official language of instruction and communication, and for a programme name in English, is fully justified. The programme has a strong international profile, and with a regular and consistent international intake, it is committed to the concept of an international classroom, and is fully prepared to tailor it to international students' needs.

Curriculum design and didactic principle
The structure of the educational programme is based on the Leiden 100-600 level structure. In the bachelor's programme, modules are offered at the 100 – 400 level. In practical terms, these levels translate as an introductory course with no prior experience or knowledge required (100), an introductory course for which experience with independent study is expected (200), an advanced course with some prior knowledge required at the 100 or 200 level (300), and a specialised course and bachelor's graduation project (400). In the panel's view, this course level structure, as reflected in the design of the programme's curriculum, corresponds to and safeguards the level requirements for a bachelor's degree.

The programme's didactic principle is firmly based on its educational concept, with three guiding ideas. First, the notion of the international classroom, which aims to activate the variety of backgrounds and perspectives of the programme's international students and staff as a counterpart to the multidisciplinary and global approach of education. Second, the creation of cultural sensitivity and awareness based on interaction in a small-scale teaching setting. And third, an emphasis on labour market preparation, highlighted by extensive attention paid to the training of transferable skills in tutorials. These guiding ideas are also reflected in the curriculum design and learning trajectories, the panel found, and cleverly present a framework for multidisciplinary learning. For an overview of the curriculum structure and design, see Appendix 2.

The curriculum is organised into four learning paths, based on:
1. Disciplinary knowledge in History, Culture, Politics and Economics;
2. Regional orientation, based on a choice for one of the eight target regions;

3. Language acquisition based on a choice of sixteen languages connected to the eight target regions;
4. Academic skills, both generic and programme-specific transferable skills.

These four learning paths are interwoven throughout the curriculum structure and create various cross-over points: between disciplinary perspectives, between area-specific context and disciplinary methods, between skills and disciplinary and regional learning. In this way, students are constantly redistributed in differently organised classrooms: they do find a clear area-focused and language-focused 'home' while also being regularly exposed to various disciplinary methodologies with fellow students from other regional and linguistic 'homes'. The international classroom and cultural exchange are firmly anchored in this way within the curriculum design.

All students follow courses within all four disciplinary pillars, which creates a base frame for the curriculum design of 65 EC in total. All courses within these disciplinary pathways are 5 EC each: History comprises a total of 10 EC, Culture 20 EC, Politics 15 EC and Economics 20 EC. Students follow shared courses in the various disciplines in the first semester alongside the foundation courses 'Introduction to International Studies' (5 EC) and 'Academic Reading and Writing' (5 EC). In their second semester they are introduced to area-specific elements within their study programmes and start with language acquisition. In this way, the programme guarantees a global context and level playing field in general knowledge prior to diversification into one of the eight target regions. Language acquisition (25 EC) is mainly built into the first two years, complemented by a 'Language in Practice' module (5 EC) in the third year. Elective space (30 EC) is freed up in the first semester of the third year; students may take an internship or minor and/or study abroad. They finish their studies by writing a thesis within the context of a thesis seminar (15 EC).

The third educational principle underlying the programme, labour market preparation, mainly translates into how transferable skills are interwoven in certain curriculum elements. Academic skills are trained in 'Philosophy of Science' (5 EC) and in the 'Thematic Seminar: Research methods' (5 EC), both taught in the second year. In the second-year thematic seminars (10 EC), the students focus on research methods and case studies with global effect examined from various disciplinary angles paired to the use of transferable skills. And notably, labour market preparation is the guiding idea behind the third-year group project 'Practicing International Studies' (10 EC; hereafter: PRINS), in which twelve students work together to formulate an answer to a problem presented by an external organisation.

The panel considers the way in which multidisciplinary approaches are woven into the programme in the first two years through disciplinary pathways to be well designed. The students become acquainted with the programme's global approach, but are also sensibly directed into a specific area. The programme has a rigid setup as a result, which works well in the first year as it gives students a good foundation on which to base the rest of their studies. Nevertheless, this rigid structure that is so conducive at first starts to become a hindrance to their freedom of choice and flexibility towards the end of the programme, in the panel's view.

Students indicated that they would welcome being able to accentuate their disciplinary pathways in the second year, for example by having a choice to follow an additional History or Politics course within their area of interest over another Economics course. Other students wanted to be able to take additional language classes. This seemed a realistic wish, to the panel, which could be met without compromising the current ILOs or the programme's structure and identity. Also, it heard that some students loved the PRINS project and the way in which it provided them with relevant experience for their goal of entering the labour market, while others objected to it as they felt it presented an obstruction in the third year for their preparation for a specific, more traditionally humanities-based, master's programme. It appears that more structured optionality is needed to meet the needs of the diverse student population; fine-tuning the second year would be advisable, along with a closer look at the design of the third year.

PRINS project

As many students and alumni commented on the PRINS project, the panel studied and discussed it in further detail. It therefore presents some further observations regarding the project, without seeing it, or the current curriculum design of the IS programme as a whole, as compromising the students' ability to achieve the programme's ILOs in any way. The panel is aware that the programme is very committed to the PRINS project, that it currently fulfils the ILO regarding structured group work, and that changes to its setup are already foreseen. The Programme Board also indicated that it is currently considering consolidating existing practices rather than looking for another complete overhaul of its curriculum design, as the programme is in need of stability. The panel acknowledges that the Programme Board has been very responsive to suggestions by earlier review panels and that internal recommendations were quickly acted upon. Hence, it trusts the programme to find a satisfactory answer to the following observations and act upon them in due course.

Panel members studied the PRINS project and a couple of student portfolios. The objectives of the PRINS project are manifold: it aims to train students in consultancy skills, improve their communication skills with clients, learn and work in a group setting, and develop their social and academic skills. Peer feedback and peer-to-peer learning play an important role, as do the management of group roles and group functioning. Students are guided during the project by a group coach, who advises on the group dynamics where necessary. The studied portfolios demonstrate that the programme managed to find interesting questions and problems with relevant for-profit and non-profit organisations.

The panel found the project to be innovative, ambitious and daring, and an example of the energy and ambitions within the programme. For those students wanting to enter consultancy, or interested in a professional focus including consultancy skills or a more social scientific interest in addition to a humanities-based interest, the project seems very useful and an excellent opportunity to practise certain skills. Nevertheless, the panel wonders whether the programme will be able to continue securing so many interesting projects in the long run – especially as it has grown explosively in the last couple of years, creating a need to accommodate more and more students. In reaction, the programme indicated that it did not encounter problems securing projects in the last four years, already accommodating a vast amount of students. Good and professional guidance also presents challenges: the panel heard that the programme had contracted project coaches with specific consultancy skills, which it considers wise, but the students indicated that many PRINS coaches were less well equipped for guiding the process or less academically well trained.

Based on the evidence in the portfolios, the panel also noticed that not all students seemed equally committed. This may be connected to a fundamental issue in the project's design: the PRINS project presents a sort of disconnect between some of the disciplinary pillars underlying the programme, in particular those of the more traditional disciplines of the Humanities: history and literary studies. Its appeal therefore passes over the interests of a considerable proportion of the IS cohorts. The panel heard from third-year students that this also creates a sense of disappointment. The expectations raised in the first and second years by the way in which the programme interweaves disciplinary pathways, region-specific orientation and language skills does not come together in the way they would have anticipated.

Third-year students and alumni also indicated that the second semester of the third year was considered very stressful and demanding, sometimes resulting in study delays. The Programme Board indicated that changes in this respect have already been implemented: in the 2019-2020 academic year, the PRINS project is divided into two parts, an individual and group work part, and the amount of credits available has been raised to reflect the time investment better. Also, the IS graduation rates are rather favourable compared to most Humanities degree programme in the Netherlands. This student concern is yet another indication that some students feel constrained by the current programme setup represented by the PRINS project.

The panel discussed its findings regarding the PRINS project with representatives of the programme. It became clear that the PRINS project is considered an area of attention; along with foreseen changes based on feedback from the Programme Committee and Board of Examiners, recent staff hires were aimed at strengthening the PRINS project moderating team. The programme also indicated that it is exploring new ways in which the PRINS project may, could or should be connected to other elements within the third-year curriculum, for example to internships and/or the thesis. The panel encourages these examples of flexible thinking, but also wants to point out that there may be a case for making the PRINS project into an optional choice. The programme may want to explore whether the PRINS project, in a slightly altered form, could be an alternative to a bachelor's thesis. In this way, it would be able to cater for smaller groups of very dedicated students, and always guarantee the best professional guidance and exciting briefs. Students choosing the PRINS project option over a thesis would be able to meet even higher standards: combining consultancy skills with some of the academic research skills needed for a final 400-level bachelor's project. Simultaneously, by making it into an option rather than a mandatory programme element, time and space would be freed up for other students to follow, for example, an additional thematic seminar based on their disciplinary interests.

Teaching methods
Regarding teaching methods, area and disciplinary and foundation courses at the start of the first year are conducted in a lecture setting and taught by specialists drawn from the entire Humanities Faculty. In line with its didactic principle, these large-scale lectures are always accompanied by small-scale tutorials, led by tutors who closely collaborate with the responsible module coordinator, the involved lecturers and the head tutor. Tutor groups contain 12-14 students, a size which allows for close and direct interaction and exchange of perspectives in line with the programme's guiding ideas of exchange to build cultural awareness in an international classroom setting.

In tutorials, a variety of teaching methods is applied to enable the development of transferable skills reflecting the programme's emphasis on employability training. Group discussions, panel discussions, presentations, group exercises and a range of writing tasks, including blog post writing and essay writing, are all part of the variety. Language classes offer plenty of opportunity for training all aspects of language acquisition. In general, the panel considers the employed teaching methods, both in their variety and in the way in which they are tailored to the various disciplinary and training needs, as a suitable teaching-learning environment conducive to obtaining the ILOs.

Exchange and labour market orientation
Labour market orientation and intercultural exchange are considered crucial by the programme to meet its aims. Both elements are clearly reflected in its objectives and interwoven in the curriculum. For example, the training of transferable skills is a guiding principle in the programme design and clearly recognisable in the setup of the PRINS project. In addition, the programme supports students to study abroad or pursue an internship (including internationally). Although IS offers a fully international classroom, international exchange as part of the students' individual programme is encouraged. Studying abroad often takes place within the context of the Erasmus exchange programme. Alternatively, the students target a specific institution and organise their own individual study programme with the consent of the Board of Examiners. Studying abroad is considered prestigious; only those with a GPA of 7.0 or higher qualify. Support is offered by a dedicated Exchange Officer and considered good by both the students and the panel.

The programme designed its own optional internship track, which could be taken as part of the 30 EC elective space provided in the third year. If students wish to enrol in this optional track, they follow a mandatory, additional preparatory course 'Organizational Theory, Culture and Behaviour' in the second semester of the second year to allow them to analyse workplace practices. Additional support with finding a placement is offered by the Humanities Career Service. The panel acknowledges the challenges involved in setting up a comprehensive internship scheme for a large, international programme and considers the design of the internship track sensible and effective in principle.

During the site visit, the panel received some complaints from the students regarding information on the internship, the availability of placements, and communication issues when abroad on internships. It studied all available information on internships and concluded that all necessary information is in place, but dispersed over several manuals and websites. It was told that the information has been collected together and is now presented as a more comprehensive package in reaction to student feedback. This is considered a first step by the panel; it encourages the programme to aim for a comprehensive manual combining all key information. It also feels that information about the students' individual responsibility in finding placements could be further clarified. It was reassured that the indicated communication issues were known to the programme. Recently, internship coordination at IS has been strengthened by adding four academic internship coordinators, as various members of the IS community had indicated that workload constraints of staff members hindered communication during internships.

Programme-specific facilities
The programme IS is based in The Hague. Although the panel did not visit the The Hague Wijnhaven Campus, it briefly discussed its facilities with the students, staff members and the Programme Board during the site visit to verify the information provided in the self-evaluation report. The Wijnhaven Campus has its own, separate infrastructure and has grown explosively over the last couple of years. The panel was told that facilities at The Hague Campus are catching up, but slowly: it has its own Information Desk, and faculty departments such as the Communication Department, Career Service and the Exchange Office can now be found in The Hague as well.

The students mentioned that study space is still hard to come by at The Hague Campus. They are welcome to use all the University's facilities in Leiden; this provides some solace, but the wish for more study space for students in The Hague is supported by the panel. Also, it heard that the design of the campus was not conducive to easy contact between the tutors and the students. Tutors organise office hours for students to allow for better communication, but no dedicated office space is available for these meetings. The panel praises the tutors for their initiative in finding suitable locations for organising office hours, but also suggests the programme pay attention to this matter. Students should be able to communicate easily with their teachers, and if the buildings' design is hampering contact, it should be proactively addressed. A cause of concern is the access to mental health support: students repeatedly indicated that access to it in The Hague was insufficient.

The programme also has some programme-specific facilities to tailor to the needs of students at IS, notably the Writing Lab and a community builder, both introduced in 2017. The Writing Lab is organised in collaboration with the Academic Language Centre and was initiated in response to student demand for further help with their academic writing skills in English. It employs four specially trained student assistants, who provide peer feedback to their fellow students. The Writing Lab is well-used and popular amongst students. The main task of the community builder is to create a clear-cut and recognisable IS community. Initiatives launched since the employment of the Community Builder are the organisation of seminars and public talks, the introduction of a new website specially for students coming to the IS programme, and the annual 'Welcome to The Hague' events for new staff members and students at the start of every new academic year. To the panel, both initiatives are seen as very positive, contributing to a lively, peer-supported IS community.

Communication, feedback and guidance
Communication and the organisation of tailored guidance and advice for all individual students including those who are less visible within the programme, the so-called 'silent majority', appeared as the main challenges for IS during the panel assessment. Being still a relatively new programme and its explosive growth could be seen as additional stresses. The panel was therefore pleased to see the programme has managed to meet these demands in a satisfactory way over the period of review. At several points in this report, it has emphasised the need to improve communication even further. These recommendations should not be interpreted as a negative reflection on the current communication in the programme; they merely reflect the stage at which the programme is in its

maturation. All key elements are in place, but fine-tuning is desirable; the panel warns the programme to be vigilant regarding the needs of the silent majority.

The panel noted during the site visit that all relevant official bodies, such as the Programme Committee and Board of Examiners, have been very proactive over the years under consideration; the Programme Board has in turn been very responsive to their suggestions and feedback. The internal quality control cycle seems to function well in this respect. Students have also been major players in the programme's success: they are very engaged and extremely involved. The study association BASIS, which actively organises social, study-related and labour market orientation events, is a positive force, but individual students also presented themselves as very committed to improvement and aware of overlooked issues. They demonstrated a true community spirit, which positively affected the quality of the programme's teaching-learning environment in the panel's view. This deserves to be applauded.

An elaborate support system advises and guides students throughout their studies. The programme employs internship coordinators, an exchange officer and community builder to help students with these particular aspects of their studies and to feel welcome in the programme. Additionally, services such as the Academic Language Centre offer Dutch language classes to the programme's international student body on site. All these structures seem to be in order, although some of the areas may need further support in terms of resources within the context of the quick growth of the programme. The panel also asks the Programme Board to monitor the way in which these services are used; demands may change with the maturation of the programme, and international students may have different needs than Dutch students. Flexibility with regard to these support services is therefore essential.

Academic advice is offered by the study coordinators, who also act as study advisors. They hold weekly office hours and organise plenary meetings for students to drop by and ask questions regarding their studies. In addition, all first-year students meet individually with them during their first semester. Since 2018-2019, second-year students discuss their individual programmes with them in group meetings. In addition, students receive peer support through the mentor system. First-year students are assigned a mentor: a second- or third-year student who helps them to settle in and acts as a first point of contact and information. When mentors encounter problems with their mentees, they direct them to the study coordinators. The students praised the system and felt supported by it.

Thesis trajectory
Thesis supervision is offered within the context of a thesis seminar. Supervisors usually guide a group of 10-14 students through the process of thesis writing and act as first examiners. Six scheduled group meetings, in which the students present their topics and research questions and receive feedback from their peers, are complemented by a minimum of four individual supervisory meetings. Clear guidelines regarding thesis supervision are in place, with a fixed time schedule and assessment criteria. Students submit three assignments before submitting a final version of their thesis: they write a detailed thesis proposal, a literature review and a first draft. These are all discussed individually with the student to offer sufficient feedback.

Thesis seminars are regionally based and within the region thematic: a broad theme is set, with a global dimension that is also open to being approached from multiple disciplinary perspectives. The students should be able to pick their own individual research topics within this setting, using at least two of the four disciplinary fields. They confirmed that they were all assigned to the seminar of their first or second choice. Upon enrolment, they are asked to indicate their intended research topic, the way in which they want to connect their topic to the seminar's theme, and the intended disciplinary approaches. Supervisors then evaluate their ability to supervise and assess the suggested theme and chosen approach. In exceptional cases, a switch to another seminar can be made or an alternative supervisor may be appointed for the individual supervision.

The students in general were content with the existing structure and support and indicated that they felt well advised, also in terms of defining whether a specific supervisor's expertise was sufficiently matched to their topic. In its scrutiny of the thesis sample provided, though, the panel observed some less fruitful combinations of chosen methodology and supervisors' assessments. In some cases, the match between supervisors, chosen methodologies and student topics seems to have been wanting. When this observation was discussed with staff members during the site visit, it was not recognised by those interviewed. Staff members indicated that they felt capable of rejecting research topics with which they were not comfortable and gave examples of cases in which they referred students to colleagues for thesis supervision.

The programme also indicated that it was aware that methodology training is a point requiring attention, as is the formulation of research questions; the Programme Committee had flagged up the need for more training. Students indicated that recent changes to the thesis seminar had introduced better help and support in methodology training, which will hopefully translate into a more solid basis for thesis writing. The panel is pleased to hear that changes have already been introduced that should address its noted concerns regarding the mismatches between supervisors and chosen methodologies. It also accepts that it may have picked up the exception rather than the rule in its sample check with respect to the assessments. Nevertheless, it asks the programme to be vigilant.

Staff
The teaching staff reflects the diversity of the programme. All four disciplinary perspectives are represented by lecturers with specific expertise in these areas, like the eight world regions and the sixteen different languages that need to be taught. The great majority of the programme's lecturing staff is based in the Faculty's research institutes; they are active researchers and have excellent academic and teaching qualifications. An increasing number of lecturers is now specifically appointed to IS to meet its growing demands. The Faculty and Programme Board have also acknowledged the need to create a sense of common ground, belonging and ownership within the programme. Lecturers employed at IS teach at least two, preferably three, courses. During the site visit, they confirmed that they generally felt very committed to the programme.

The programme also hires some specialised language teachers for the various language courses and some experts in the field of consultancy, in particular for guidance during the third-year PRINS project. The panel ascertained that they are sufficiently vetted and prepared for the academic teaching environment, but the students commented critically on their coaches: the match between academic qualifications, consultancy skills and group management abilities seemed not to be ideal in all cases. In the panel's view, the PRINS project would ideally be guided by a combination of a consultancy expert and an academic, who bring both worlds together.

In addition to the lecturers and specialists, the tutors are heavily involved in the programme. Initially, the programme mostly hired generic tutors. As it became clear over the years that the students often sought out the tutors for academic advice and didactic guidance, a shift in the programme's hiring programme has taken place. Now, tutors are generally hired with expertise in the field in which they are tutoring. About half of the tutors are in the process of completing their PhD, or have already done so. The programme feels that this facilitates the combination of skills teaching and content-based support for the lecturers much better, especially with the tutors being the 'face' of the programme. The panel agrees with this reasoning and has no objections to tutors with a master's degree tutoring in the first year.

With the progression of the students' studies, however, active research experience and involvement becomes more important for students. Those in their second year have different needs from those in their first year, let alone those in their third year. The panel is aware that students in their third year are always guided in their thesis supervision by lecturers with the necessary academic background and active research expertise. The lecturers also indicated that many of them participate

in the programme as tutors, suggesting that most students would have been in contact with the lecturers in a tutorial setting before their third year.

Nevertheless, the panel would welcome more opportunities for students to actively connect with lecturers in their second year, especially in light of the university's vision to provide all students with research-led teaching. This is fully acknowledged by the IS Programme Board and also recognised and affirmed by the programme's staff members. The programme needs stability and time to build upon its current foundation, rather than further growth or overhaul. Key to this process of stabilisation is a growing core of IS staff members and stability in the composition of the tutor group to allow for the development of expertise. Six full-time staff members, with the desired academic background and active research connections, have recently been added to the existing core staff of nine members. Also, the programme has lately been able to reappoint many of its tutors. These signs are considered favourable and promising by the panel.

The level of English of all staff members is assessed and monitored prior to their participation in the programme. The lecturers have the appropriate teaching qualifications, or are obtaining them if recently hired. The Faculty stimulates lecturers in their professional development by offering staff members workshops at the university's teachers training centre ICLON and expert meetings with other lecturers. In the faculty-wide Expertise Centre Online Learning, they can share best practices, and in the university-wide Leiden Teacher's Academy, they can work out innovative didactic tools. The tutors are extensively trained prior to being engaged in the programme and always work under the supervision of the module coordinator and in close collaboration with the course's lecturers and the head tutor. Also, the head tutor regularly attends at least one tutorial of all employed tutors. Student feedback regarding tutors is actively researched and acted upon, when needed.

The students are positive in general about the support offered by both lecturers and tutors. They consider them very approachable and engaged. Some students indicated that, in their view, the quality of their tutors varied: some are considered and found to be more experienced and/or skilled, some less suited to the specific international classroom setting, some less astute in creating the desired cultural inclusivity, some were clearly overstretched. They felt, however, that their feedback was taken seriously in these cases. They also noted a marked improvement with respect to the support for tutors by the programme. To the panel, these testimonies confirmed its own observations and the programme's response to the indicated concerns regarding the tutor system. By and large, the students agreed that they were well taught and sufficiently advised and guided throughout their studies and, therefore, the panel feels that the quality of teaching at IS is sufficiently guaranteed.

The panel found that keeping the workload within limits is a continuous challenge, for the IS programme as well as other programmes in the Humanities. The limited budget combined with the intensity in contact hours that is required for learning languages and for writing theses that are up to the mark threaten to overburden staff members, especially when combined with challenging tasks such as the redefinition of a track's profile. Dealing with this is complicated by the fact that the educational staff is made available by the Faculty's Research Institutes, for example the Institute for Area Studies (LIAS), Centre for the Arts in Society (LUCAS), Centre for Linguistics (LUCL) and the Institute for History.The Institutes, not the Programme Board or Faculty, are directly responsible for personnel management. This may get in the way of a fair division of labour amongst members of staff across Institutes, especially for those members of staff taking up tasks in several of the legal bodies, such as the Programme Committee and Boards of Examiners. The panel fully supports the Faculty in trying to harmonise this, and calls on the Institutes to stick to the list of compensation hours per task that is provided by the Faculty Management. It considers workload a serious challenge, but also found that the Faculty Management is very aware of this problem and does its best to tackle it.

Considerations

The panel ascertained that the bachelor's programme International Studies creates a fertile and engaging teaching-learning environment in an international classroom setting that is conducive to obtaining the ILOs. The programme's curriculum design and structure enable multidisciplinary learning, language acquisition and skills training in a setting that allows for specialisation in certain target regions within a global context. The teaching methods are adapted to the students' learning trajectory and clearly reflect the programme's educational concept and main goals. All staff involved in the programme are committed to it. The lecturers involved in the programme are motivated and well qualified. The core staff of the programme sufficiently safeguards the adequate training and supervision of the tutors.

The students of the programme are active and involved. They actively contribute to the programme's quality, success and community building, for which the panel applauds them. They were also positive in general about the quality of the staff and the advice and support received from lecturers, tutors and support staff. The programme has demonstrated that it is very adaptable to student feedback and suggestions by external reviewers, responsive to suggestions and complaints, and highly dedicated to its continued development. Communication regarding student expectations and attention to less vocal students are considered key points requiring attention by the panel.

The panel shares the Programme Board's wish for stability within the programme, starting with its personnel. Growth of the core staff and stability in the tutor team are considered crucial by the panel, as are further opportunities for students to interact with teachers with an active research background in their second and third years. The panel verified that the programme aims to invest in its staff members and pursued the right match between staff and programme in its recent hires. In addition, workload monitoring needs continuous attention at the Faculty level, as does a fair distribution of allocated hours for certain tasks.

Additionally, the panel offered some suggestions with respect to the second and third years to free up additional space for students to tailor their individual study programmes more to their needs, without compromising the attainment of the ILOs. Methodological training in the thesis trajectory and the match between supervisors and supervisees in thesis seminars will continue to be a point of interest in the coming years. Facilities at The Hague Campus, especially access to mental support and student work space, also need to be strengthened, according to the panel. It trusts the programme to take these suggestions up at the appropriate time, as it agrees that a period of consolidation should be allowed after the recent extensive programme-building and rapid expansion.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme International Studies: the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 3: Student assessment
The programme has an adequate system of student assessment in place.

Findings

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

Assessment in the programmes is structured according to shared principles. The design of all forms of assessment is always peer-reviewed: tests and exams are checked on their validity and coherence

prior to being administered. Also, the exams are designed in such a way that students are invited to continuously sharpen their skills and broaden their knowledge, based on the principles of structural alignment. In this way, they develop their knowledge and skills from a basic to a more advanced level, appropriate for their degree level. Knowledge acquisition and application are continuously tested, along with academic and communication skills. The students are preferably tested multiple times within a course, allowing for a diversity of testing forms and methods. At least two independent examiners are involved in the assessment of theses or final projects.

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

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

Board of Examiners International Studies
In addition to the Faculty guidelines, the panel studied the programme's Course and Examiners Regulations (in Dutch: Onderwijs- en Examenregeling) and its assessment plan along with the rules and regulations of the responsible Board of Examiners (hereafter: BoE). The BoE consists of seven members and collaborates closely with the programme director and study advisors. It is supported by a secretary, who receives additional administrative support for one day a week. Tasks within the BoE are divided amongst its members. Regular business (student requests and complaints) are initially dealt with by the secretary. Cases requiring closer scrutiny are taken up by the entire Board, by individual members of the Board, or by mandated third parties. An example of the last case is the appointment of second readers for the theses, which is organised by the thesis seminar coordinator. The panel was impressed with the level of professionalism of the BoE and its members, who all were fully committed to improving assessment in the programme.

The BoE is responsible for guaranteeing the quality and standard of examinations and degrees. In order to do so, it appoints examiners and sets credits for individual internships prior to their approval as part of a student's studies. To guarantee the quality of course assessment, every course and its assessment are reviewed at least once every three years by the BoE. An additional check is performed whenever a course has undergone fundamental changes. Protocols and procedures are in place, also with respect to student complaints and regarding practices involving internships and international exchanges. For the students, however, the panel found during the site visit that these official and formal routes are not always fully transparent. Some students indicated that they struggled to find the relevant information and found it hard to get into contact with the BoE. Although the panel

verified that all relevant information is accessible and available to the students, it asks the programme to be alert and clear in its communications with students.

The BoE actively follows up on cases of fraud and plagiarism and handles incidents according to the Faculty fraud protocol. The panel learnt that plagiarism did occur from time to time, but that inquiries addressed to the BoE showed that in most of these cases, the students transgressed out of unfamiliarity with the system and as a result of a misinterpretation of the plagiarism rules. In these cases, a formal warning was paired with further training to increase the involved students' awareness along with denying them the option of graduating with the highest honours. This seems an adequate reaction according to the panel. During the site visit, it also discussed an observation based on its study of the PRINS protocol that seemed to allow for some leeway for plagiarism and free-riding behaviour of students. The BoE responded adequately to these questions: it had reviewed the PRINS protocol in its last annual cycle, just before the site visit, and had already introduced measures to address these inconsistencies. Tutors were also recently re-instructed regarding the ways in which they could minimise the danger of free-riding behaviour in the PRINS project, which was confirmed by the Programme Board. To the panel, these BoE actions demonstrate that the internal quality control cycle regarding course reviews seems to function effectively.

Test and examination practices at International Studies
The programme has a transparent assessment plan, which systematically shows how the learning outcomes of the programme are linked to the assessment of the various courses. Course coordinators are responsible for the design and quality of assessment for their modules. Tests and examinations are peer-reviewed, as are the answer models. The BoE also advises the Programme Board on matters regarding assessment and is involved in the further development of the teaching staff's assessment practices. It closely monitors the way in which its advice is taken up by individual lecturers and steps in, when and where necessary.

During the site visit, the panel also ascertained that the BoE trains the tutors on assessment principles prior to engaging them in the programme. It acknowledges that training such a varied group of tutors, often from different disciplinary backgrounds and various international grading systems, is fundamental to create a team of reliable assessors with similar practices. The students mentioned during the site visit that they felt that differences existed between the grading practices of the tutors: they said that all IS students knew which tutors were considered 'easy' and 'hard' in their grading practices. The programme responded to this critique that the students' comments were based on perception rather than on actual evidence and practice: all tutors within a module meet and peer-review their assessments, under the supervision of the course coordinator tutor, before handing back assessments to their students. This seems to be a good practice to the panel, but it wants to underline that even a perceived unreliability of grading could be dangerous to the programme's assessment quality. It therefore asks the programme to be crystal clear about its grading arrangements to the students.

The panel studied the programme's assessment plan and some courses. It was pleased to learn that the programme had reduced the number of multiple-choice exams after recommendations by earlier review committees. Nevertheless, there is still room for improvement regarding the variety of the assessment forms administered. The panel found a satisfactory balance between exams and other forms of assessment in the first year. Staff members also confirmed that they have worked hard to follow up with further diversification of assessment moments in the programme's first year.

The panel acknowledges that, as a relatively new programme, it is still in the developing phase; it just finished its second three-year cycle and has extensively reviewed and monitored progress and adjustments within this period. It encourages the programme to continue with further diversification of assessment methods and to focus now on the second year. At least in some of the modules, the clear shift to a more academic aptitude needed for a second-year course should be more visible in the chosen assessment forms: it advocates introducing more moments in which argumentation, reflection, writing ability and creativity are called upon. It would advocate more essay-writing tasks

in the second year, along with the introduction of more reading responses. This would also help students to connect with lecturers and the practices within a certain disciplinary field at an earlier stage, which would prepare them better for the thesis trajectory.

As part of the quality control cycle, the BoE checks exams (midterm, final and resit), answer keys, submitted papers and other written assignments, assessment forms and grade distribution provided by the lecturer for every course. A dedicated form has been designed to assist this process. Recommendations and actions following from these reviews are passed on to the lecturer concerned and monitored.

Thesis assessment International Studies
The BoE also annually reviews a sample of randomly selected theses: five with a grade ranging between 6.0-6.9, five with a grade ranging between 7.0-8.4 and five with a grade above 8.4. The panel was pleased to hear that an annual thesis check takes place and compliments the BoE on its awareness of the need for a systematic check. During the site visit, the BoE also elaborated on the results, indicating that they had inspired various concrete adjustments. For example, knock-out criteria have been introduced, which now guarantee that all students live up to a satisfactory standard on all elements considered key for a bachelor's graduation project. Another adjustment is the creation of a third readers' committee, which checks all lower grades and arbitrates in cases in which thesis grading differs substantially. The panel feels, however, that with more than 300 students graduating each year and IS being such a diverse, and still relatively young, programme, that a sample of 15 theses is too small to pick up the many variations in assessment practices between the readers involved that need to be aligned.

The need for a greater annual sample check is inspired by the panel's own findings with regard to its sample check of fifteen theses prior to the site visit. Although it considered the quality of the theses as being generally good, it was less enthusiastic about the quality of the assessments. It noted some inconsistencies, which demonstrated that the programme is still searching for the right way to manage such large and diverse cohorts of students and supervisors with varied backgrounds. Assessments were very vaguely phrased in a couple of cases, and some seemed to indicate an unfamiliarity with the Dutch grading system. Also, particularly with respect to more politically oriented theses in which methods from the social sciences were 'borrowed' by the students, the involved examiners seemed not in all cases to properly review the methodology and/or literature used. This resulted, according to the panel, in some assessments that were too high and some that were too low.

In its discussions with the BoE, the Programme Board and staff members, the panel found awareness of these concerns amongst all involved. It also approved of the measures taken to try to introduce clearer guidelines and protocols to assist assessors with their assessments. It fully trusts the programme and its BoE to take this matter seriously, but also wants to underline that staff members, the BoE and students need to be protected as not all assessments are currently fully transparent and could therefore be considered compromised. In its view, the most obvious route to weed out differences in practices is further support for the BoE. The current sample checks need to be enlarged. The BoE has demonstrated that it takes the required measures based on the results of its sample checks, but it needs to have a good grasp of the variation in practice to weed out all irregularities – and therefore needs a larger annual sample. In addition, it needs sufficient time to follow up on its findings, which also means time to communicate with staff members and train them, when necessary.

Considerations
According to the panel, the assurance and monitoring of the quality of assessment are sufficiently guaranteed for the bachelor's programme International Studies. The assessment policies and protocols used in the programme are well designed and extensive, resulting in a regulated system of assessment. The Board of Examiners for International Studies (hereafter: BoE) is supported by the Faculty in the development and professionalisation of its assessment practices. The panel approves of the noted tendency towards standardisation of the evaluation and feedback practices.

In addition, it advises clearly communicating the faculty guidelines regarding fraud to all Boards of Examiners within the Faculty, and adjusting them if and when necessary to avoid diversity of practice amongst the programmes. It verified that these practices are up to standard with respect to the programme International Studies.

In the panel's view, the programme should now concentrate on the diversification of assessment in the second year. Here, improvements could be made to reflect more pronouncedly the shift to the academic aptitude needed for second-year module assessments. In addition, the panel points out the need for increased clarity in communication to the students in terms of the way in which assessment within modules is organised to address student concerns regarding grading differences. A similar conclusion is reached with regard to thesis assessment. The panel found that the transparency and reliability of the thesis assessments could be strengthened. It verified that the Programme Board and BoE are aware of these concerns, share them and have already proactively acted upon them to address the irregularities they found during their sample checks and reassessments. In this respect, the internal quality control cycle is not compromised, establishing sufficient trust in the programme's ability to meet the challenges. Nevertheless, the BoE needs additional time and support to be allowed to extend its current sample checks and act upon its findings. Therefore, the panel strongly advises finding the necessary resources for the BoE to enhance its monitoring task in this matter.

As a multidisciplinary, international, very diverse and relatively new programme, International Studies is still in the process of fully defining and settling the working practices of its assessment system. The panel ascertained that the Programme Board and the responsible BoE are committed to doing so and also aware and proactive with regard to improving the current quality control. The BoE has developed protocols and actively monitors and follows up on established irregularities within the programme as well as on recommendations, both its own and those of external reviewers. The panel verified that the internal quality control cycle functions effectively. Based on its findings, it fully trusts the BoE and the Programme Board to continue their current course of improving the programme's system of assessment. Hence, it concludes that the quality of assessment is sufficiently guaranteed at the programme level.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme International Studies: the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes
The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

Thesis quality
The panel studied fifteen bachelor theses for the programme IS and considered that all meet the standards for a bachelor's degree. The quality of the theses, which cover a very broad range of topics reflective of the broad multidisciplinary programme, varies to a considerable degree in terms of academic and methodological rigour, research design and argument. This is what could be expected from such a varied and wide-ranging programme.

The panel observed that strong theses benefitted from a clear argumentation and well-balanced use of disciplinary approaches and methodologies. It appreciated that some theses displayed a particularly good level of original research and very successfully demonstrated an interdisciplinary approach to the chosen topic. Weaker theses indicated the downsides of the more flexible degree path: they were less methodologically rigorous, less well-structured, contained underdeveloped passages and/or were rather descriptive, using less variety of source materials and theory to back the argumentation for comparative analysis. The panel also noted that less mature theses often

demonstrated that the student struggled with the integration of methodological approaches from different disciplinary angles.

In general, the approach taken in the studied theses was clearly situated in the Humanities. The theses demonstrated a knowledge of and engagement with their target regions. The global perspective was also clear in most cases. When the global aspect could be more pronounced, this criticism was always picked up by the examiners. These findings confirm that the programme clearly pays attention to the representation of its main defining programme features in the outcomes of the students' final work. The panel members were surprised to see that most students did not engage with sources written in the foreign language studied in their theses. The students and alumni indicated that most supervisors recommended using primary sources in the original languages; as it was not a requirement, this advice was not necessarily followed. To the panel, it seemed a missed opportunity to showcase another defining aspect of the programme related to a discussion regarding the application of language skills, as discussed above under Standard 1.

Position of graduates
The alumni success of the programme is still hard to judge, according to the panel, since only a few cohorts of IS students have graduated so far. The self-evaluation report presented the findings of a first survey of alumni done through LinkedIn. It suggests that alumni, either directly upon completion of the bachelor's degree or after following a master's degree programme, mainly end up in six fields of employment: government/diplomacy; civil society/development; business/finance; sustainability/corporate social responsibility; journalism/education/content; and culture. This wide range of options seems to suggest that IS graduates often enter professions that clearly benefit from broadly educated generalists with multi- and interdisciplinary approaches and skills. This feedback was also received from another alumni survey conducted by the programme, which indicated that alumni were very positive regarding their preparedness for entering the labour market upon completion.

Evidence collected during the site visit was slightly more critical in tone. The students indicated that they found it hard to define their perspectives in terms of the labour market and asked for more guidance in this respect. They also felt overwhelmed by the variety of options in master's programmes, not knowing exactly how to go about approaching them with respect to their acquired skill set. The programme management offered in response that it tries to cater to this demand by communicating in non-ambiguous terms the relation between the coursework and the trained skills to the students and through study guidance and advice offered as part of their support system. These initiatives were rated as satisfactory in quality by the panel, which wanted to underline that the programme continuously needs to communicate to the students that they must be self-aware and proactive in this respect. The panel also appreciates the programme's efforts to maintain links with the labour market and the various options and opportunities built into the curriculum to interact with potential career possibilities.

Alumni pointed out, on the other hand, that while they may have felt underprepared during their studies, upon graduation, it proved to be less of a problem to make the transition to either the labour market or a master's programme than previously thought. Graduates indicated that they often enrolled in master's degree programmes in the Humanities without any major difficulties, although sometimes additional coursework was required. These testimonies seem to indicate that the programme is successful in securing an unhindered transition from a broad bachelor's programme to a more specialised master's programme for determined and well-prepared students. In response, the programme added that it has actively made arrangements with humanities based master programmes in Leiden to enable smooth transition of its students to these masters without extra course work, or well-defined course work which could be done during the bachelor, either by incorporating it in their elective space or by taking extra-curricular courses. It is clear, however, that the students need in addition to these arrangements to be prepared to be proactive in this respect and aware of the potential need for additional groundwork before enrolment in a master's programme.

Considerations

The panel ascertained that graduates of the programme International Studies achieved the intended learning outcomes. The theses reflected an adequate achievement level for a bachelor's degree programme and also communicated clearly the programme's defining features: a global perspective, an approach based on various disciplines within the humanities, and a knowledge of and engagement with the chosen target regions. Evidence so far suggests that graduates of the programme are able to enrol in master's programmes within the Humanities without facing too many obstructions or delays. Also, graduates seem to be able to find their way to the labour market in professional fields in which a broad, multi- and interdisciplinary training could be seen as an advantage.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme International Studies: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'meets the standard'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The panel assessed standards 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the bachelor's programme International Studies as 'meets the standard'. Based on the NVAO decision rules regarding limited programme assessments, the panel therefore assesses the programme as 'positive'.

Conclusion

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

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

I: Graduates of the programme who started before the academic year 2017-2018 have attained the following learning outcomes, listed according to the Dublin descriptors:

A. Knowledge and understanding
1. Knowledge and understanding of the most important classic and contemporary theories necessary for the understanding of the regional effects of globalization, used in the disciplines offered in the programme:
   - history;
   - culture (including cultural studies and socio-linguistics);
   - economics;
   - politics and international relations.
2. Knowledge and understanding of key concepts and concept structures used in the disciplines offered in the programme necessary for the understanding of the regional effects of globalization.
3. Basic knowledge and understanding of methods used in the disciplines used in the programme relevant to the understanding of regional effects of globalization.
4. Knowledge and understanding of the history, culture, economy and politics of one of the eight geographical areas defined by the programme:
   - Africa;
   - East Asia;
   - Europe;
   - Latin America;
   - Middle East;
   - North America;
   - Russia and Eurasia;
   - South Asia and Southeast Asia.
5. Knowledge of the historical, cultural, political and economic aspects of international relations.
6. Knowledge and understanding of the historical, cultural, economic and political developments in the chosen geographical area from a global perspective.
7. In-depth knowledge of a specific aspect of a geographical area in its global context.

B. Specific academic skills
1. The ability to analyse and critically reflect on a specific issue within the field of study of International Studies from a multidisciplinary perspective.
2. The ability to analyse aspects of the historical, cultural, economic and political developments of the chosen geographical area from a global perspective.
3. Basic ability in all aspects (listening, reading, speaking and writing) of one modern language, other than English, which is connected to the geographical area the student has chosen, and is different from the student's native tongue.
4. The ability to apply research methods relevant to the field of International Studies.
5. The ability to operate in a multicultural academic and professional environment.
6. The ability to apply the acquired knowledge and skills in non-academic, professional contexts.
7. The ability to analyse and critically reflect on relevant knowledge and insights as laid out in scientific literature within the disciplines that are offered in the programme.
8. The ability to formulate an opinion with regard to the field of study of International Studies, taking into account the relevant aspects (social, societal, academic and/or ethical).
9. The ability to work with others, give and receive feedback to and from peers in a constructive fashion and use reasoned criticism to revise one's own point of view or own argumentation.

Furthermore, each humanities programme at Leiden University trains students in the general academic skills formulated by the Faculty. These skills relate to the Dublin descriptors Judgement, Communication, and Learning skills as specified in Appendix A of the general section.

II: Graduates of the programme who started in or after the academic year 2017-2018 have attained the following learning outcomes, listed according to the Dublin descriptors:

A. Knowledge and understanding
1. Knowledge and understanding of the most important classic and contemporary theories necessary for the understanding of the regional effects of globalization, used in the disciplines offered in the programme:
    - history;
    - culture (including cultural studies and sociolinguistics);
    - economics;
    - politics and international relations.
2. Knowledge and understanding of key concepts and concept structures used in the disciplines offered in the programme necessary for the understanding of the regional effects of globalization.
3. Basic knowledge and understanding of methods used in the disciplinary perspectives offered in the programme relevant to the understanding of regional effects of globalization.
4. A further knowledge and understanding of qualitative and quantitative methods used in at least one of the disciplines in the programme.
5. Knowledge and understanding of the history, culture, economy and politics of one of the eight geographical areas defined by the programme:
    - Africa;
    - East Asia;
    - Europe;
    - Latin America;
    - Middle East;
    - North America;
    - Russia and Eurasia;
    - South Asia and Southeast Asia.
6. Knowledge of the historical, cultural, political and economic aspects of international relations.
7. Knowledge and understanding of the historical, cultural, economic and political developments in the chosen geographical area from a global perspective.
8. In-depth knowledge of a specific aspect of a geographical area in its global context.

B. Specific academic skills
1. The ability to analyse and critically reflect on a specific issue within the field of study of International Studies from a multidisciplinary perspective.
2. The ability to analyse aspects of the historical, cultural, economic and political developments of the chosen geographical area from a global perspective.
3. Basic ability in all aspects (listening, reading, speaking and writing) of one modern language, other than English, which is connected to the geographical area the student has chosen, and is different from the student's native tongue.
4. The ability to apply research methods relevant to the field of International Studies.
5. The ability to operate in a multicultural academic and professional environment.
6. The ability to apply the acquired knowledge and skills in non-academic, professional contexts.
7. The ability to analyse and critically reflect on relevant knowledge and insights as laid out in scientific literature within the disciplines that are offered in the programme.
8. The ability to formulate an opinion with regard to the field of study of International Studies, taking into account the relevant aspects (social, societal, academic and/or ethical).
9. The ability to work with others, give and receive feedback to and from peers in a constructive fashion and use reasoned criticism to revise one's own point of view or own argumentation.

Furthermore, each humanities programme at Leiden University trains students in the general academic skills formulated by the Faculty. These skills relate to the Dublin descriptors Judgement, Communication, and Learning skills as specified in Appendix A of the general section.

The level to be reached is at least CEFR level:

Language	Reading	Writing	Listening	Speaking
Arabic	A2	A2	A2	A2
Dutch	B1+	A2+	B1	A2+
French	B1+	A2+	B1	A2+
German	B1+	A2+	B1	A2+
Hebrew	B2	B1	B2	B1
Hindi	B1	A2	B1	B1
Indonesian	B1	B1	B1	B1
Japanese	B1	A2	B1	A2
Korean	B1	B1	A2+	A2+
Mandarin	A1+	A1+	A1+	A1+
Persian	B1	A2	B1	A2
Portuguese	B1+	A2+	B1	A2+
Russian	B1	A2	B1	A2
Spanish	B1+	A2+	B1	A2+
Swahili	B1	A2+	B1	A2+
Turkish	A2+	A2+	A2+	A2+

Appendix A: General Academic Skills
Graduates of the bachelor's programme have obtained the following:

I - Elementary research skills, including heuristic skills
1. Collect and select specialised literature using traditional and electronic methods and techniques;
2. Analyse and evaluate this in terms of quality and reliability;
3. Formulate a well-defined research problem based on this;
4. Set up, under supervision, a study of a limited size taking into consideration the traditional and electronic methods and techniques relevant for the discipline;
5. Formulate a reasoned conclusion on the basis of this;
6. Also make use of the acquired research skills outside the student's own discipline.

II - Written presentation skills
1. Explain research findings in a clear and well-argued way;
2. Formulate an answer to questions concerning the discipline or a topic within it in the form of a clear and well-structured written presentation:
    - In accordance with the criteria set by the discipline;
    - Using relevant illustration or multimedia techniques;
    - Aimed at a specific target group.

III - Oral presentation skills
1. Explain research results in a clear and well-argued way;
2. Formulate an answer to questions relating to the discipline or topic within it:
    - In the form of a clear and well-structured oral presentation;
    - In accordance with the criteria set by the discipline;
    - Making use of modern presentation techniques;
    - Aimed at a specific target group;
3. Participate actively in a specialist discussion.

IV - Learning skills
1. Give and receive feedback to and from peers in a constructive fashion and use reasoned criticism to revise one's own point of view or own argumentation;
2. Take on board the instructions and criticism of supervisors, and take previous instructions and criticism into account in new situations;
3. Be able to make a realistic schedule and to stick to the agreed schedule and prioritisation.

APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Year 1	EC	Level
Academic Reading & Writing	5	100
Cultural Studies	5	100
Global History	5	100
Introduction to International Studies	5	100
Principles of Economics	5	100
Sociolinguistics	5	100
Foundations of Political Economy	5	100
Politics	5	100
Africa		
Culture: Africa	5	200
History: Africa	5	200
Choose one of the following: Arabic 1 Beginners (100); Arabic 1 Pre-Intermediate (200); French 1 Beginners (100); French 1 Intermediate (200); Portuguese 1 Beginners (100); Swahili 1 Beginners (100)	10	-
East Asia		
Culture: East Asia	5	200
History: East Asia	5	200
Choose one of the following: Japanese 1 Beginners (100); Korean 1 Beginners (100); Mandarin 1 Beginners (100); Mandarin 1 Pre-Intermediate (200)	10	-
Europe		
Culture: Europe	5	200
History: Europe	5	200
Choose one of the following: Dutch 1 Beginners (100); French 1 Beginners (100); French 1 Intermediate (200); German 1 Beginners (100); German 1 Intermediate (200); Portuguese 1 Beginners (100); Spanish 1 Beginners (100); Spanish 1 Intermediate (200)	10	-
Latin America		
Culture: Latin America	5	200
History: Latin America	5	200
Choose one of the following: Portuguese 1 Beginners (100); Spanish 1 Beginners (100); Spanish 1 Intermediate (200)	10	-

Middle East		
Culture: Middle East	5	200
History: Middle East	5	200
Choose one of the following: Arabic 1 Beginners (100); Arabic 1 Pre-Intermediate (200); Modern Hebrew 1 Beginners (100); Persian 1 Beginners (100); Turkish 1 Beginners (100)	10	-
North America		
Culture: North America	5	200
History: North America	5	200
Choose one of the following: French 1 Beginners (100); French 1 Intermediate (200); Spanish 1 Beginners (100); Spanish 1 Intermediate (200)	10	-
Russia and Eurasia		
Culture: Russia and Eurasia	5	200
History: Russia and Eurasia	5	200
Choose one of the following: Russian 1 Beginners (100) or Russian 1 Pre-Intermediate (200)	10	-
South Asia and Southeast Asia		
Culture: South Asia and Southeast Asia	5	200
History: South Asia and Southeast Asia	5	200
Choose one of the following: Hindi 1 Beginners or Indonesian 1 Beginners	10	100

Year 2	EC	Level
Cultural Interaction: A Global Perspective	5	200
Global Political Economy	5	300
International Relations	5	300
Philosophy of Science	5	200
Mandatory if doing an internship: Organizational Theory, Culture and Behavior	5	200
Choose one of the following research seminars: A Matter of Context: Including Environmental Issues in Research – 1; A Matter of Context: Including Environmental Issues in Research – 2; A Matter of Context: Including Environmental Issues in Research – 3; Capitalism, War and International Relations; Democracy and Political Transitions; International Organisations; International Political Economy in Social Science Research 1; International Political Economy in Social Science Research 2; Power and Armed Conflict; Religion, Politics, and the Public Domain; The Historical Study of Terrorism; Transnationalism and Global Diaspora 1; Transnationalism and Global Diaspora 2; Transnationalism and Global Diaspora 3; Understanding International Organisations 1; Understanding International Organisations 2; War and Strategic Studies; What Language Reveals about our Identity 1; What Language Reveals about our Identity 2; What Language Reveals about our Identity 3	5	200

Bachelor's programme International Studies, Leiden University

Choose one of the following seminars: An International History of Tourism; Anti-Semitism, Anti-Zionism and Holocaust Denial: Cause for Confusion; Argumentation and Debate; Art, Literature, and Law - The Questions of the Human Nature of Right(s); Censorship: Social Transformation, Manufactured Consent, and Free Speech; Close-Reading Comics: Hybrid Storytelling in Graphic Memoirs; Comparative Accounts of Human Flourishing; Emerging Economies; Feminist Philosophy; Film Journeys, the World on Screen; Global History of Work and Labour Organisations; Global Protest Movements; Languages and Cultures in Contact; Language with an Attitude; Nationalism and Nation-Building in the Twentieth Century; Political Justice: Equality, Freedom, Community; Race in World Politics; Religions in the Modern World; Terrorism: Philosophical Perspectives; The Global Cold War; The Linguistic Lens: How Language Influences our Perception of the World; The Powers of Literature in the Modern Middle East; The Present and Future of our Past: Critical Approaches to Heritage Studies; Waging War - Cultural Approaches; WWII in Asia: Images, Realities, Legacies	10	300
Africa		
Economy: Africa	5	200
Politics: Africa	5	200
Choose one of the following: Arabic 2 Pre-Intermediate; French 2 Pre-Intermediate; French 2 Upper-Intermediate; Portuguese 2 Pre-Intermediate; Swahili 2 Pre-Intermediate	10	200
Choose one of the following: Arabisch 3 Intermediate; French 3 Intermediate; French 3 Advanced; Portuguese 3 Intermediate; Swahili 3 Intermediate	5	200
East Asia		
Economy: East Asia	5	200
Politics: East Asia	5	200
Choose one of the following: Japanese 2 Pre-Intermediate; Korean 2 Pre-Intermediate; Mandarin 2 Pre-Intermediate	10	200
Choose one of the following: Japanese 3 Intermediate; Korean 3 Intermediate; Mandarin 3 Intermediate	5	200
Europe		
Economy: Europe	5	200
Politics: Europe	5	200
Choose one of the following: Dutch 2 Pre-Intermediate; French 2 Pre-Intermediate; French 2 Upper-Intermediate; German 2 Pre-Intermediate; German 2 Upper-Intermediate; Portuguese 2 Pre-Intermediate; Spanish 2 Pre-Intermediate; Spanish 2 Upper-Intermediate	10	200
Choose one of the following: Dutch 3 Intermediate; French 3 Intermediate; French 3 Advanced; German 3 Intermediate; German 3 Advanced; Portuguese 3 Intermediate; Spanish 3 Intermediate; Spanish 3 Advanced	5	200
Latin-America		
Economy: Latin-America	5	200

Politics: Latin-America	5	200
Choose one of the following: Portuguese 2 Pre-Intermediate; Spanish 2 Pre-Intermediate; Spanish 2 Upper-Intermediate	10	200
Choose one of the following: Portuguese 3 Intermediate; Spanish 3 Intermediate; Spanish 3 Advanced	5	200
Middle East		
Economy: Middle East	5	200
Politics: Middle East	5	200
Choose one of the following: Arabic 2 Pre-Intermediate; Modern Hebrew 2 Pre-Intermediate; Persian 2 Pre-Intermediate	10	200
Choose one of the following: Arabic 3 Intermediate; Modern Hebrew 3 Intermediate; Persian 3 Intermediate	5	200
North America		
Economy: North America	5	200
Politics: North America	5	200
Choose one of the following: French 2 Pre-Intermediate; French 2 Upper-Intermediate; Spanish 2 Pre-Intermediate; Spanish 2 Upper-Intermediate	10	200
Choose one of the following: French 3 Intermediate; French 3 Advanced; Spanish 3 Intermediate; Spanish 3 Advanced	5	200
Russia and Eurasia		
Economy: Russia and Eurasia	5	200
Politics: Russia and Eurasia	5	200
Russian 2 Pre-Intermediate	10	200
Russian 3 Intermediate	5	200
South Asia and Southeast Asia		
Economy: South Asia and Southeast Asia	5	200
Politics: South Asia and Southeast Asia	5	200
Choose one of the following: Hindi 2 Pre-Intermediate or Indonesian 2 Pre-Intermediate	10	200
Choose one of the following: Hindi 3 Intermediate or Indonesian 3 Intermediate	5	200

Year 3	EC	Level
Elective Credits	30	-
Practising International Studies (PRINS)	5	300
Choose one of the following: A Global History of War; Art, Literature, and Law - The Question of the Human Nature of Right(s); Capitalism, Modernity and Geopolitics: Historical Sociology of International Relations; Cinematic Discourses: Nation, Migration, Minorities; Cosmopolitics: Ethics and International Politics, Theory and Practice; Cultures of Consumption; Foreign Direct Investment, Multinational Companies and the Political Economy of Emerging Market Countries; How We Are Human: Cultural Reflections on Human Identity in Contexts of Biotechnology, Digitalization, and Gender; Intercultural Communication 1; Intercultural Communication 2; International Human Rights: History, Politics, and Economics; Political Agency in the Digital Age; Political Economy of Human Rights; Race in World Politics; Religions 'On the Move': the Case of Global Buddhism; Religious, Linguistic, and Sexual Minorities in the Contemporary World; Science, Media, and Society 1; Science, Media, and Society 2; Terrorism in Modern History; The Future of Religion: The West and Rest; The Politics of Human Rights; The Transformation of (Inter)National Political Community; Vulgar Culture; What is this War About Anyway?: Armed Conflicts in the Twentieth Century; Women and Politics	10	400
Africa		
Thesis and Thesis Seminar Africa A/B/C	15	400
East Asia		
Thesis and Thesis Seminar East Asia A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I	15	400
Europe		
Thesis and Thesis Seminar Europe A/B/C/D/E/F	15	400
Latin America		
Thesis and Thesis Seminar Latin America A/B/C/D/E	15	400
Middle East		
Thesis and Thesis Seminar Middle East A/B/C/D/E/F	15	400
North America		
Thesis and Thesis Seminar North America A/B/C/D	15	400
Russia and Eurasia		
Thesis and Thesis Seminar Russia and Eurasia A/B/C/D	15	400
South Asia and Southeast Asia		
Thesis and Thesis Seminar South Asia and Southeast Asia A/C	15	400

Year 3 (from 2019-2020 onwards)	EC	Level
Elective Credits (Internship, Study Abroad, Minor)	30	-
Practising International Studies	10	300
Choose one of the following: Arabic in Practice; Dutch in Practice; French in Practice; German in Practice; Hebrew in Practice; Hindi in Practice; Indonesian in Practice; Japanese in Practice; Korean in Practice; Mandarin in Practice; Persian in Practice; Portuguese in Practice; Russian in Practice; Spanish in Practice; Swahili in Practice; Turkish in Practice	5	300
Africa		
Thesis and Thesis Seminar Africa A/B/C	15	400
East Asia		
Thesis and Thesis Seminar East Asia A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I	15	400
Europe		
Thesis and Thesis Seminar Europe A/B/C/D/E/F	15	400
Latin America		
Thesis and Thesis Seminar Latin America A/B/C/D/E	15	400
Middle East		
Thesis and Thesis Seminar Middle East A/B/C/D/E/F	15	400
North America		
Thesis and Thesis Seminar North America A/B/C/D	15	400
Russia and Eurasia		
Thesis and Thesis Seminar Russia and Eurasia A/B/C/D	15	400
South Asia and Southeast Asia		
Thesis and Thesis Seminar South Asia and Southeast Asia A/B	15	400

APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

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

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

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

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

Day 3: Friday 7 June 2019 – Boards of Examiners

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

APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Thesis selection
Prior to the site visit, the panel studied 15 theses of the bachelor's programme International Studies. The selection was based on a provided list of graduates between 2016-2018. The programme does not include specified tracks or variations which the panel had to take into account in its thesis selection. A variety of topics and a diversity of examiners were included in the selection. The project manager and panel chair assured that the distribution of grades in the selection matched the distribution of grades of all available theses. Further information on the selected theses is available from QANU upon request.

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

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

Specific reading material bachelor's programme International Studies:
- Course material 'Cultural Studies' (BA1), 'Politics by Area: Europe' (BA2), 'Politics by Area: East Asia' (BA2), 'Politics by Area: Middle East' (BA2), 'Practising International Studies' (BA3);
- Programme Board reports 2015-2018;
- Board of Examiners reports 2015-2018;
- Course and Examination Regulations;
- Programme Committee minutes 2014-2019;
- Factsheets of Nationale Studentenenquête;
- Course evaluation 2019;
- Mid-Term Tutorial Evaluation (template);
- Programme metrics *(Opleidingsjaarkaart)*;
- Assessment plan I and II;
- Self-Evaluation Report;
- Guide Academic Skills;
- Other documents.

PRINS project reports:
- *Google Parachute: Skilling me softly;*
- *Quid Pro Quota: Visa Measures to Incentivise Readmission Agreements;*
- *Rising Solutions: A Threefold Approach to the Development of Flood Resilience: Technical, Social, Political;*
- *Data for Food: Assessing Food Security through Broadband.*

Additional material bachelor's programme International Studies (internship):
- Prins project staff manual;
- Prins project student manual;
- 7 examples of Prins project group presentations (2018-2019);
- The "This is International Studies" website;
- The internship website;
- Instruction internship package module;
- Template internship plan (and filled in examples);

- Examples of research paper proposals;
- Examples of internship assignments;
- Examples of internship reports.

Links provided on laptops:
- Learning environment selected courses;
- Structure of the Faculty of Humanities movie;
- Study association International Studies – BASIS.