



**RESEARCH MASTER'S
PROGRAMME**

LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

LEIDEN UNIVERSITY

Qanu
Catharijnesingel 56
3511 GE Utrecht
The Netherlands

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

Project number: Q0771

© 2021 Qanu

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

CONTENTS

REPORT ON THE RESEARCH MASTER’S PROGRAMME LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES OF LEIDEN UNIVERSITY5

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME 5

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION 5

COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL 5

WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL 6

SUMMARY JUDGEMENT10

DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENTS13

GENERAL CONCLUSION26

APPENDICES.....28

APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES30

APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM.....32

APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE ONLINE VISIT34

APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL38

This report was finalised on 16 July 2021



REPORT ON THE RESEARCH MASTER'S PROGRAMME LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES OF LEIDEN UNIVERSITY

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

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

Research master's programme Latin American Studies

Name of the programme:	Latijns-America Studies (research)
International name:	Latin American Studies (research)
CROHO number:	60844
Level of the programme:	master's level
Orientation of the programme:	academic research master
Number of credits:	120 EC
Specialisations:	none
Location:	Leiden
Mode of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	Spanish, Portuguese, English
Submission deadline NVAO:	01/11/2020, extension submission date until 31/10/2021 due to legislation WHW art. 5.16 lid 4

The online assessment of the research master's programme Latin American Studies of Leiden University took place on 3-5 February 2021.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

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

COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The NVAO has approved the composition of the panel on 2 June 2020. The panel that assessed the research master's programme Latin American Studies consisted of:

- Prof. dr. K. (Kristoffel) Demoen, professor Ancient Greek Literature at Ghent University (Belgium) [panel chair Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and Leiden University];
- Prof. dr. E.H.M. (Helena) Houvenaghel, professor Spanish Language and Culture at Utrecht University;
- Em. prof. dr. J.F. (John) Healey, emeritus professor in Semitic Studies at the University of Manchester (United Kingdom);
- Em. prof. dr. phil. J.U. (Jens-Uwe) Hartmann, professor Indian and Iranian Studies at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in München (Germany);

- Prof. dr. T. (Thomas) Meier, professor for Pre- and Protohistory and director of the Käte Hamburger Center for Apocalyptic and Post-Apocalyptic Studies at Heidelberg University (Germany);
- Dr. G. (Gerhard) Anders, senior lecturer African Studies and International Development at the Centre of African Studies of the University of Edinburgh (United Kingdom);
- Y.P. (Yannick) de Raaff, MA, recent graduate research master Archaeology at the University of Groningen [student member].

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

WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

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

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

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

Panel members

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

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

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

Preparation

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

Before the online site visit to the Leiden University, Qanu received the self-evaluation report of the programme and sent it to the panel. In January 2020, the panel received a report on the measures taken to assure the quality of teaching and assessment during the Covid-19 pandemic. The panel studied all theses and assessment forms that were produced since the programme's reassessment in 2017, including theses finished in the second half of 2020. Its thesis sample consisted of fourteen theses in total.

Online assessment

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

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

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

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

Site visit

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

Development dialogues

Five digital development dialogues were scheduled at the following dates:

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

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

Consistency and calibration

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

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

Working method during site visit

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

Report

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

Definition of judgement standards

In accordance with the NVAO's *Assessment Framework for the Higher Education Accreditation System of the Netherlands* (September 2018) for limited programme assessments, the panel used the following definitions for the assessment of the standards:

Generic quality

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

Meets the standard

The programme meets the generic quality standard.

Partially meets the standard

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

Does not meet the standard

The programme does not meet the generic quality standard.

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

Positive

The programme meets all the standards.

Conditionally positive

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

Negative

In the following situations:

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

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

SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

The research master's programme Latin American Studies offers a two-year research-oriented programme of 120 EC. The majority of the teaching staff is affiliated the Leiden University Institute for History (LUIH) or the Leiden University Centre for Arts in the Society (LUCAS). These research institutes were assessed according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol in 2018 for the period 2012-2017. LUIH was rated 'world leading/excellent' (1) in terms of research quality and LUCAS was assessed 'very good' (2). These high scores reflect the excellent research environment offered to research master students. According to the panel, these two institutes offer a relevant and valuable research environment for a research master's degree programme.

Standard 1

The panel is positively impressed by the changes implemented since the assessment in 2017. It concluded that the research master's programme in Latin American Studies has continued to mature and develop. During the site visit, it met with highly reflective and motivated staff members who take pride in their achievements and the changes the programme went through, while also staying open and reflective regarding the current approach and need for future development. In the panel's view, both attitudes are fully justified. It considers the research master's programme in Latin American Studies an attractive programme, with a distinctive approach and clear identity. The opportunity to focus on Brazilian studies, the available expertise in Portuguese, the interdisciplinary approaches and a mandatory stay abroad set the programme apart within the Dutch academic landscape, and it is considered highly valuable in an international context.

The thematic focus on Modernities offers both opportunities and challenges. In the panel's view, extended collaboration with linguistics and more attention to current debates within both social and cultural studies that touch on linguistic aspects would be a welcome addition to the profile. Additional collaboration with linguistics, as suggested, may also justly emphasise the position of Spanish and Portuguese as academic languages in their own right. To the panel, these wishes are not considered to be at odds with the chosen direction and the overarching theme; it sees opportunities to further enrich the current take and scope of the programme. Hereby, peer-involvement could be valuable to define the best way to continue honing the profile, honouring the available strengths and unique selling-points of the current Leiden research while creating a future-proof research master's programme continues to be attractive to new groups of students. The programme is highly aware of these questions. The panel trusts the programme on the way how to progress, based on the way how it reacted to earlier recommendations.

The programme combines a substantive focus on theory, method and literature with a reflective attitude towards Latin American society and the embedding of debate in historical tendencies. In this way, the students receive a good theoretical training while acquiring relevant transferable skills. These skills could be more foregrounded in connection with potential careers, both in the programme's profile outline and the ILOs. The ILOs for the programme are linked to the Dublin descriptors for the master's level and are clearly research-oriented in their attention to theory training and methods and the acquisition of relevant skills to conduct independent research. The panel therefore concludes that they are appropriate for a research master's degree. The ILOs also clearly reflect the programme's interdisciplinary orientation. In order to connect them more closely to the programme's profile, the panel advises adjusting the outcome describing the programme's scope and formulating the exact linguistic skills obtained more transparently.

Standard 2

The panel ascertained that the existing selection and admittance criteria select suitable and highly motivated candidates with a strong academic record for enrolment in the research master's programme Latin American Studies. The choices for Spanish, Portuguese and English as the languages of instruction, and for an English programme name, are deemed appropriate by the panel. These choices are of added value for the students' future careers. The panel ascertained that the level of proficiency of staff members in Spanish and Portuguese is excellent. The English

proficiency of staff members is sufficient and is monitored by the programme management ensuring continuous professional development where needed. This remains, however, an opportunity for further professional development in individual cases.

Enrolment numbers have been low over the last years, but the panel was pleased to note the attention being paid to this matter. Increased ties with partner institutions, exchange of best practices within the Faculty, and a slight diversification of the programme so as to include linguistics may create new opportunities. Continuous Faculty and University support is also needed, in particular aiming for the enrolment of talented non-EU students from less financially solvent backgrounds. Staff and students share the wish to increase cohort numbers and are open to initiatives to create further classroom interaction. The panel's suggestions include digital collaboration with international programmes and exchange, possibly also within the context of the Master Languages initiative.

Notwithstanding these observations, the panel verified that the dynamics within the programme offer a very rich and challenging teaching-learning environment that is truly international, research-led and student-centred, tailored towards individual needs in the framework provided by the thematic approach. Also, it verified that the programme acted responsively and adequately to the challenges posed by Covid-19, ensuring progress for students without compromising the quality of the programme or the attainment of the intended learning objectives. The curriculum design helps the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes within the constraints of a two-year programme, resulting in high student success. The field work is considered a defining feature, as is the strongly integrated training of methods and theory, in line with the requirements of a research master's programme. Attention to the ethical aspects of research is included, though they could be better substantiated. The curriculum manages very well to achieve the programme aim to offer solid training, allowing the students to become independent researchers who have mastered the full research cycle by the time they graduate. The panel offered some minor suggestions for further improvement of the existing contents of the programme, particularly regarding the integration of the interdisciplinary approach. As the programme is currently discussing the way forward with respect to its profile, and the potential involvement of linguists, it is confident that its suggestions will be taken into consideration while fine-tuning the curriculum.

The students are highly appreciative of their teachers. These positive student observations regarding the staff are fully shared by the panel. Staff members are passionate, engaged, reflective, and always striving for further professional development and programme improvement. They are also highly experienced researchers, established at leading scholarly institutes that constitute an excellent research environment for the programme. The programme and its staff members find themselves in a vulnerable position due to high work pressure, the panel established. This is partly the result of the staff's involvement in many teaching programmes simultaneously, of vacancies at the chair level and ultimately also of low intake numbers. The panel believes that the high quality of the programme, directly related to its teaching-learning environment, truly deserves a chance to thrive and urges the Faculty, University and research institutes involved to continue to support it to the best of their abilities.

Standard 3

The panel ascertained that the assessment methods used at the research master's programme Latin American Studies are sufficiently varied; they reflect the level of the programme and adequately test the students' research abilities and awareness of the ethics of research. The students are satisfied with the quality of the assessment and feedback received. The assessment of the theses is of good quality. The panel by and large agreed with the grades awarded. Over the period of assessment, it noted a greater awareness of the need to use assessment as a form of communication, in particular in the thesis grading practices. This was appreciated by the panel, which wants to acknowledge the hard work and good results of the programme in this respect. It demonstrates the awareness of the need for transparency and reflects the commitment of the programme and its staff to continuous improvement. To strengthen the current thesis assessment practices, the panel has some minor suggestions to make. It advises including a criterion for publishability in the current thesis assessment form, reflecting in more detail on the methods

used, and systematically addressing the interdisciplinary focus in the thesis assessments. The transparency could also be strengthened by the creation of a more detailed marking scheme.

Assessment at the research master's programme benefits from its embedment within the Faculty of Humanities, which has developed robust assessment policies and procedures to organise a transparent and reliable system of assessment. At the programme level, the Board of Examiners together with the Test Committee ensures a solid quality assurance process that guarantees the independence and transparency of assessment and also managed to maintain the quality of assessment during the circumstances caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. The panel encourages the Faculty to continue monitoring the workload of the Board of Examiners, and to pay attention to the continuous need for sufficient secretarial support. Based on its findings, it gained a positive impression of the system of assessment and the ways it is implemented at the programme level and followed through by staff members. Hence, it concludes that the programme has an adequate system of student assessment in place.

Standard 4

Based on the overall level of the theses and the performance of graduates after completion of the programme, the panel concludes that the graduates have achieved the programme's ILOs. It appreciates the quality of the theses examined, which contain original approaches to current socio-political issues in Latin America. The creative application of theory stood out, as did the advanced academic level of Spanish and Portuguese proficiency in the work of graduates opting for those languages. The quality of written English deserves further attention, both at the student and staff level, but suffices. The interdisciplinary quality of the research could be made more explicit in the theses' outlook and design and could be diversified by entering into further collaboration between the different fields of expertise available, including linguistics. Due to the relevance, quality and originality of the research, the theses contribute to the existing field of knowledge and could thus be successfully reworked to fit publication standards or serve as a basis for future research projects. The panel verified that the students complete the entire research cycle at a master's level in their thesis trajectory, and that their research ties in well with the available research expertise. In this way, the theses demonstrate that the students are fully embedded within a good-quality research context. The fact that many graduates are successful in their future careers and obtain PhD positions, competitive traineeship positions and relevant professional careers adds to this positive assessment.

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

Research master's programme Latin American Studies

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

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

Date: 16 July 2021

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

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

The intended learning outcomes tie in with the level and orientation of the programme; they are geared to the expectations of the professional field, the discipline, and international requirements.

Findings

Profile

Latin American Studies offers students an interdisciplinary research master's programme that brings together staff expertise in cultural analysis, public policy and modern history, all with a distinctive focus on the Latin American region. The programme aims to equip students with the tools and skills needed to discuss, analyse and communicate research into the region in a theoretically embedded and empirically sustained manner, allowing them to grow into capable scholars and valuable professionals. The students are trained to develop a critical research attitude and are able to position their own research in relevant scientific debates, while also being able to conduct independent interdisciplinary research. To this end, they are obliged to go to Latin America for a research period of at least 8-12 weeks, generally enjoyed at one of the programme's partner institutions in Guatemala, Puerto Rico, Brazil, Mexico and Chile.

To achieve its objectives, the programme familiarises the students with the current debates in the field. To sharpen its focus, it has adopted a central, overarching theme which guides their study trajectories: *Latin American Modernities, Resistance, Revival and Change*. This central theme was embraced by the programme in reaction to suggestions by the former review panel. The theoretical approach within the programme is grounded in the long-standing tradition in the field of Latin American Studies of reflecting on, and often challenging, the idea of modernity. To ensure a deep theoretical and methodological underpinning within the confines of its central, overarching theme, the programme offers three clusters of research: 1. Culture and identity; 2. State-society relations; and 3. Literature, arts and media. These clusters bring together disciplines such as literary studies, film studies, anthropology, public policy, politics and history.

The panel appreciates the way in which the programme acted upon the earlier recommendations and considers the current profile fitting. In discussion with the programme, it was told that some staff members are worried that the current operationalisation of the thematic focus on Modernities might be interpreted in a too limiting way. It could, for instance, potentially impede any initiative to incorporate linguistic approaches more directly into the programme. The panel acknowledges these concerns and considers the thematic focus not at odds with the wish to diversify and include linguistic approaches. It is pleased to hear that the programme continues to review its profile and it welcomes any discussion to ensure that the programme's focus is renewed and developed to contribute to current debates within the discipline, especially those related to language policy and multilingualism. It is also in favour of additional links with the Linguistics department, as the Programme Board is currently exploring. Additional collaboration with linguistics would also foreground the strength of the programme regarding Spanish and Portuguese as academic languages in their own right next to English, opening up the programme to students from alternative backgrounds. The students mentioned that for some of them, extended connections with linguists during their studies would be beneficial for their future careers.

In the panel's view, introducing a fourth thematic research cluster connecting to sociolinguistics and language policy alongside the three already existing research clusters might be a good point of departure. Today's debates on language and policy, language and conflict, language and history, variety and hybridisation could benefit from linguistic insights. Any collaboration with this area of studies may be relatively easy to integrate and connect to the

current set-up, also institutionally. For example, the current chair of the Board of Examiners of the programme is a linguist and would therefore be well-placed to check and perhaps offer advice regarding formalities. If broadening the profile and themes in one single movement is too much of a stretch, the programme may decide to work step by step by first integrating sociolinguistics at the course level and then furthering the process of integrating and interdisciplinary dialogue in following years. The panel fully trusts the programme on the way how to progress and recommends including external views to find and define the best way forward.

In general, the panel is impressed by the commitment by Leiden University to maintain its diverse offer in research in languages and cultures at the Faculty of Humanities. This commitment is of vital importance for international research and the training of future generations of scholars in these specialised subfields and contributes directly to the good reputation of Dutch scholarship and academic teaching in the humanities. In particular, its incorporation of Brazilian studies, and the available expertise in Portuguese at Leiden University, the attention paid to interdisciplinary approaches and a mandatory stay abroad set the programme apart within the Dutch academic landscape, and it is considered highly valuable in an international context. Its focus and structure also differ from other similar degrees in Europe. In the panel's view, the programme strongly benefits from its staff's research environment at the Leiden University Institute for History (LUIH) and the Leiden University Centre for Arts in the Society (LUCAS). Both institutes are highly regarded for their research output and are fully embedded in an extended international academic network. At the time of the review, there is no official collaboration (yet) with Leiden University Centre for Linguistics (LUCL) in terms of research themes and content. In the panel's view, LUCL could offer a valuable contribution to the further diversification and strengthening of the programme's profile and is therefore in favour of closer ties and collaboration.

Intended learning objectives

The objectives of the programme are summarised in five intended learning outcomes (hereafter: ILOs; see Appendix 1), which reflect the Dublin descriptors for academic programmes at the master's level. The panel studied these aims and the attainment level and the embedment of these objectives within the curriculum of the programme. Emphasis on individual research and the writing of a significant academic research study stand out. Graduates can draw on a wide range of relevant skills and training in theory, methods and relevant knowledge. The ethical aspects of research are also included in the ILOs. In the panel's view, the ILOs are in line with the expectations and practices of the academic and professional field for a research master's programme. It concluded that these combined skills and abilities should prepare students for a research position at a university or for a comparable position in government, civil society and private-sector organisations related to Latin American Studies.

In some areas, the ILOs could do with additional clarification. ILO 1c names two research scopes for students: social and cultural studies. It would be helpful if this specific outcome was more directly related to the research clusters. Also, the panel would advise to specify this goal and to relate it to the programme's interdisciplinary approach. Also, the panel would advise reformulating the language objectives in ILO 4d to clarify which two languages exactly students become proficient in at the highest academic level. The connection to professions outside of academia is implied by the set of obtained transferable skills rather than specified. This could be made more explicit, both in the ILOs and in the programme's profile.

Considerations

The panel is positively impressed by the changes implemented since the assessment in 2017. It concluded that the research master's programme in Latin American Studies has continued to mature and develop in this area since the successful reassessment in 2016. During the site visit, it met with highly reflective and motivated staff members who take pride in their achievements and the changes the programme went through, while also staying open and reflective regarding the current approach and need for future development. In the panel's view, both attitudes are fully justified. It considers the research master's programme in Latin American Studies an attractive programme, with a distinctive approach and clear identity, and concluded that it is well-served by the academic expertise available at the Leiden University Institute for History (LUIH) and the Leiden University Centre for Arts in the Society

(LUCAS). The opportunity to focus on Brazilian studies, the available expertise in Portuguese, the interdisciplinary approaches and a mandatory stay abroad set the programme apart within the Dutch academic landscape, and it is considered highly valuable in an international context.

The thematic focus on Modernities offers both opportunities and challenges. In the panel's view, extended collaboration with linguistics and more attention to current debates within both social and cultural studies that touch on linguistic aspects would be a welcome addition to the profile. Additional collaboration with linguistics, as suggested, may also justly emphasise the position of Spanish and Portuguese as academic languages in their own right. To the panel, these wishes are not considered to be at odds with the chosen direction and the overarching theme; it sees opportunities to further enrich the current take and scope of the programme. Hereby, peer-involvement could be valuable to define the best way to continue honing the profile, honouring the available strengths and unique selling-points of the current Leiden research while creating a future-proof research master's programme that continues to be attractive to new groups of students. The programme itself is highly aware of these questions. The panel trusts the programme on the way how to progress, based on the way how it reacted to earlier recommendations.

The programme combines a substantive focus on theory, method and literature with a reflective attitude towards Latin American society and the embedding of debate in historical tendencies. In this way, the students receive a good theoretical training while acquiring relevant transferable skills. These skills could be more foregrounded in connection with potential careers, both in the programme's profile outline and the ILOs. The ILOs for the programme are linked to the Dublin descriptors for the master's level and are clearly research-oriented in their attention to theory training and methods and acquiring relevant skills to conduct independent research. The panel therefore concludes that they are appropriate for a research master's degree. The ILOs also clearly reflect the programme's interdisciplinary orientation. To connect them more closely to the programme's profile, the panel advises adjusting the outcome describing the programme's scope and formulating the exact linguistic skills obtained more transparently.

Conclusion

Research master's programme Latin American 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

Admission and intake

Prospective students are required to have an affinity with and suitability for scholarly research in the specific field of the programme as well as a demonstrable motivation for the programme. Formal admission criteria include a bachelor's degree from a research university, proven knowledge of the fundamentals of area studies, literary studies, history and/or social sciences and a strong academic record (an equivalent average mark of at least 7.5 and at least 8.0 for the bachelor's thesis in the Dutch grading system). Candidates are required to hand over two letters of recommendation, a research proposal including an annotated bibliography, and a letter of motivation. The panel noted staff members on the Board of Admissions now represent the thematic clusters and expertise in Latin American Studies, and it appreciated how this well-balanced composition addressed panel recommendations made during the reassessment in 2016.

On a case-by-case basis, candidates with a strong motivation and proven academic record but no background in Latin American Studies or a closely related field may conditionally be admitted. Students from the one-year master

could in some cases switch to the research master's programme, if they show talent and drive. The panel approves of this practice, as it opens up the programme to a more diverse intake. The Board of Admissions carefully weighs the application files, while paying attention to the level of English proficiency and Spanish/Portuguese proficiency. The panel was told by the students that if they came from an alternative background, for example a Liberal Arts programme, they were generally asked to follow a minor in one of the Latin American languages or to invest in their language skills prior to enrolment. The students considered the programme's admission procedures to be transparent and the selection process challenging yet fair. They pointed out that the experienced flexibility towards entry requirements could be better communicated to incoming students. This assessment and suggestion are shared by the panel, which also agrees with the admission criteria in place.

The research master's programme Latin American Studies has attracted between two to four students annually in the last years. To raise intake numbers, several initiatives have been undertaken. The panel learnt that the programme, with help from the Faculty, invested in its online visibility by using social media more extensively. It is also trying to reach new target groups. At the moment, the students primarily come from the Netherlands and other European countries. Only some students come from further afield, which is likely because of the high tuition fees for non-EU citizens. The panel advises the programme to explore its current partnerships with universities in Latin America in this regard and to invest in exchanges with similar European programmes at the bachelor's level; by increasing collaboration, the programme may become more attractive for enrolment for students at these institutions. As suggested above (see Standard 1), increased collaboration with linguistics may also be a way to open up the programme and generate new interest. In this respect, the recruitment of a professor of Spanish and Portuguese Language and Literature with an interdisciplinary and international profile would be a key asset for the programme to attract international students and to further strengthen the diversification of the programme.

The panel also encourages the programme to exchange best practices regarding student recruitment with the other research master's programmes in Area Studies at the Faculty. It noted, for example, the use of matching to connect current with prospective students at one of the other programmes under review during this assessment. It also acknowledges the need for continuous Faculty support to sustain the current initiatives and to develop new ways to reach out to fresh target groups. Any additional funding or initiatives by the university to open up the programme for non-EU students would also be highly appreciated by the panel.

Languages at the programme

Spanish and Portuguese are the main languages of instruction in the programme. Spanish is considered the lingua franca. Portuguese is mainly used in courses dedicated to Brazilian Studies and only employed if the level of proficiency (passive or active) of the attending students is of a sufficiently advanced level. Many staff members teaching in the programme are native speakers of Spanish or Portuguese, received their academic training abroad, and are fully qualified to communicate, teach and mark at the high proficiency level required. The students appreciate the chance to actively engage in these languages at this high academic level and consider the programme's linguistic policy well-employed. The panel considers the excellent linguistic training in the languages of the region a true asset and unique selling-point of the programme. It advises the programme to stimulate students to make use of this expertise and to write as much as possible in the languages of the region, including in their theses. English is also one of the programme's official languages to ensure that the students are able to engage in interdisciplinary research by following courses within the wider academic community at Leiden University. The programme name is in English to increase its visibility in line with the practice at the Faculty. The panel ascertained that the level of English proficiency of staff members is sufficient, yet noted in the evaluation of the staff's thesis feedback that it is a point for attention (see Standard 4). This was acknowledged by the Programme Board.

The panel fully approves of these linguistic choices and considers the rich palette of languages used an attractive feature and of added value for the students' careers. It could even be seen as a requirement for success within academia in the field. Spanish and Portuguese are fully established languages of academic communication. Research in the field of Latin American Studies and primary source material is mainly published and available in Spanish and

Portuguese. The programme language policy is also a logical approach in terms of the programme's objectives: a high level of proficiency in two of the three mentioned languages is part of the programme's ILOs, and students are obliged to go abroad for research in Latin America as part of their course work. The students may reasonably expect to move abroad or work closely together with foreign colleagues in international collaborations, both during their studies and upon graduation. For this last reason, inclusion of English also makes sense: it offers additional options to students in terms of career planning.

Teaching concept and curriculum

The programme's teaching concept is based on the idea that research master students are in an advanced stage of their training as professional researchers. The panel verified that the teaching in the programme is strongly research-led and closely connected to the staff members' research. The programme consists of four semesters with a course load of 30 EC each, for a total of 120 EC. The curriculum is organised in three phases: a foundational, deepening and synthesis phase. These phases partly overlap, offering a structured preparation for the final stage of the programme in which all knowledge and acquired skills are consistently built up, accumulating in a final, independent research project: the thesis. The panel noted that the curriculum follows a clear didactic logic, allowing for a more independent research attitude, and consistent attention is paid to the training of research skills and methods, which is well-suited to the aim to deliver capable researchers.

As part of the foundational phase, the students follow two core courses in which the thematic profile of the programme is worked out. The first core course, *Theoretical Approaches to Modernities in Latin America* (10 EC), focuses on the concept of modernity in the humanities and social sciences, reflecting on the linear project of development and progress and challenging students to reassess the concept as a state- or elite-led process, with multiple, ambiguous, expected and unintended results. The second course, *Resistance, Revival and Change: Mechanisms and Expressions* (10 EC), explores case studies from across the cultural and national geographies of the Latin American region and the Caribbean. It focuses on social relations, cultural production and political mobilisation where resistance, revival and change become observable. In this course, the ethical aspects of research within the field of study are also discussed. The panel noted that these aspects could be better substantiated, in the course information and objectives but also in the way they are part of the students' learning trajectories.

The panel considers the way in which both courses work in tandem commendable: staff interaction between the two courses has been improved in line with the suggestion in the reassessment of 2016. The teaching schedule has been modified to allow the students to relate the contents of the courses. In this way, knowledge acquisition is truly progressive. The panel also appreciates that the core courses provide a solid framework in which the students are challenged to approach their own interests from various angles. It also noted the desire to adopt an interdisciplinary approach, and the struggle to fully integrate the various approaches and make them engage with each other. A way forward may actually be by further diversification. The panel proposes inviting staff members who could include linguistic-political perspectives and sociolinguistic reflections on ongoing debates as these points of view could provide some missing links. Additionally, the unique multilingual profile of the programme could be more foregrounded in the core courses, as it is considered a particular programme strength by the panel.

The students deepen their learning by following three electives (10 EC each) within one of the three thematic research clusters offered by the programme. Most of the courses on offer are shared with one-year master's programmes, diversifying the classroom experience. For these modules, additional requirements are set for the research master students. These encourage the students to connect the course work to the theoretical framework and overarching theme of the research master's programme. They can choose from a range of subjects and are adequately guided in making choices, both in general information sessions and in consultation with staff and the coordinator of studies. They also have to follow a course taught at a national Dutch Research School of their choice in the Humanities (10 EC). Finally, they go abroad in the deepening phase: they follow their final elective (10 EC) at a university in Latin America in their second year. According to the panel, the three thematic clusters differentiating

the electives strike a balance in terms of focus and breadth. The lines of enquiry bring together staff research in an interdisciplinary approach, embedding the students' interests in connection to staff expertise.

The curriculum also includes three methods courses. *Methods I: Research Seminar Latin American Modernities* (10 EC) deepens the foundation in the core course of the foundation phase. *Methods II: Research in Latin America* (20 EC) is an active phase of fieldwork and/or research in Latin America (20 EC). *Methods III: Writing Workshop* (5 EC) is complementary to the thesis trajectory (25 EC) and should be seen in unison with it. They intend to provide further methodological deepening while eventually resulting in synthesis. Interdisciplinary research methods are interwoven in the programme with assignments, offering the integration of methods training within a research setting and a clear structure to the curriculum design. The panel studied the materials for these courses and considered them well laid out and thorough, with attention being paid to various research methods and approaches, and with adequate room for reflection. In this way, the students are well-prepared to set up and complete an individual research project at the end of their studies. The panel is appreciative of the way in which the programme prepares them for interdisciplinary research. They benefit from a wide range of tools and methods which they can combine creatively and innovatively in their own original interdisciplinary research. It encourages a further strengthening of interdisciplinary research through an integration of linguistic and socio-linguistic aspects (culture, public policy and history) as part of the curriculum offer. In its view, this would strengthen Leiden's position within the research field and strengthen the programme's profile and attraction to students. It may be useful to discuss the options to do so with external experts with a broad view of the international field, to define Leiden's take and niche field.

The actual synthesis of knowledge and skills is achieved in the last elements of the programme's study programme: the fieldwork or research assignment in Latin America in combination with the thesis and the writing workshop. The research assignment abroad, often fieldwork, is an opportunity to dive in at the deep end: the students freely shape their own research or fieldwork at this stage. The period in Latin America usually spans three months and is scheduled together with the students' final elective. The students enhance their academic development through the various means by which they collect data in their research assignment. They read original texts, engage with audio-visual and social media, hold interviews, conduct participant observation and surveys, and communicate in written and oral form in the target language. The panel considers it a strong and attractive feature of the programme that the research period abroad is firmly embedded in the curriculum. This provides a valuable learning experience; it has a strong impact on the students' understanding of cultural and societal issues.

Although the students are 'on their own', they are not 'alone', the panel heard. Staff are at hand to check whether the proposed research or fieldwork is in line with the proposed thesis plan and the desired academic standards. They keep an eye on the quality of the outcomes and often suggest suitable destinations and/or contacts to work with from their personal networks. The students' fieldwork is eventually assessed by their supervisor; this supervisor is also responsible for guidance during the thesis trajectory. All supervisors engaged in fieldwork and thesis supervision are senior researchers at Leiden University, offering students the opportunity to discuss their research dilemmas, questions and practices with highly respected and well-connected academics.

The students spoke highly of their supervisors, calling them resourceful, enthusiastic and very engaged. They also appreciated their feedback, both during the process and on assignments. One student mentioned that switching between supervisors due to a changed interest had demonstrated the high quality of supervisory support available: both supervisors were excellent, supportive and provided excellent guidance. It exemplified the trend that as a student of the programme, you always got a 'lucky pick'. The panel noted that supervisors, due to their double supervisory role for the study abroad and thesis, oversee a large part of the students' individual study trajectories. This is generally considered advantageous by those involved and by the panel, but should be closely monitored to avoid any unwanted situations. The panel verified that this possibility has been acknowledged.

The thesis encompasses the entire research cycle. It includes formulating a research question, choosing appropriate research methods, collecting and analysing data, reflecting on theory and the student's own contribution to the

current academic debate, reaching conclusions, identifying avenues for further research, and also critically assessing their own learning journey. The data used for thesis research is based on the results of the research conducted during the period of research in Latin America. The structure for the process of thesis writing is offered through the compulsory writing workshop that is part of the method training, which is programmed at the same time. The students can find additional information in the online thesis writing manual, which sets out all the requirements. The panel ascertained that this set-up functions well. The students usually finish the programme within two years, and delays are relatively low and often due to personal choices and/or circumstances. The panel is pleased with these results.

The panel compliments the programme on its structured curriculum design that truly results in a sound and well-organised preparation for the thesis trajectory. The curriculum design sets the students up to finish in time. They already write their proposals in year one, are guided in their data collection through their term abroad, and are kept on schedule by the complementary nature of the writing workshop and the thesis. In the thesis workshop, they are also encouraged to rewrite their thesis proposal into a proposal for a postgraduate research position or a journal article, which is a very good yet challenging way to prepare them for what lies ahead after graduation. They also like the curriculum design and work flow it creates. They indicated that at times the workload could be considered a lot, but that the study path is very clear and helps to address obstacles naturally. The courses offer clear steps that prepare them to get assignments finished in time.

Student-centred teaching and classroom interaction

The curriculum is both research-led and student-centred, the panel found. The students shape their own learning journeys in their choice for certain electives and by matching their assignments in the compulsory courses to their individual research interests. Although an internship is not a structural part of the curriculum, the programme is prepared to accommodate internships that may replace some of the elective requirements. If students seek to replace electives, changes to their programme always need approval from the Board of Examiners. The students were pleased with the balance between flexibility and mandatory elements in the curriculum: it offers them the freedom to pursue their own interests while also broadening their horizons and connecting existing knowledge to new insights and ideas from ongoing research and academic debate.

The teaching methods and practices employed (e.g. classroom discussions, peer review exercises, essay writing) aim to develop the students' own research, learning and transferable skills as independent researchers based on the idea of flexible learning paths. This is in line with the panel's expectations for a research master's programme. During the modules, the students practise their planning and communication skills, allowing for an increasing focus on informed interaction with their fellow students rather than a more teacher-focused approach. This is considered positive by the panel. It is not always easy to realise, however, due to the low student numbers, especially within the field of cultural analysis. The students indicated that having larger class sizes is high on their wish list. They indicated that they are open to all kind of initiatives to increase the options for further discussion.

Cooperation with other institutes could be explored further, in the panel's view, both in an international, digital discussion setting, but also through an exchange of papers and assignments, allowing experience with peer-to-peer feedback with students from different backgrounds. The Master Languages initiative of the collaborating Dutch universities may offer options for interaction amongst students that have not yet been fully explored. The panel verified with the students that they experience classroom interaction as student-led, research-oriented, informative and challenging. The classroom is truly international, offering a stimulating teaching-learning environment. The students also enjoy the interaction with students from the one-year master's programmes in their electives, allowing for more lively discussions with multiple voices and viewpoints. Simultaneously, they truly value the personal attention and close interaction with staff in the courses reserved for research master students, and also the chance offered to discuss course work for electives on a one-to-one basis with staff.

During the pandemic, the research staff was asked to work from home. Research master students still followed most of their contact hours in class due to the low numbers. In some specific cases, hybrid and digital teaching was introduced to meet personal circumstances and/or demands. Interaction in a digital setting was at first challenging, but the students told the panel that both staff and students managed to overcome their initial reservations and now engage almost as easily in a digital setting as within the classroom. They indicated that the research staff was still easily accessible by digital means and that they were extensively supported to deal with the changed circumstances due to Covid-19. Most fieldwork and study abroad could not go ahead under the pandemic circumstances. The students indicated that the staff went the extra mile to search with them for suitable alternatives. They experienced it as a hectic period, but also appreciated the energy, positive support and creative solutions found together with staff members.

Staff, research environment and facilities

Teaching at the programme is delivered by two full professors and seven university lecturers. All teaching staff hold a Basic Teaching Qualification (*Basiskwalificatie Onderwijs/BKO*), and recently appointed staff are in the process of obtaining it. One staff member holds a Senior Teaching Qualification (*Seniorkwalificatie Onderwijs/SKO*). They are established researchers who have worked tremendously hard over the last years to establish a research master's programme that is fresh, unique and well-structured. Those participating in the programme are based at either the Leiden University Institute for History (LUIH) or the Leiden University Centre for Arts in the Society (LUCAS). These research institutes were assessed according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol in 2018 for the period 2012-2017. LUIH was rated 'world leading/excellent' (1) in terms of research quality and LUCAS was assessed 'very good' (2). These high scores reflect the excellent research environment offered to research master students.

The panel is highly appreciative of the staff members. It noted their enthusiasm and dedication to their students and their reflective attitude towards the programme, continuously striving for further improvement based on shared ideas that result from lively and passionate internal discussion. This desire for continuous development was also evidenced by staff initiatives to expand their teaching skills and practices. The students praised the staff members for their support, encouragement and attentiveness; they mentioned that once professors take note of their interests, they tailor courses to those interests. They feel seen and appreciated by staff members and taken seriously as individuals with needs and dreams and as junior researchers in their own right. The panel heard that the staff also offer valuable guidance and help regarding study and career planning. It considers the staff sufficiently well-equipped in terms of qualifications, research experience and attentive attitude to student needs and concerns to match the high requirements for teaching in a research-led master's programme.

The staff's expertise is a good match with the curriculum contents. The panel was pleased to note that Latin American Studies has strengthened its Portuguese/Brazilian Studies profile. This has entailed the concurrent appointment of new staff, consolidating the profile and curriculum as an area studies programme. The panel also approves of the practice of offering visiting chairs to professors from Chile and Brazil, introduced since the last assessment. These visiting professors participate in teaching activities in the form of thematic electives or masterclasses. This enriches the international classroom experience. These appointments that improve the teaching-learning environment are unfortunately not achieved in all areas of expertise feeding into the curriculum. The chair in Languages and Literature has been vacant since 2016. This lack of a full professorship also impacts the visibility of this research area in the curriculum. It erodes the existing quality of the teaching-learning environment, which may become more evident in the near future. The panel is aware that the Faculty is not responsible for the hiring strategy of the research institutes. In turn, the research institutes may have different needs or concerns and are financially under pressure due to the crisis in the humanities caused by funding shortages. The panel must emphasise, however, the need to continuously address this issue at the University level in relation to the quality of the teaching-learning environment for students and the welfare of staff.

The panel noted an exceptionally high work pressure on staff teaching in the research programme Latin American Studies. This pressure is not necessarily due to teaching demands in the programme itself, but is rather connected

to the fact that all staff members are also involved in teaching in other programmes at both bachelor's and master's levels. As most programmes within this disciplinary field are relatively small, the ensuing administrative pressure is spread out over a very small team of staff members, especially those at the midcareer level. They combine many positions on the various boards and committees (Programme Board, Teaching Committee, Board of Examiners, Admissions Board, etc.) and are currently not sufficiently compensated for their time investment. This places staff, but also the programme, in a vulnerable position as exemplified by the difficulties experienced regarding the position of study coordinator. It fell vacant in rapid succession, a problem which has now fortunately been addressed to the relief and full satisfaction of all involved. This vacancy also impacted the students' experience, the panel heard. Information was not readily available in those days, resulting in confusion that had to be taken up by individual staff members, which again resulted in inconsistencies. The panel strongly urges the Faculty to continuously monitor the workload at the programme and see what could be done to relieve the staff accordingly. It suggests considering rotating the positions on boards and committees more frequently.

The panel noted that the students not only benefit from the high-quality research skills of their teachers, but are also offered plenty of opportunity to engage in the staff's ongoing research. They are welcome to engage in colloquia and attend talks and public lectures by visiting professors. They are stimulated to take an active role within this lively research environment. The programme shifted from a monthly LAS research seminar series model (2014-2018), in which students, staff members and guest speakers presented their research, to a student-organised conference format. This led to the first yearly Student Conference in Latin American Studies (ScolAS) in 2018, co-organised by the students and LAS staff. During the pandemic, a digital version was created. The students also benefit from the good research facilities at Leiden University. Latin American Studies has a subject librarian working with a dedicated library collection at the University Library, which includes many sources in the target languages.

Lastly, the panel wants to acknowledge the initiatives taken to improve career preparation in the last years, which include alumni visits and the creation of online video testimonials. These initiatives have been mainly directed towards preparation for non-academic careers, in line with earlier recommendations. Further improvements would be welcome, according to the students and alumni. They mentioned that applying for careers, academic and non-academic, requires confidence. Confidence building by pointing out all the skills learnt at various points throughout the programme would therefore already be helpful.

Considerations

The panel ascertained that the existing selection and admittance criteria select suitable and highly motivated candidates with a strong academic record for enrolment in the research master's programme Latin American Studies. The choices for Spanish, Portuguese and English as the languages of instruction, and for an English programme name, are deemed appropriate by the panel. These choices are of added value for the students' future careers. The panel ascertained that the level of proficiency of staff members in Spanish and Portuguese is excellent. The English proficiency of staff members is sufficient and is monitored by the programme management ensuring continuous professional development where needed. This remains, however, an opportunity for further professional development in individual cases.

Enrolment numbers have been low over the last years, but the panel was pleased to note the attention being paid to this matter. Increased ties with partner institutions, exchange of best practices within the Faculty, and a slight diversification of the programme to include linguistics may create new opportunities. Continuous Faculty and University support is also needed, in particular aiming for the enrolment of talented non-EU students from less financially solvent backgrounds. Staff and students share the wish to increase cohort numbers and are open to initiatives to create further classroom interaction. The panel's suggestions include digital collaboration with international programmes and exchange, possibly also within the context of the interuniversity Master Language programme.

Notwithstanding these observations, the panel verified that the dynamics within the programme offer a very rich and challenging teaching-learning environment that is truly international, research-led and student-centred, tailored towards individual needs in the framework provided by the thematic approach. Also, it verified that the programme acted responsively and adequately to the challenges posed by Covid-19, ensuring progress for students without compromising the quality of the programme or the obtainment of the intended learning objectives. The curriculum design helps the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes, within the constraints of a two-year programme, resulting in high student success. The field work is considered a defining feature, as is the strongly integrated training of methods and theory, in line with the requirements of a research master's programme. Attention to the ethical aspects of research is included, though they could be better substantiated. The curriculum manages very well to achieve the programme aim to offer solid training, allowing the students to become independent researchers who have mastered the full research cycle by the time they graduate. The panel offered some minor suggestions for further improvement of the existing contents of the programme, particularly regarding the integration of the interdisciplinary approach. As the programme is currently discussing the way forward with respect to its profile, and the potential involvement of linguists, it is confident that its suggestions will be taken into consideration while fine-tuning the curriculum.

The students are highly appreciative of their teachers. These positive student observations regarding the staff are fully shared by the panel. Staff members are passionate, engaged, reflective, and always striving for further professional development and programme improvement. They are also highly experienced researchers, established at leading scholarly institutes that constitute an excellent research environment for the programme. The programme and its staff members find themselves in a vulnerable position due to high work pressure, the panel established. This is partly the result of the staff's involvement in many teaching programmes simultaneously, of vacancies at the chair level and ultimately also of low intake numbers. The panel believes that the high quality of the programme, directly related to its teaching-learning environment, truly deserves a chance to thrive and urges the Faculty, University and research institutes involved to continue to support it to the best of their abilities.

Conclusion

Research master's programme Latin American Studies: the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 3: Student assessment

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

Findings

Assessment policy and system of assessment

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

At the course level, the teachers are assigned a central role in assuring the quality of assessment; as content experts, they know the requirements of the relevant fields. The panel found that the programme has a well-arranged assessment policy, which is a balanced combination of both formative and summative testing. The design of assessments is peer-reviewed and regularly evaluated. As part of the programme's quality assurance process, the

course instructors hand in the examination papers, information on learning objectives for the courses that are part of the educational curriculum, and the expected final attainment levels to the Board of Examiners (BoE) for Latin American Studies, which reviews the assessment criteria for the different examination components (such as oral presentations, papers, etc.) provided by staff members if such documents are applicable to the chosen assessment method.

The assessment methods used are considered fitting for the assessment of research master students. The panel concluded that the assessment reflects the research master's focus on theoretical approaches and research methods, the reflection on them, the ability to develop high-quality independent research and the capacity to process this into written and oral presentations. Key issues assessed are theoretical issues, research methods and reflection on research methods, research skills and the relation to current debates in the field of Latin American Studies. Forms of assessment include oral presentations, papers, written assignments, research plans and fieldwork reports, and are mostly individual assignments. Some group work is also part of the testing methods, as is peer review. The students are satisfied with the feedback on their work, which they receive both in writing and orally. During the Covid-19 pandemic, assessment and feedback practices at the programme did not fundamentally change. Assignments gradually increase in length and complexity based on the principles of structural alignment. Knowledge acquisition and application are continuously assessed, as are academic and communication skills. In this way, the students develop their knowledge and skills to the advanced research master's level required in a structured assessment system. Research skills and ethics are tested in an appropriate manner, and the students go through the full research cycle in their thesis project.

Research master students of Latin American Studies share the acquisition of academic knowledge and skills with students from the one-year master's programme. In these shared courses, the assessment forms for the programmes partly overlap, but extra requirements apply to the students from the research master's programme. They are expected to connect their assignments more closely to theory and to current debates. They appreciate these extra assignments and opportunities to reflect on their skills and value the additional attention. They realise that these extra assignments improve their skills as future independent researchers. The panel considers these additional requirements valid and successfully applied, yet is aware that some other programmes under the Faculty of Humanities' remit do not set additional requirements for modules shared between one-year and research master programmes. This variety of approaches within the Faculty, and perhaps within the University, may create confusion and a level of ambiguity in the expectations raised regarding attainment levels for students. Hence, communication to research master students regarding expectations, assessment criteria and course objectives is key. Without wanting to blaze a trail for either approach, the panel challenges all of the programmes associated with the Faculty of Humanities – including the research master's programme Latin America Studies – to discuss their approach and learn from each other's practices.

Thesis assessment

The panel looked at a selection of theses and the accompanying assessment forms. The theses are assessed by two assessors, who independently fill in an assessment form and assign a grade. Afterwards, they calibrate their findings and agree on a final grade, which is substantiated on a third form. The third form with the justification of the grade is handed over to the students. The panel approves this procedure and states that this safeguards the independence of the assessment, while also guaranteeing transparency. It suggests tailoring the assessment forms more directly to the extra criteria for a research master's programme and creating a better fit with the programme's ILOs. For example, they could include a qualitative reflection on the publishability of the thesis (parts of it), including feedback and/or advice on the format and prospective platforms/media/journals. This would make the ILO dedicated to publishability of the thesis explicit while also helping the students on their way towards the publication of their research. Additionally, the panel advises paying more attention to the way in which the reflection on methods is integrated and systematically addressing the interdisciplinary focus in the thesis assessments.

Different practices seem to exist with respect to the presentation of feedback on the third form. A small minority of older forms seemed to reflect mainly one point of view, other forms presented a merged version of the two independent assessments, and exemplary forms reflected the calibration process, containing the interaction between the two assessors. According to the panel, this last method represents a best practice, as it gives a transparent insight into the grading process. The BoE explained that over the period of assessment, attention had been paid to the way in which the form is used as a tool for communication to the students. It now consistently checks whether the reasoning and substantiation of the grade are sufficiently insightful and transparent for the students and whether the voices of both assessors are represented. It is left to the individual pairs of assessors to choose the method of communication, either a merged version or an independent representation of the calibration process. The panel considers this practice fitting and encourages the team to continue learning from each other's practices.

The assessment of the theses was valid. The panel by and large agreed with the grades awarded. In some cases, the grades were on the high side in its view. An explanation for this higher mark could usually be found in the substantiation on the assessment form: these were theses of students who had made great progress during the writing process and were rewarded accordingly. The panel would welcome a more detailed marking scheme that clearly describes the criteria across the marking scale underlying the current grading, which would elucidate this practice and present a more transparent framework for rewarding personal growth during the thesis process. It was pleased to note that the programme kept the students to the word limit for the thesis. It was also pleased to find that staff members at the programme feel comfortable awarding the highest possible grade for an exceptional achievement. This exceptional grade was also carefully calibrated and checked by a third assessor, and it was also fully justified in the panel's view.

Board of Examiners

Assessment in the programme takes place under the supervision of the BoE for the bachelor, master and research master's programmes Latin American Studies. The BoE consists of three members: a chair, a second staff member and an external member specialised in educational assessment plus a secretary. As of September 2020, all Board members receive compensation for their work. The panel heard that the members of the BoE were pleased with these allowances that helped them to fulfil their time-consuming but important legal tasks. Regarding the quality assurance of the assessment, the BoE has been working with a Test Committee for a number of years, which is formed by a staff member of Cultural Analysis and a staff member from Linguistics as chair.

The panel is positive about the work of the BoE, which has a strong positive effect on the quality of assessment within the programme. Since the last (re)assessments, the quality culture at the programme has continued to develop into a mature system of assessment that is in control. To the panel, the BoE seems a rather small entity, but it concluded that the members were up to their important task and also managed to maintain the quality of assessment during the circumstances caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. Based on discussions with the members of the BoE, it acknowledges the valuable contribution of the secretary in managing the BoE's workload. It thus encourages the Faculty to continue monitoring the workload, and in particular to pay attention to the continuous need for sufficient secretarial support.

The BoE adequately handles its legally mandated tasks. Its practices and rules related to academic misconduct are in line with common standards at the Faculty. Its quality assurance process includes checking that the learning outcomes of the programme are adequately covered by the learning objectives of the individual courses that together constitute the educational curriculum (relation between final objectives and learning objectives); checking that the learning paths are aligned and work towards the learning outcomes in a logical way (relation between learning paths and final objectives); checking that the learning objectives of the courses that together constitute the educational curriculum are adequately tested by the chosen assessment methods. Additionally, the BoE approves fieldwork, internships and individual study projects, assigns thesis supervisors and second (and third) examiners, and checks the Test Committee assessment dossiers, graded theses and regular papers.

Considerations

The panel ascertained that the assessment methods used at the research master's programme Latin American Studies are sufficiently varied; they reflect the level of the programme and adequately test the students' research abilities and awareness of the ethics of research. The students are satisfied with the quality of the assessment and feedback received. The assessment of the theses is of good quality. The panel by and large agreed with the grades awarded. Over the period of assessment, it noted a greater awareness of the need to use assessment as a form of communication, in particular in the thesis grading practices. This was appreciated by the panel, which wants to acknowledge the hard work and good results of the programme in this respect. It demonstrates the awareness of the need for transparency and reflects the commitment of the programme and its staff to continuous improvement. To strengthen the current thesis assessment practices, the panel has some minor suggestions to make. It advises including a criterion for publishability in the current thesis assessment form, reflecting in more detail on the methods used, and systematically addressing the interdisciplinary focus in the thesis assessments. The transparency could also be strengthened by the creation of a more detailed marking scheme.

Assessment at the research master's programme benefits from its embedment within the Faculty of Humanities, which has developed robust assessment policies and procedures to organise a transparent and reliable system of assessment. At the programme level, the Board of Examiners together with the Test Committee ensures a solid quality assurance process that guarantees the independence and transparency of assessment and also managed to maintain the quality of assessment during the circumstances caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. The panel encourages the Faculty to continue monitoring the workload of the Board of Examiners, and to pay attention to the continuous need for sufficient secretarial support. Based on its findings, it gained a positive impression of the system of assessment and the ways it is implemented at the programme level and followed through by staff members. Hence, it concludes that the programme has an adequate system of student assessment in place.

Conclusion

Research master's programme Latin American 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

Fourteen theses by graduates who had completed their studies since the reassessment of the programme in 2017 were available, all of which the panel studied. Seven theses were written in Spanish, two in Portuguese and five in English. The quality of the Spanish and Portuguese in the studied theses was excellent, underlining the graduates' mastery of these languages at an advanced academic level. The panel noted that the quality of the academic English, although still sufficient, was of a lower level and that not all staff members were fully capable of addressing omissions in English theses in their evaluations. Based on this finding, the panel considered the choice for English as the language of communication a missed opportunity in some ways at the thesis level. In its view, a thesis written in Spanish or Portuguese gives graduates of the programme an advantage over those who opt for English or those who completed other (research) master programmes for their academic and professional careers.

The majority of the theses offer original approaches to current socio-political and cultural issues in Latin America, and the creative application of theory stands out. They lead to innovative contributions to on-going debates. In particular, the theses add to the field of cultural analysis: many make the case that the link between different fields of culture (media, music, film & theatre, literature, performing arts) and society is highly revealing. They thus deepen and nuance the understanding of the impact that culture has on different socio-political issues in Latin America. In doing so, the research makes original and relevant contributions to current debates as well as important additions to the scientific literature. In the panel's view, this exemplifies the high academic quality achieved in the programme.

Drawing on the main findings, the research presented in the theses could be reworked and published either in an academic journal or, due to its relevance for today's society, in a non-academic outlet. The panel verified that in some cases, the presented work indeed resulted in academic publications and PhD proposals that were successful in securing a PhD position.

According to the panel, the topical choices made by the students reflect the research interests available at Leiden University. The interdisciplinary theses give very good, and in some cases outstanding, results. Still, more varied interdisciplinary approaches by means of close collaboration between the different fields of expertise available, including linguistics, could lead to even more ground-breaking results. Also, the interdisciplinary quality of the research could be more foregrounded in the theses, instead of being implicitly present. Weaker theses would have benefitted from a more structured research design or more sharply formulated research question, yet still embodied all elements of the research cycle, from the formulation of a research question to the output of a written report. All theses demonstrated that the ILOs were met. The panel also judged the 30 EC size of the RMA thesis project to be in line with the structure of the curriculum and with the added criteria for a research master's programme.

In recent years, three alumni obtained a PhD position, in Leiden, Nijmegen and at the Fundação Universidade Federal do Tocantins. Some graduates work as tutors in the bachelor's programme International Studies or secured competitive traineeships at governmental bodies. Others moved on to a variety of professional careers, for example as political affairs officer at the Embassy of Mexico in the Netherlands, as editor or language engineer. The panel is pleased with the level and the diversity of career paths taken by the programme's graduates. It considers this variety a good reflection of the skills taught at the programme, which are clearly of added value in a range of different environments. Recent graduates confirmed this positive impression of the programme's results. The alumni considered their proven analytical, intercultural and linguistic abilities to be key selling points that secured a good connection with the labour market. They were highly appreciative of the degree programme and the opportunities it created, and praised the efforts and support of staff members in their search for a suitable career path.

Considerations

Based on the overall level of the theses and the performance of graduates after completion of the programme, the panel concludes that the graduates have achieved the programme's ILOs. It appreciates the quality of the theses examined, which contain original approaches to current socio-political issues in Latin America. The creative application of theory stood out, as did the advanced academic level of Spanish and Portuguese proficiency in the work of graduates opting for those languages. The quality of written English deserves further attention, both at the student and staff level, but suffices. The interdisciplinary quality of the research could be made more explicit in the theses' outlook and design and could be diversified by entering into further collaboration between the different fields of expertise available, including linguistics. Due to the relevance, quality and originality of the research, the theses contribute to the existing field of knowledge and could thus be successfully reworked to fit publication standards or serve as a basis for future research projects. The panel verified that the students complete the entire research cycle at a master's level in their thesis trajectory, and that their research ties in well with the available research expertise. In this way, the theses demonstrate that the students are fully embedded within a good-quality research context. The fact that many graduates are successful in their future careers and obtain PhD positions, competitive traineeship positions and relevant professional careers adds to this positive assessment.

Conclusion

Research master's programme Latin American Studies: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'meets the standard'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The panel assessed standards 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the research master's programme Latin American Studies as 'meets the standard'. It hereby took the additional aspects for research master's programmes as included in the

Specification of Additional Criteria for Research Master's Programmes into account. Based on the NVAO decision rules regarding limited programme assessments, it therefore assesses the programme as 'positive'.

Conclusion

The panel assesses the *research master's programme Latin American Studies* as 'positive'.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

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

1. Knowledge and understanding

Graduates demonstrate in their written and oral work:

- a) A thorough knowledge and understanding of central research questions and debates in the field of Latin American Studies, with a special focus on knowledge of current debates on Latin American Modernities;
- b) A thorough knowledge and understanding of the interdisciplinary aspects of Latin American studies;
- c) For those who choose to focus especially within the scope of the social studies: knowledge of its basic concepts, research methods and techniques and the developments in the specialisation; or:
For those who choose to focus especially within the scope of Latin American cultural studies: knowledge of basic concepts, research methods and of text and discourse analysis.

2. Applying knowledge and understanding

Graduates demonstrate, in their written and oral work, the ability to:

- a) translate the acquired knowledge on key issues and the academic debates around them into relevant research questions, which in terms of content and scope can be studied in an independent research;
- b) have a thorough knowledge of up-to-date research methods used in the followed path and are able to operationalize this knowledge in an independent way into a concrete and feasible research design;
- c) contribute to the on-going debates on Latin American modernities through a case-study based on independent research and theoretical reflection;
- d) be sensitive towards the relationship between theory, method and place: understand the specificity of Latin American social and cultural dimensions of both the researched practice and the theoretical approaches to it;
- e) critically select, study and analyse literature relevant to the issues and problems presented by the curriculum and the research programmes in question;
- f) carry out independent research in an/or on Latin America and they possess the intercultural skills to work there with relevant individuals and institutions.

3. Making judgements

Graduates demonstrate, in their written and oral work, the capacity to:

- a) critically evaluate their sources;
- b) build an argument that leads to its conclusion in a clear, cogent, and verifiable manner;
- c) make careful considerations about the academic merits and utility of academic arguments and of material that is at the basis of their research and subsequent final report;
- d) form a good judgment about the social, cultural and ethical aspects which should be taken into account when conducting and reporting about their research.

4. Communication

Graduates demonstrate the ability to:

- a) formulate a clear and well-founded hypothesis and research questions, and to divide these into convenient and manageable parts;
- b) produce a clear, systematic and well-founded oral or written report of the state of the art in their research field, the selected object of inquiry and the concepts and theories used;
- c) present their work for an audience of specialists in the field and non-specialists;
- d) write texts at a high scholarly standard in Spanish, Portuguese or English;
- e) to rework the results of the thesis in to an article for an academic journal and/or non-academic publications.

5. Learning Skills

Graduates demonstrate, in their written and oral work, the ability to:

- apply learning skills that allow them to initiate and conduct a research project with a great degree of independence and autonomy, under expert national or international supervision.

This means that graduates:

- have articulated the research question or thesis independently;
- have conducted relevant bibliographical research;
- have drawn up a feasible research plan;
- possess the learning skills that enable them to pursue a follow-up study which demands a great amount of self-organisation and self-sufficiency, such as writing a PhD thesis.

APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Programme 2019-2020

Year 1	EC	Level
Core courses		
Resistance, Revival and Change; Mechanisms and Expressions	10	600
Theoretical Approaches to Modernities in Latin America	10	600
Thematic accent I: choose one of the following	10	500
(State-society relations) State, public policies and civil society in Latin America		
(Culture and identity) Interculturality 1: Key Concepts		
(Culture and identity) Brazil in the Portuguese Speaking World: Political and Cultural Dynamics		
(Literature, arts, and media) El lugar de lo político en la literatura y el cine		
Methods I: Research Seminar Latin American Modernities	10	500
Research School Course	10	600
Thematic accent II: choose one of the following	10	500
(State-society relations) Chile Visiting Chair 2020		
(State-society relations) Contemporary Brazil		
(Culture and identity) Neoliberalism and Illegality: Flows, Commodities, Locations		
(Culture and identity) State-Social Movements relations in the Andean Region		
(Literature, arts, and media) Desplazamiento, memoria e identidad en la narrativa y el cine latino-americanos		
(Literature, arts, and media) Thematic Course Latin American Cultural Analysis		

Year 2	EC	Level
Core courses		
Thematic accent III	10	500
Methods II: Research in Latin America	20	600
Methods III: Writing Workshop	5	600
ResMA Thesis	25	600

APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE ONLINE VISIT

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

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

Day 1: Wednesday, February 3

Area Studies & Classics and Ancient Civilizations, Faculty of Humanities

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

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

Day 2: Thursday, February 4

Latin American Studies & African Studies, Faculty of Humanities

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the online site visit, the panel studied fourteen theses and assessment forms of the research master's programme Latin American produced since the programme's reassessment in 2017, including theses finished in the second half of 2020. No selection took place. There are no specialisations to take into account. 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.

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

Frameworks and documents pertaining earlier assessments

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

Faculty Documents Faculty of Humanities (FGW)

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

Programme Documents Latin American Studies

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

Study materials Latin American Studies (including examples of assessment) and evaluations for the following courses:

- Methods III: Writing Workshop (2018-2019 and 2019-2020)
- Theoretical Approaches to Modernities in Latin America (2018-2019 and 2019-2020)
- Resistance, Revival and Change; Mechanisms and Expressions (2019-2020)