



B Greek and Latin Language and Culture
University of Groningen

© 2025 Academion

www.academion.nl
info@academion.nl

Project code P2413

Contents

Summary	4
Score table	5
Introduction.....	6
Procedure.....	6
Panel	7
Information on the programme	8
Description of the assessment.....	9
Organization	9
Recommendations previous panel	9
Standard 1. Intended learning outcomes	10
Standard 2. Teaching-learning environment.....	12
Standard 3. Student assessment	18
Standard 4. Achieved learning outcomes	21
General conclusion	22
Recommendations	22
Appendix 1. Intended learning outcomes	23
Appendix 2. Programme curriculum.....	25
Appendix 3. Programme of the site visit.....	27
Appendix 4. Materials	29

Summary

Standard 1. Intended learning outcomes

The profile of the programme is clear and appealing, and the integrated approach to Antiquity (“Classics”) commendable. The panel notes positively that the programme works actively to incorporate new developments in the field into the curriculum. The intended learning outcomes are in line with the profile and these developments, well-formulated, realistic and of the right level. For further improvement, the panel recommends that the programme include digital humanities and the ethical and responsible use of GenAI in the current intended learning outcome 5.4. It also recommends that the Faculty and Cluster Boards further facilitate the elaboration of such a new learning outcome into the programme, including alignment of this with policy and guidelines for the use of GenAI at university and faculty level.

The programme prepares students for entering a master’s programme in Classics and Ancient Civilizations or an educational master’s programme in Latin and Greek Language and Culture, as well as for a range of other master’s programmes degrees in literary or cultural studies or for a position on the labour market where undergraduate-level academic knowledge and skills are required. The panel judges that the intended learning outcomes are well aligned with these follow-up opportunities and that the broad intercultural and interdisciplinary profile of the bachelor’s programme is well suited to this. The panel recommends maintaining and guaranteeing the presence of sufficient language training in the programme in the future, which is essential to train well-qualified teachers of Greek and Latin and in order to meet the labour market’s need for these teachers.

Standard 2. Teaching-learning environment

Admission requirements for the programme are appropriate. The curriculum is logically structured, with a good balance between language courses and history and culture courses, a well-considered mix of working methods and a gradual build-up of basic knowledge and skills towards broadening, deepening and independent work. Courses are interesting, relevant to the intended learning outcomes and well-developed. The panel especially appreciates the commitment of the programme to research-driven education. This is most clearly evident in the research seminars, which are interesting in terms of content and tie in with the excellent research being conducted by staff members. Sufficient action has been taken in response to the recommendation of the previous panel to better structure the thesis process and improve student support. The thesis process is now well-organised, with a good balance between supervision, guidance and personal responsibility. In recent years, the programme has implemented many changes to improve the curriculum. The panel studied these changes and concludes that most of them are well-founded and (will) further improve the programme. In 2026-2027, further curriculum changes will be made. The panel recommends ensuring that sufficient language skills remain part of the programme.

The panel is impressed by the proximity and student-oriented nature of the guidance system. Students feel heard and are enthusiastic about the study advisor, who is approachable and offers good guidance. Combined with the mentoring system in the first year and with small-scale teaching, this ensures high quality guidance and support. The study progress figures of the programme are a point of concern. The panel found that these figures can be partly explained by the high number of students with special circumstances. The panel also found that the programme acknowledges the issue of study pressure and has recently introduced various measures to reduce it. Students are positive about these changes and feel taken seriously. During the site visit, students expressed satisfaction with the study association, the facilities and the provision of information.

The quality of the teaching team is excellent, both in the required fields in the programme as well as in didactics. The panel recommends retaining the programme's capacity as set out in the staff list submitted before the site visit. The panel supports plans to develop more interdisciplinary shared courses, also as a way of reducing the workload of lecturers. The panel recommends that workload in smaller courses continue to be closely monitored, with measures being taken if necessary.

Standard 3. Student assessment

The assessment system of the programme is well-designed. Assessment methods are varied and the assessment programme demonstrates a clear progression towards greater independence of the student. The panel studied a selection of assessments and concludes that these have been developed in a proper way. Students are generally satisfied with the communication about assessments. The programme responded appropriately to the recommendation of the previous assessment panel to include more writing assignments in the assessment programme in preparation for writing the thesis. The panel suggests clarifying in the assessment plan where oral communication skills are assessed, and to consider expanding the number of oral assessments.

The thesis manual contains clear information and the thesis assessment form is well-constructed. Thesis assessment procedures are followed and thesis assessments are carried out carefully. The Board of Examiners is adequately equipped to carry out its duties and functions satisfactorily. The programme is actively considering ways to deal with GenAI, experimenting with GenAI and adjusting policy based on new insights and experiences. Students are actively made aware of the risks and misuses of GenAI. A clear and well-coordinated line on the use of GenAI at programme-level still needs to be developed.

Standard 4. Achieved learning outcomes

The panel concludes that students achieve the intended learning outcomes of the programme. Most graduates continue their academic career with a master's degree. Graduates generally enter well into a relevant master's programme and a career as a language teacher of Greek or Latin in secondary education.

Score table

The panel assesses the programme as follows:

Bachelor's programme Greek and Latin Language and Culture	
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 assessment panel has reviewed the report and agrees with its contents. On behalf of the panel,

Koen De Temmerman
Chair

Adrienne Wieldraaijer-Huijzer
Secretary

Date: 12 January 2026

Introduction

Procedure

Assessment

On 13 and 14 October 2025, the bachelor's programme Greek and Latin Language and Culture of the University of Groningen was assessed by an independent peer review panel as part of the cluster assessment Region Studies 2. The assessment cluster consists of 13 programmes, offered by the University of Groningen, Leiden University, the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, the University of Amsterdam and Radboud University Nijmegen. The assessment followed the procedure and standards of the NVAO Assessment Framework for the Higher Education Accreditation System of the Netherlands (April 2024).

Quality assurance agency Academion coordinated the assessment upon request of the cluster Region Studies 2. Fiona Schouten acted as coordinator in the cluster assessment and Adrienne Wieldraaijer-Huijzer as secretary for the assessment of the programmes of the University of Groningen. They have been certified and registered by the NVAO.

Panel composition

Academion composed the peer review panel in cooperation with the institutions and taking into account the expertise and independence of the members. In order to strengthen the mutual consistency between the assessment panels within the cluster, the coordinator from Academion ensured joint instruction for the panel members and a comparable assessment method for all site visits. This consistency was also a point of attention at all concluding panel meetings during the site visits. Finally, overlap in assessment panels of the various site visits in the cluster further strengthened the consistency.

On 7 August 2025, the NVAO approved the composition of the panel. The coordinator instructed the panel chair on his role in the site visit according to the Panel chair profile (NVAO 2016) on 27 May 2025.

Preparation

The University of Groningen composed a site visit schedule in consultation with the coordinator (see appendix 3). The programme selected representative partners for the various interviews. It also determined that a development dialogue would be made part of the site visit. A separate development report was made based on this dialogue.

The programme provided the coordinator with a list of graduates over the period 2020-2024. In consultation with the coordinator, the panel chair selected 15 theses per programme. They took the diversity of final grades and examiners into account, as well as the variants and the language of the theses (Dutch or English). The selection reflected the number of graduates in the two variants and the number of English- and Dutch-language theses. The selection for the bachelor's programme in Greek and Latin Language and Culture included thirteen theses from the full-time programme, two theses from the part-time programme, five English-language theses and ten Dutch-language theses.

Prior to the site visit, the programme provided the panel with the theses and the accompanying assessment forms. It also provided the panel with a self-evaluation report and additional materials (see appendix 4).

The panel members studied the information and sent their findings to the secretary. The secretary collected the panel's questions and remarks in a document and shared this with the panel members. In a preliminary

meeting, the panel discussed the initial findings on the self-evaluation report and the theses, as well as the division of tasks during the site visit. The panel was also informed on the assessment framework, the working method and the planning of the site visits and reports.

Site visit

During the site visit, the panel interviewed various programme representatives (see appendix 3). The panel also offered students and staff members an opportunity for confidential discussion during a consultation hour. No consultation was requested. The panel used the final part of the site visit to discuss its findings in an internal meeting. Afterwards, the panel chair publicly presented the preliminary findings, general observations of the panel and suggestions for improvements.

Report

The secretary wrote a draft report based on the panel's findings and submitted it to an Academion colleague for peer assessment. Subsequently, the secretary sent the report to the panel for feedback. After processing this feedback, the secretary sent the draft report to the programme in order to have it checked for factual errors. The secretary discussed the ensuing comments with the panel chair and changes were implemented accordingly. The panel then finalized the report, and the coordinator sent it to the Faculty of Arts of Groningen University.

Panel

The panel assessing the bachelor's programme Greek and Latin Language and Culture at Groningen University consisted of the following members:

- Prof. Dr. K. (Koen) De Temmerman is Professor of Classics at the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy at Ghent University (Belgium);
- Prof. Dr. L. (Lieve) Van Hoof is Professor of Ancient History and Classics at the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy at Ghent University (Belgium);
- Prof. Dr. A.P.M.H. (André) Lardinois is Professor of Greek Language and Literature at the Faculty of Arts at Radboud University;
- Dr. A. (Annemarie) Ambühl is associate professor of Classical Philology (especially Latin) at the Faculty of History and Cultural Studies at the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz (Germany);
- H.H. (Hugo) Oostdijk MA is a graduate of the research master Classics and Ancient Civilizations at the Amsterdam Centre for Ancient Studies and Archaeology (ACASA; University of Amsterdam/Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam).

Each panel member, the panel secretary and the university have filled out the Statement of Impartiality and non-disclosure agreement, as required by the NVAO. They can confirm that the assessment was carried out in complete independence.

Information on the programme

Name of the institution:	University of Groningen
Address:	Broerstraat 5 -7 9712 CP Groningen
Website:	https://www.rug.nl/
BRIN-number:	PC21
Status of the institution:	Publicly funded institution
Result institutional quality assurance assessment:	Positive
Programme name:	Greek and Latin Language and Culture
ISAT number:	56003
Orientation of the programme:	Academic
Level of the programme:	Bachelor (NLQF 6)
Number of credits:	180 EC
Language of instruction:	Dutch
Professional requirements:	No
Specializations or tracks:	-
Location:	Groningen
Mode(s) of study:	Fulltime, parttime
Assessment group:	Region Studies 2
Awarded degree:	BA
Submission date NVAO:	1 May 2026

Description of the assessment

Organization

The three-year bachelor's programme in Greek and Latin Language and Culture (GLTC) of the University of Groningen has an average annual intake of 15–20 students. It is part of the Faculty of Arts, which offers 16 bachelor's programmes and 20 master's programmes.

The Faculty of Arts is governed by a Faculty Board consisting of the dean (research portfolio holder), the vice-dean (education portfolio holder) and the resources portfolio holder. The Faculty Board is supported by a student adviser (student assessor), who is appointed annually. Within the faculty, education is organised into five clusters of related programmes. The Faculty Board sets frameworks and preconditions for matters such as policy, finances and staffing. These are then elaborated on and implemented by the Cluster Board. The Cluster Board is supported by a cluster coordinator, a cluster assistant and an education secretariat. The GLTC programme sits within a cluster alongside the BA programmes in American Studies, Archaeology, History and Middle Eastern Studies, and the MA programmes in American Studies, Archaeology, History, Middle Eastern Studies and Classics and Ancient Civilizations, plus the Research Master Archaeology and Research Master History.

The bachelor's programme GLTC and the master's programme Classics and Ancient Civilizations share a programme coordinator, who is responsible for the day-to-day running of the programmes. The Programme Committee (PC) is also shared between these programmes. It consists of four staff members from the programmes, and four student representatives, one from each year of the programmes. The PC meets at the end of each teaching block. In addition to general feedback mechanisms, the PC selects one course from each year for detailed analysis at the end of each block. The Board of Examiners is organised at faculty level (ECL: Examencommissie Letteren). It is supported by expert teams (ETs). Each of the five clusters has its own ET.

Recommendations previous panel

In 2019, the bachelor's programme GLTC received a positive final assessment without conditions. The 2019 panel identified several areas for improvement. The programme reflected on actions taken and the current situation in a self-evaluation report and during the site visit. Based on this, the 2025 panel judges that sufficient attention has been paid to them. Below, the 2025 panel explains its findings on the key recommendations of the previous panel.

In 2019, the panel recommended examining ways to increase the visibility of classical language programmes within the faculty. The current panel found that this advice has been addressed in various ways. The staff have developed a new university minor, 'Mirror of Myth', which attracts over eighty students a year from across the university. The programme also substantially contributes to two successful faculty minors: 'Rhetorics' and 'Oudheidstudies'. The extracurricular language courses for beginners and early-career researchers (Latin/Greek for Beginners/Research) have high attendance rates. During the visit, the visibility of the programme and the opportunities for collaboration within the faculty were frequently discussed. The panel concludes that the interdisciplinary 'Classics' approach of the bachelor's programme offers valuable new opportunities to collaborate with lecturers from other programmes within the faculty and that the programme is actively considering and implementing these where relevant.

In Standard 2, the 2019 panel flagged the relatively low number of first year students as a point of concern. The current panel commends the staff for their dedication and drive to increase enrolment numbers, e.g. by

forming an 'intake' working group with staff and students and by optimizing open days. Efforts have led to a small upward trend in programme enrolment numbers. Nevertheless, programme enrolment figures remain a point of concern. Therefore, this topic is addressed again in this report. The 2019 panel also recommended that efforts be made to retain the lecturers. The current panel is pleased to see that this advice has been followed, with many lecturers being kept for the programme. Due to the current financial situation of the faculty, it is unclear whether lost (or soon to be lost) expertise in ancient Greek language and culture and ancient history will be replaced. Therefore, the 2025 panel has formulated a new recommendation on this subject.

In Standard 3, an important area for improvement in 2019 concerned the thesis process. To facilitate timely graduation, the 2019 panel recommended better structuring this process, improving student support and ensuring that thesis assessors complete assessment forms carefully. The 2025 panel found that the thesis process has been thoroughly revised. It now includes concise and clearly communicated timelines, a 'scriptieklas', and a list of potential research areas to help students identify a suitable thesis topic. The programme also followed the previous panel's advice to include more essay-based assessments, to help students develop their academic writing skills. The 2025 panel notes with satisfaction that there are early indications that theses are being completed more timely. Thesis assessment forms in the sample of theses studied by the panel, were completed carefully and include clear and comprehensive feedback.

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 and intended learning outcomes

The bachelor's programme GLTC equips students with tools to study the ancient Greco-Roman world through its textual heritage. An important element of the programme is the acquisition and training of language skills which support the analysis of ancient texts and literatures. Another key feature is the programme's interdisciplinary approach to the ancient world: all students in the programme take courses in the languages and literature, ancient philosophy, ancient history, and archaeology. This interdisciplinary approach allows them to understand ancient texts in their cultural context. Since the previous accreditation, more space has been allocated in the programme for the reception of Antiquity and its heritage in today's world.

The panel studied the profile of the programme and considers it to be clear and appealing. The programme clearly distinguishes itself from comparable programmes with a broad cultural-historical and intercultural focus. The integrated approach to Antiquity that underpins the programme ("Classics") is commendable and instrumental in operationalising the intercultural and interdisciplinary approach that the programme strives for. The panel was pleased to find that the programme has not stood still in recent years and has actively worked to translate new developments in the academic field into the programme's curriculum, such as increased awareness of geographic and social inclusion, cognitive studies, reception history and the dialogue of Antiquity with modern society.

The panel studied the intended learning outcomes of the programme (see Appendix 1) and found that they are well-formulated and realistic. The intended learning outcomes align with what is to be expected in an academic bachelor's programme in this field of study. To further demonstrate this, the intended learning

outcomes have been matched with the categories of Dublin descriptors (knowledge, insight, judgment, communication, learning skills and language proficiency), which are related to the bachelor level of the Dutch Higher Education Qualifications Framework (NLQF 6). The panel also established that the intended learning outcomes contain all the elements that should be present based on the programme's profile described above. For example, intended learning outcome 1.1. clearly reflects the interdisciplinary approach of the programme, while intended learning outcome 3.2 addresses the role of the classics in contemporary society. The acquisition of analytical and academic research skills (e.g. in ILO 3.2) and language skills (e.g. ILO 1.3 and 2.1) are also explicitly and adequately addressed.

The panel identified one area for further improvement. This concerns the current absence in the set of intended learning outcomes of digital humanities and learning how to use GenAI responsibly. Although students and lecturers were able to mention moments where the responsible use of GenAI is addressed in the programme (see Standard 3, Dealing with GenAI), a clear and well-coordinated line at programme level still needs to be developed. The panel recommends that the programme include digital humanities and the ethical and responsible use of GenAI in the current intended learning outcome 5.4. It also recommends that the Faculty and Cluster Boards further facilitate the elaboration of such a new learning outcome into the programme, including alignment of this with policy and guidelines for the use of GenAI at university and faculty level.

Alignment of profile and intended learning outcomes with the academic and professional field

The bachelor's programme GLTC prepares students for entering a master's programme in Classics and Ancient Civilizations or an educational master's programme in Latin and Greek Language and Culture (2 years), as well as for a range of other master's programmes in literary or cultural studies. It is also possible for graduates to enter a master's programme in another relevant field or to enter a position on the labour market where undergraduate-level academic knowledge and skills are required. The panel judges that the intended learning outcomes are well aligned with these follow-up opportunities. The combination of solid knowledge and understanding of Greek and Latin language and literature with a focus on an intercultural approach to Antiquity and a critical reflection on cultural heritage in the context of contemporary social issues fits well with a possible career as a teacher in secondary education. The interdisciplinary breadth of the programme also sufficiently equips students to continue with a master's degree in literary or cultural studies, or a related field such as gender studies or journalism.

The university and faculty are facing budget cuts that require choices to be made in the education portfolio. The panel discussed this with the faculty management and found that there is a high level of awareness of the importance of the bachelor's programme GLTC. The programme lays an important foundation for the training of teachers of Greek and Latin in secondary education. It is the only programme of its kind in the north of the Netherlands, and there is a great need for these teachers. In addition, the programme has an important broader significance for other academic areas of study and research, such as heritage. The aim of the faculty is to keep the programme viable and to continue contributing to the societal need for teachers of Greek and Latin in the region and the Netherlands. The panel encourages university, faculty and cluster management to continue to bear in mind the importance of this programme when making decisions about the programme, profile and staffing.

The programme plans to further strengthen its interdisciplinary profile in the upcoming years, by increasingly seeking further collaboration with other areas of expertise within the faculty. The panel supports this plan. It fits well with the profile of the programme and is also a good way to increase course enrolment numbers and reduce workload of lecturers (see Standard 2). Having said this, the panel would also like to emphasise how important it is that the programme, which focuses on the acquisition of two

ancient languages, continues to include sufficient language skills training. Therefore, the panel recommends maintaining and guaranteeing the presence of sufficient language training in the programme, which is essential to train well-qualified teachers of Greek and Latin and to meet the labour market's need for these teachers.

Considerations

The profile of the programme is clear and appealing, and the integrated approach to Antiquity ("Classics") commendable. The panel notes positively that the programme works actively to incorporate new developments in the field into the curriculum. The intended learning outcomes are in line with the profile and these developments, well-formulated, realistic and of the right level. For further improvement, the panel recommends that the programme include digital humanities and the ethical and responsible use of GenAI in the current intended learning outcome 5.4. It also recommends that the Faculty and Cluster Boards further facilitate the elaboration of such a new learning outcome into the programme, including alignment of this with policy and guidelines for the use of GenAI at university and faculty level.

The programme prepares students for entering a master's programme in Classics and Ancient Civilizations or an educational master's programme in Latin and Greek Language and Culture, as well as for a range of other master's programmes degrees in literary or cultural studies or for a position on the labour market where undergraduate-level academic knowledge and skills are required. The panel judges that the intended learning outcomes are well aligned with these follow-up opportunities and that the broad intercultural and interdisciplinary profile of the bachelor's programme is well suited to this. The panel recommends maintaining and guaranteeing the presence of sufficient language training in the programme in the future, which is essential to train well-qualified teachers of Greek and Latin and in order to meet the labour market's need for these teachers.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the programme meets standard 1.

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

Admissions and intake

Students are admitted to the Dutch language bachelor's programme GLTC with an equivalent of a Dutch pre-university education (vwo) diploma. An additional requirement is that their secondary school curriculum and final examinations must have included at least one of the two ancient languages of the study programme. This additional requirement also applies to students with a higher professional education propaedeutic certificate. The panel concludes that the admission requirements are appropriate.

Students who have not taken their final examinations in Latin or Greek need to follow a Transition Module in the relevant language during the first semester of the first year. Starting in the 2018-19 academic year, this transition module is integrated into regular language skills teaching. Students who are required to take this module attend regular Language Skills courses alongside students who are no longer required to do so and receive additional teaching in a separate class, which allows for targeted instruction and provides opportunities to address questions. The panel agrees with this setup. The panel suggests that, in future, the

programme could consider dropping the additional requirement that the secondary school curriculum and examinations of students must have included at least one of the two ancient languages of the study programme. This could potentially attract more students to the programme, while those who already have prior knowledge of one or both of the ancient languages in the programme could be offered additional assignments and challenges. However, in this scenario the language component of the curriculum should probably be expanded to ensure that the students continue to acquire sufficient proficiency in both languages.

In 2019, the panel flagged the relatively low number of first year students in the programme as a point of concern. Since then, the staff have worked hard to increase enrolment numbers, e.g. by forming an 'intake' working group with staff and students, by improving experience days for prospective students, by organizing recruitment events at secondary schools and by developing an 'Oudheidag' at the university. The current panel concludes that these efforts have led to a small upward trend in programme enrolment numbers.

The panel commends the staff for their efforts and drive to attract more students. Nevertheless, programme enrolment figures remain a point of concern, also because funding streams are based on these figures. With the current intake figures, the faculty's standard of at least 20 new students per year is still not fully met. The panel discussed this issue with management and staff. The panel noted with satisfaction that not only programme enrolment but also the importance of the GLTC programme for the northern region of the Netherlands and for training secondary school teachers of Greek and Latin are important factors that are taken into account in discussions about the future of the programme (see Standard 1). The relevance of the programme becomes clear when looking at course enrolment numbers rather than intake into the programme. Many of the programme's courses also attract students from other programmes, resulting in higher course enrolment numbers. The panel supports efforts to seek more interdisciplinary collaborations in courses as a way to further increase course enrolment numbers.

Curriculum structure and content

The bachelor's programme GLTC (180 EC) offers a full-time and a part-time variant. The part-time variant does not involve separate courses or programming. Part-time students follow the same courses as full time students, but at a slower pace based on an individual study plan (see 'Guidance, support and studying with a disability').

The programme's curriculum (see Appendix 2) is structured into three phases. The first phase, comprising the first and second semesters, focuses on establishing a foundation in ancient languages and cultural-historical disciplines. Students take courses in language acquisition in Latin and Greek, consolidating, expanding and applying their grammar knowledge to a limited number of original texts. These courses also introduce students to some basic concepts of Greek and Latin linguistics. Foundational knowledge of historical, material and philosophical approaches to the ancient world is acquired through the courses 'Introduction to the Ancient Greek World' and 'Introduction to the Roman World'. Students then build on this knowledge in courses on Greek and Latin drama and other reading courses, the 'Highlights of Classical Literature' course and the 'Academische Vaardigheden voor Classici' module.

The second phase, covering the third and part of the fourth semester, focuses on the broadening and deepening of students' knowledge of ancient texts and culture, structured reflection on the relationship between classical Antiquity and the modern world, as well as the further development of analytical and communication skills. During this period, the Greek and Latin modules focus on epic poetry, while the Poetry Analysis module focuses on shorter poetic genres. Students also study Greek and Roman historiography, as well as ancient documentary texts such as inscriptions and papyri.

The final phase includes independent research and enquiry in the fourth and sixth semesters, as well as a minor in the fifth semester. Students follow research seminars (onderzoekscolleges) in ancient philosophy, ancient history and archaeology in the fourth semester, and in Greek and Latin literature in the sixth semester. The topics of these seminars align with the teachers' research interests.

The panel considers the curriculum to be logically structured, with a good balance between language courses and history and culture courses, a well-considered mix of working methods and a gradual build-up of basic knowledge and skills towards broadening, deepening and independent work. The programme strikes a good balance between broad basic knowledge of ancient languages, literature, culture, history and philosophy, and a contemporary perspective on these subjects. This is reflected not only in the attention paid to reception history, but also in the new course, 'Classics: A Controversial Heritage in the 21st Century'. The panel studied courses and found them to be relevant, interesting, and well developed.

Students seeking an additional challenge can participate in an extracurricular honours programme. Students are also actively encouraged to take up study abroad opportunities and to participate in the activities of the interdisciplinary research institute CRASIS. The panel would like to make special mention of the interesting extracurricular activities that complement the formal curriculum, including a yearly theatre project by students. The student association of the programme, Boréas, is very active. It organises various annual events for its members, including an introductory camp, a Christmas dinner and study-related activities such as lectures and excursions.

Based on discussions with students, the National Student Survey (NSE) and the student chapter, the panel concludes that students share the panel's positive impression of the curriculum. Students are especially positive about the programme's interdisciplinary focus, curriculum structure and the gradual increase in the difficulty and level of courses. They also expressed satisfaction with the study association and the provision of information. As a point for further improvement, students mention that they would like to have more opportunities to specialise during the programme. During the site visit, it became apparent that students appreciate the broad foundation provided by the programme and would not necessarily want more courses, but rather more freedom to specialize. The panel understands this request from the students, but at the same time also understands that the limited size and resources of the programme and the intended learning outcomes may sometimes make it necessary for the programme to make choices. The panel suggests that if the programme is kept as it is, the programme communicates curriculum choices more clearly to students.

Students conclude the programme by writing a 10,000-word bachelor's thesis (10 EC). They choose their own thesis topic and indicate their preferred supervisor. Based on this information, the thesis coordinator assigns an individual supervisor. In response to the 2019 panel's recommendations, the programme introduced clearer and more clearly communicated timelines for the thesis, a 'scriptieklas' and a list of potential research areas, to help students identify a suitable thesis topic. Also, the programme included more essay-based assessments to help students develop their academic writing skills (see Standard 3). The panel studied the thesis manuals and discussed the thesis trajectory with students and staff during the site visit. It found that there is now a well-organised thesis process with a good balance between supervision and personal responsibility and freedom of choice. Rules are clearly communicated in the thesis guidelines and followed. The panel notes with satisfaction that, although students are assisted with a list of possible dissertation topics, they are free to choose their own topic. The panel concludes that revisions have led to a better thesis process, with early indications that theses are being completed more timely.

Vision of education and didactical approach

The programme's educational approach is based on three key principles. First, research is embedded in the curriculum from the start (research-driven teaching and learning). Second, courses incorporate perspectives from different areas of study and encourage students to explore links between classical Antiquity and present-day challenges, as well as promoting their understanding of cross-cultural exchanges in Antiquity (interdisciplinary and intercultural learning). Third, the teaching approach fosters discussion and active student participation ((inter)active and dialogue-based learning).

The panel agrees with the chosen didactic principles. Research-driven education is clearly visible and a strong point of the programme. During the site visit, students told the panel that they are actively encouraged to develop their own research interests, attend lectures and conferences (e.g. those organised by the interfaculty institute CRASIS), undertake research internships, and fulfil roles as student assistants in supporting academic projects and conference organization. It is in the research seminars that research-driven education is most clearly demonstrated. Students confirmed that these seminars are interesting and inspiring. The panel is positive about the decision to align the content of the seminars with the research conducted by staff members. It offers students a valuable opportunity to learn about and from the excellent research of these staff members and introduces students to new developments and research questions in the field.

Interdisciplinary and intercultural learning, and the programme's emphasis on interactive and dialogue-based learning are also evident. Interdisciplinary and intercultural learning are inherent to the integrated approach to Antiquity that underpins the programme. The programme's ambition to explore links between classical Antiquity and present-day challenges and to incorporate additional perspectives is clearly visible in the courses on offer. Interactive and dialogue-based learning are fostered by using a variety of working methods and didactic approaches, with a well-considered mix between listening and active participation. In the student chapter and during the visit, students mentioned that they are satisfied with the variation in teaching methods used and the number of contact hours in the programme.

Curriculum changes and the pilot Smarter Academic Year

There have been significant curriculum changes to the programme in 2024-2025 and 2025-2026. The panel studied these changes and concludes that most of them are well-founded and (will) further improve the programme. The panel welcomes efforts taken to reduce the number of parallel courses, to reduce exam pressure with a better-thought-out balance between formative feedback and assessment, the transition from 5 EC to 10 EC courses, and the introduction of new relevant developments from the field into courses. The team's willingness to experiment with educational innovation is also evident from the programme's participation in the national pilot project "A Smarter Academic Year". As part of this pilot, the academic schedule of the programme for 2025-2026 has been adapted to allow for six weeks of instruction per quarter, allowing for more weeks of semester time devoted to independent study and recuperation. The panel discussed the pilot with students and staff. At the time of the site visit, the new academic schedule had only been in place for a few months. Initial findings of students and staff were positive, but further evaluation of the pilot would be better conducted at a later time. This evaluation will take place at programme and faculty levels, and is facilitated by an especially appointed project manager.

In 2026-2027, further curriculum changes will be made, among other things to make room for interdisciplinary courses in which programmes collaborate. The panel suggests that the programme continues to monitor the relationship between subject-specific and general academic skills and the connection with the intended learning outcomes. In doing so, particular attention should be paid to

maintaining the intended strong foundation in Greek and Latin language skills that is necessary for a future career of students as a teacher of Greek and Latin at secondary schools. The panel recommends ensuring that sufficient language skills remain part of the programme. The acquisition of academic skills must also be actively monitored, as the module “Academic Skills for Classics Students” will probably be discontinued in favour of a shared course, and course-specific elements of this will be integrated into other course components. The panel suggests making it clear to students where academic skills for classicists are included in the programme so that they are aware of what they are learning. The panel also suggests the option of working with a portfolio for academic skills.

Guidance, support and studying with a disability

The programme has a dedicated study advisor for the students in the programme. In addition, all first year students in the programme have a staff mentor, who meets with each student individually at fixed intervals discussing progress, obstacles and challenges. This first year staff mentor is supported by two second or third year students, who are a first point of contact for students. The first year also includes group mentoring sessions on study skills and opportunities such as the honours programme and study abroad.

The study advisor is also the first point of contact in case of special circumstances that impact a student's ability to study. The study advisor has a mandate, granted by the Board of Examiners to assign and register necessary accommodations. The study advisor follows exam regulations, which allow for adaptations to students' needs, and the university-wide policy plan for studying with a disability. This policy plan describes the full care structure of the university on different organizational levels, including student counsellors, student psychologists, trainers, study supervisors and confidential advisors. About one third of GLTC's student population have special circumstances, which is significantly higher than in many other study programmes at the university.

During the visit, the panel spoke with students about the system of guidance, support and studying with a disability. Students told the panel that they feel heard. They are enthusiastic about the study advisor, who is approachable and offers good guidance. Because the study advisor is also the first point of contact for special circumstances, tailor-made arrangement can be made quickly in careful consultation with the student and other parties involved. Combined with the mentoring system in the first year and small-scale teaching, this ensures high-quality guidance and support. The programme also has part-time students and a relatively large number of students who are pursuing the programme as a second degree. During the visit, students confirmed that in these cases, an individual study plan is drawn up and that it is usually possible to arrive at customised solutions that work for the student. The panel concludes that the programme has a solid guidance system in place. It is impressed by the proximity and student-oriented nature of this system.

Feasibility

In the student chapter, students indicate that they find the workload in the courses too high, forcing them to take fewer courses and fall behind in their studies. This is confirmed by study progress figures that show that students often take longer than the regular three or even four years to complete the programme. In the self-evaluation report and during the site visit, programme management told the panel that the study progress figures are partly to be explained by the special circumstances which apply to many students in the programme and by the fact that a significant proportion of students (about a quarter of the students who enter the BA GLTC) is studying for two degrees simultaneously. Nevertheless, the programme acknowledges the issue of study pressure and has recently introduced various measures to reduce it. Measures include increasing the size of courses to 10 EC, improving the guidance of the thesis trajectory, combining language and literature work in a new Lectoraat 1 course and abolishing the independent study of a pensum, which often caused study delay (also see: Curriculum changes and the pilot Smarter Academic Year). The panel

discussed these changes with the students. Students are positive about the changes and feel taken seriously when they mention the study pressure in the programme committee. The panel commends the programme for its efforts to improve the feasibility of the programme. It is confident that the programme will continue to actively monitor work pressure and feasibility and take measures if necessary.

Teaching staff

In 2019, the panel praised the programme for the quality of its teaching staff, recommending that efforts be made to retain the lecturers. The current panel studied an overview of the teaching staff and is pleased to see that this advice has been followed, with many lecturers being retained — although unfortunately not all. Since 2019, the number of permanent staff has grown. The programme is taught almost exclusively by active researchers with a PhD, many of whom are very successful in research and obtaining research grants. Expertise of lecturers ranges across a variety of fields including reception studies, the history of science, computational linguistics, psychology, marketing, and religion. The recent appointment of a new professor by special appointment in the field of Classical Reception Studies further strengthens team expertise. All course instructors with a permanent contract have a Basic Teaching Qualification (BKO) or Senior Teaching Qualification (SKO) and are able to teach in Dutch and English. The panel concludes that the quality of the team is excellent, both in the required fields in the programme as well as didactics. Conversations during the site visit show that students agree with this. Another striking feature of the staff is their openness to innovation and changing circumstances, and their commitment to the programme. The staff continuously reflects on what needs to be changed in order to keep the programme up to date and of good quality.

Although the panel praises the overall quality of the staff and is satisfied with the efforts made to retain staff, it also has some concerns. Recently, an assistant professor (UD) in ancient Greek Language and Literature has been appointed as a professor elsewhere. As a result, the expertise in the field of ancient Greek Language and Literature has been significantly reduced. Due to the current financial situation of the faculty, it is unclear whether this expertise will be replaced. In addition, the professor and an associate professor (UHD) of ancient history will be retiring in the foreseeable future. The panel considers it important for the reputation of the programme that it continues to have a professor of ancient history. The panel recommends retaining the programme's capacity as set out in the staff list submitted before the site visit (i.e. the UD in ancient Greek language and literature and the UHD and Professor of Ancient History).

The panel identified two possible risks to teachers' workload and discussed these with management. The first one is the result of the high quality of permanent staff members in the programme. Their success in obtaining research grants leads to a significant number of temporary staff. These staff members require more supervision and are unable to perform certain tasks. The second possible risk is the method of allocating hours to course lecturers based on the number of students enrolled in that course. The panel learned that this risk is mitigated to some extent. For example, teachers in small courses receive fifteen to thirty hours extra on top of their calculated hours and hours in language courses are often calculated on the basis of a minimum of 8 students, even if less students participate. Nevertheless, there are fewer teaching hours available for small courses, which may not always be sufficient. The management indicated that they are aware of this. Therefore, they actively encourage collaboration in interdisciplinary courses in order to increase enrolment numbers and monitor any potential negative effects of the allocation model on the workload of lecturers. The panel supports plans to develop interdisciplinary, shared courses with more students as a way of reducing the workload of lecturers. This can, however, not prevent that there will still be some small courses, which, in the interest of staff wellbeing, should not lead to an increased workload. The panel therefore recommends to closely monitor the number of temporary staff hours and the workload of lecturers in these smaller courses, with measures being taken if necessary.

Considerations

Admission requirements for the programme are appropriate. The curriculum is logically structured, with a good balance between language courses and history and culture courses, a well-considered mix of working methods and a gradual build-up of basic knowledge and skills towards broadening, deepening and independent work. Courses are interesting, relevant to the intended learning outcomes and well-developed. The panel especially appreciates the commitment of the programme to research-driven education. This is most clearly evident in the research seminars, which are interesting in terms of content and tie in with the excellent research being conducted by staff members. Sufficient action has been taken in response to the recommendation of the previous panel to better structure the thesis process and improve student support. The thesis process is now well-organised, with a good balance between supervision, guidance and personal responsibility. In recent years, the programme has implemented many changes to improve the curriculum. The panel studied these changes and concludes that most of them are well-founded and (will) further improve the programme. In 2026-2027, further curriculum changes will be made. The panel recommends ensuring that sufficient language skills remain part of the programme.

The panel is impressed by the proximity and student-oriented nature of the guidance system. Students feel heard and are enthusiastic about the study advisor, who is approachable and offers good guidance. Combined with the mentoring system in the first year and with small-scale teaching, this ensures high quality guidance and support. The study progress figures of the programme are a point of concern. The panel found that these figures can be partly explained by the high number of students with special circumstances. The panel also found that the programme acknowledges the issue of study pressure and has recently introduced various measures to reduce it. Students are positive about these changes and feel taken seriously. During the site visit, students expressed satisfaction with the study association, the facilities and the provision of information.

The quality of the teaching team is excellent, both in the required fields in the programme as well as in didactics. The panel recommends retaining the programme's capacity as set out in the staff list submitted before the site visit (i.e. the UD in ancient Greek language and literature and the UHD and Professor of Ancient History). The panel supports plans to develop more interdisciplinary shared courses, also as a way of reducing the workload of lecturers. It also recommends that the number of temporary staff hours and workload in smaller courses continue to be closely monitored, with measures being taken if necessary.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the programme meets standard 2.

Standard 3. Student assessment

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

Findings

System of assessment

The programme aims to design assessments in such a way that they not only test whether learning has been successful (assessment of learning) but also serve as a means of learning in themselves (assessment for and as learning). The programme uses both formative and summative types of assessment. In the beginning of the programme, students receive guidance on how to structure and plan their learning, supported by frequent (self-)checks, small-scale writing tasks with ample feedback, and clearly circumscribed and directed

exams. As the study progresses, assessments decrease in number but grow in size and complexity. The panel agrees with this assessment vision.

Agreements on ensuring assessment quality and assessments in the programme are laid down annually in a programme assessment plan. The panel studied this plan and concludes that it has been carefully designed with sufficient attention for constructive alignment with the intended learning outcomes and the content and design of the courses. The assessment plan also describes clear procedures for ensuring assessment quality. For example, all assessments are checked by a colleague before they are set, calibration meetings are organised among staff to help maintain consistency across courses, and oral exams are always carried out by teams of two. The panel also found that the assessment programme demonstrates a clear progression towards greater independence of the students, and that assessment includes a good variety of assessment methods, such as short tests, longer exams, commentaries and written essays, group presentations and video essays. Another strong aspect of assessment is that students are given an increased amount of short writing assignments as compared to the previous accreditation procedure, preparing students for writing the thesis. The panel studied a selection of assessments and concludes that they are well designed. During the site visit, students confirmed that they are generally satisfied with the communication about assessments in study guides and during lectures.

Recently, the programme implemented significant curriculum changes (see Standard 2). These also include a reduction of the number of small assessments in the programme and a revision of the balance between formative and summative assessments. The panel discussed these changes with students. Students are positive about the changes, which have led to less small and coinciding assessments and a reduction of their workload. The panel compliments the programme with the changes. It encourages the programme to continue keeping an eye on maintaining sufficient variety in assessment methods when making further changes in the assessment plan.

The panel judges the number of oral examinations in the assessment plan to be relatively small. During the site visit, students and staff confirmed that students practice oral communication skills regularly in presentations during multiple courses. The panel suggests clarifying in the assessment plan where oral communication skills are assessed, and to consider expanding the number of oral assessments. In response to the emergence of GenAI, the programme might also want to consider introducing an oral defence of the thesis.

Assessment of the thesis

The thesis assessment procedure is described in the thesis manual. The panel examined this thesis manual and the thesis assessment form, and concludes that they are well-designed. Procedures are clearly communicated and the assessment form, which was developed by the programme and approved by the Examination Board, contains relevant criteria and instructions for assessors. Each thesis is assessed by the supervisor (first assessor) and a second assessor who was not involved in the thesis trajectory. Both assessors complete the assessment independently and then meet to jointly determine the final grade. To obtain a passing final mark, all criteria on the assessment form must be assessed as satisfactory.

The panel reviewed a selection of theses with accompanying assessment forms. On this basis, the panel concludes that the above-described thesis assessment procedure is followed carefully. Students receive clear and nuanced feedback, and the panel generally agrees with the grades given and the reasoning provided. The panel did note that some examiners apply specific criteria in the assessment form more leniently than others. The panel judges this degree of subjectivity to be unavoidable. The panel encourages

the programme to continue to organize calibration sessions in the future in order to minimise differences between assessors as much as possible.

Board of Examiners

The Faculty of Arts has one central Board of Examiners (ECL: Examencommissie Letteren) that reviews quality of assessment, compliance with the Teaching and Examination Regulations, and achieved learning outcomes. The ECL also sets policy regarding the assurance of assessment quality. It is supported by expert teams (ETs). Each of the five clusters has its own ET. The bachelor's programme GLTC falls under the responsibility of the ET4 expertise team (ET4) that consists of one representative from each programme in the cluster.

The panel discussed with the ECL how it ensures the quality of assessment. An assessment file is created for each assessment. This file includes the course syllabus, the grade list, the assessment as it was administered and a form to prove peer review of the assessment took place, along with the expected answers, or for assignments or presentations, the assessment criteria and evaluation forms. The ECL and ET4 monitor the implementation of rules and guidelines, compliance with the Teaching and Examination Regulations and assessment quality, based on these assessment files. Each academic year, the ECL and ET4 evaluate 20% of the total module offering, ensuring that all modules are reviewed once every 5-6 years. The ECL records all activities, the outcome and suggestions for improvement for the following year in an annual report.

The panel studied annual reports of the ECL. It concludes that the ECL and ET4 describe their activities clearly. The annual reports show that the ECL performs its legal duties and responsibilities properly. Based on the conversation with ECL and ET4 members, the panel concludes that the ECL actively identifies new opportunities to further improve the quality of assessment. For example, the Examination Board has recently standardized the practice of including a third assessor in the thesis assessment procedure within the faculty. When assessing special requests for adjustments in assessment from students with special circumstances, the examination board works closely with the study advisor. Members of the ECL can participate in university-wide study days and workshops and regularly consult with members of other examination boards, including on dealing with GenAI and fraud detection.

Dealing with GenAI

The programme is dealing with the emergence of GenAI in several ways. First, there are faculty-wide guidelines. Secondly, the faculty organizes information sessions by experts and walk-in moments to facilitate programmes in considering ways to deal with GenAI in specific programmes. Thirdly, the programme has agreed on a policy for the use of GenAI, following these experts and guidelines. This policy is described in a text, drawn up by the programme, which is included in study guides if individual lecturers believe this is necessary. During the site visit, lecturers told the panel that allowing GenAI for some parts of learning and assessment but not for others is challenging to oversee and not always clear for students. Therefore, the staff is considering further adjustment of GenAI policy in the programme based on this experience and continuous new developments in GenAI. Fourthly, the programme is experimenting with new forms of assessment that limit unauthorized use of GenAI. For example, the programme is experimenting with having the essay required for 'Classics: A Controversial Heritage' written in an exam setting in a controlled digital environment.

The panel discussed the use of GenAI with students. They indicated that they are actively made aware of faculty-wide guidelines on the use of GenAI, of the risks of using GenAI and of policy on fraud and plagiarism. The use of GenAI as part of the learning process varies from course to course. In some courses, students experiment with the use of GenAI and reflect on the results, but in most courses, students are not allowed to

use GenAI at all. The panel also learned that some students do not want to use GenAI for ethical reasons. While the ethical implications of using GenAI are occasionally discussed, they are not yet a fixed part of the programme.

The panel concludes that the programme is actively considering ways to work with GenAI, experimenting with GenAI and adjusting policy based on new insights and experiences. Students are made aware of the risks and misuses of GenAI. While students and lecturers can identify moments where the responsible use of GenAI is addressed in the programme, a clear and well-coordinated approach at programme level still needs to be developed. Therefore, the panel recommends including digital humanities and the ethical and responsible use of GenAI in the intended learning outcomes (see Standard 1).

Considerations

The assessment system of the programme is well-designed. Assessment methods are varied and the assessment programme demonstrates a clear progression towards greater independence of the student. The panel studied a selection of assessments and concludes that these have been developed in a proper way. Students are generally satisfied with the communication about assessments. The programme responded appropriately to the recommendation of the previous assessment panel to include more writing assignments in the assessment programme in preparation for writing the thesis. The panel suggests clarifying in the assessment plan where oral communication skills are assessed, and to consider expanding the number of oral assessments.

The thesis manual contains clear information and the thesis assessment form is well-constructed. Thesis assessment procedures are followed and thesis assessments are carried out carefully. The Board of Examiners is adequately equipped to carry out its duties and functions satisfactorily. The programme is actively considering ways to deal with GenAI, experimenting with GenAI and adjusting policy based on new insights and experiences. Students are actively made aware of the risks and misuses of GenAI. A clear and well-coordinated line on the use of GenAI at programme-level still needs to be developed.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the programme meets standard 3.

Standard 4. Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

Quality of the theses

The panel studied 15 theses from the programme. Based on this sample, the panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes are achieved. All theses examined, including those with lower passing grades, are satisfactory. The panel found a broad spectrum of thesis topics in the thesis selection, covering a range of academic areas. This ties in well with the interdisciplinary and intercultural profile of the programme.

Performance of graduates

Alumni information shows that most alumni in the programme pursue a master's programme upon graduation, either in Classics or a different field. More than half of all alumni eventually enter secondary school teaching, either with a second-grade educational qualification by combining the BA with the educational minor or, more commonly, by combining an MA Classics with a second year of teacher training.

Students who start teaching in secondary school generally end up well; there is a high demand for teachers of Latin and Greek in the Netherlands, also in the North. Other students in the programme mostly choose to build on their BA GLTC with another degree. These range widely and include Journalism, Psychology, Maths, and Law. About one student per year enters a research master's programme, with the aim of pursuing a PhD and potentially a research career.

The panel concludes that the programme offers a broad foundation that enables students to smoothly transition to other relevant master's programmes. Students who aspire a career as a language teacher in Greek and/or Latin have good prospects to find employment relatively easily and function well.

In the self-evaluation report and the interviews during the site visit, the programme identified several opportunities to make the available career possibilities beyond teaching and research more explicit to students, and to gain a better understanding of how alumni other than teachers function on the labour market. The panel welcomes the initial steps that have already been taken in this regard, including the appointment of an alumni officer and organizing Career Days. Other ideas include highlighting transferable skills in study guides and inviting alumni with career paths different from teaching or academic research. The panel encourages the programme to continue with this.

Considerations

The panel concludes that students achieve the intended learning outcomes of the programme. Most graduates continue their academic career with a master's degree. Graduates generally enter well into a relevant master's programme and a career as a language teacher of Greek or Latin in secondary education.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the programme meets standard 4.

General conclusion

The panel judges that the master's programme meets all four standards. The panel's assessment of the programme is therefore positive.

Recommendations

1. Expand the current intended learning outcome 5.4 to include digital humanities and the ethical and responsible use of GenAI (Programme). Further facilitate the elaboration of such a new learning outcome into the programme, including alignment of this with policy and guidelines for the use of GenAI at university and faculty level (Faculty and Cluster Boards).
2. Maintain and guarantee the presence of sufficient language training in the programme, which is essential to train well-qualified teachers of Greek and Latin and to meet the labour market's need for these teachers.
3. Retain the programme's capacity as set out in the staff list submitted before the site visit (i.e. the UD in ancient Greek language and literature and the UHD and Professor of Ancient History).
4. Closely monitor the number of temporary staff hours and the workload of lecturers in smaller courses, and take measures if necessary.

Appendix 1. Intended learning outcomes

Dublin Descriptoren	Een afgestudeerde Bachelor Griekse en Latijnse Taal en Cultuur kan bogen op aantoonb(a)ar(e):
Kennis en inzicht 1.Student heeft aantoonbare kennis en inzicht van een vakgebied, waarbij wordt voortgebouwd op het niveau bereikt in het voortgezet onderwijs en dit wordt overtroffen; functioneert doorgaans op een niveau waarop met ondersteuning van gespecialiseerde handboeken, enige aspecten voorkomen waarvoor kennis van de laatste ontwikkelingen in het vakgebied vereist is.	1.1 inzicht in de samenhang van de antieke cultuur en haar disciplines - Griekse en Latijnse taal- en letterkunde van de Oudheid, Oude Geschiedenis, Klassieke en Mediterrane Archeologie en Filosofie van de Oudheid - en de doorwerking van de antieke cultuur in de Westerse cultuurgeschiedenis; 1.2 algemene kennis van en inzicht in de geschiedenis van de Griekse en Latijnse literatuur en haar belangrijkste genres; 1.3 algemene kennis van en inzicht in de beginselen van de historische taalkunde, in het bijzonder m.b.t. de talen Grieks en Latijn; 1.4 brede basiskennis op het gebied van de cultuurvakken Oude Geschiedenis, Klassieke en Mediterrane Archeologie en Filosofie van de Oudheid.
Toepassen kennis en inzicht 2.Student is in staat om zijn/haar kennis en inzicht op dusdanige wijze toe te passen, dat dit een professionele benadering van zijn/haar werk of beroep laat zien, en beschikt verder over competenties voor het opstellen en verdiepen van argumentaties en voor het oplossen van problemen op het vakgebied.	2.1 vermogen om met behulp van een woordenboek en (als deze er zijn) commentaren Griekse en Latijnse teksten van gemiddelde moeilijkheidsgraad te lezen en te analyseren, en daarbij gebruik te maken van de basisbegrippen van de tekstkritiek, de metriek, de stilistiek en de retorica; 2.2 vermogen om onder begeleiding een beperkt onderzoek op te zetten en uit te voeren en de resultaten ervan in een analytisch betoog weer te geven; 2.3 vermogen om gebruik te maken van de belangrijkste bibliografische en heuristische instrumenten en hulpmiddelen op het gebied van de Griekse en Romeinse oudheid; 2.4 beheersing van algemene academische vaardigheden, zoals het logisch redeneren en argumenteren in zowel mondelinge als schriftelijke vorm.
Oordeelsvorming	3.1 vermogen om kennis, begrip en vaardigheden toe te passen bij het systematisch en kritisch

3.Student is in staat om relevante gegevens te verzamelen en interpreteren (meestal op het vakgebied) met het doel een oordeel te vormen dat mede gebaseerd is op het afwegen van relevante sociaalmaatschappelijke, wetenschappelijke of ethische aspecten.	evalueren van informatie uit uiteenlopende bronnen, en daarbij problemen en vragen te identificeren, alsmede creativiteit te tonen bij het beantwoorden van deze vragen. 3.2 vermogen om de maatschappelijke implicaties van oordelen te overzien en, begrip hebbend voor andere culturen en opvattingen, morele verantwoordelijkheid te nemen voor de gevormde en gegeven oordelen.
Communicatie 4.Student is in staat om informatie, ideeën en oplossingen over te brengen op publiek bestaande uit specialisten of niet specialisten.	4.1 vermogen om op grond van het eigen oordeel op kritische en effectieve wijze van gedachten te wisselen met vakgenoten; 4.2 capaciteit om op betrouwbare en accurate wijze te communiceren en discussiëren met anderen over het eigen vakgebied, onder meer door het schriftelijk en mondeling becommentariëren van onderzoek van medestudenten en het mondeling presenteren en verdedigen van eigen onderzoek, daarbij rekening houdend met de opvattingen en gevoelens van anderen.
Leervaardigheid 5.Student bezit de leervaardigheden die noodzakelijk zijn om een vervolgstudie die een hoog niveau van autonomie veronderstelt aan te gaan.	5.1 vermogen te werken onder tijdsdruk en te kunnen omgaan met deadlines; 5.2 bezit van voldoende leervaardigheden en domeinkennis om via vervolgopleidingen zich verder te ontwikkelen op het professionele vlak; 5.3 vermogen om gestructureerde, helder geformuleerde en taalkundig correcte teksten te schrijven; 5.4 vermogen om effectief gebruik te maken van ICT-toepassingen

Appendix 2. Programme curriculum

Het eerste jaar omvat de volgende onderdelen met de daarbij vermelde studielast:

nr.	Onderdeel	Omvang
1	Griekse taalvaardigheid I	5
2	Griekse taalvaardigheid II	5
3	Latijnse taalvaardigheid I	5
4	Latijnse taalvaardigheid II	5
5	Inleiding op de Oudgriekse wereld**	5
6	Inleiding op de Romeinse wereld**	5
7	Overgangsmodule Grieks I*/**	5
8	Overgangsmodule Grieks II*	5
9	Overgangsmodule Latijn I*	5
10	Overgangsmodule Latijn II *	5
11	Griekse taalvaardigheid III	5
12	Latijnse taalvaardigheid III	5
13	Onderzoek en Verslag: academische vaardigheden	5
14	Grieks drama: Polis en Podium	5
15	Latijns drama: Slaven en Tirannen	5
16	Hoogtepunten van de klassieke literatuur**	5

Alle onderdelen zijn opgenomen in de digitale universitaire onderwijscatalogus, OCASYS

* Studenten die in een van beide talen de Overgangsmodule I en II volgen, doen niet de taalvaardigheid I en II in die taal.

** Deze vakken maken ook deel uit van de facultaire minor Oudheidstudies (zie bijlage 1 van deel A van deze OER).

Het tweede en derde jaar van de opleiding omvat de volgende onderdelen met de daarbij vermelde studielast:

Jaar 2

nr.	Onderdeel	omvang in ECTS
17	Grieks Epos: Homerus	5
18	Latijns Epos: Ovidius en Vergilius	5
19	Griekse en Latijnse Taalkunde: ontwikkeling en gebruik	5
20	Historiografie in de oudheid	5
	Vrije keuzeruimte	10
21	Zelfstandige literatuurstudie I	5
22	Epigrafie en papyrologie	5
23	Griekse en Latijnse Poëzie-analyse: van hymne tot satire	5
24	Onderzoekscollege Oude Geschiedenis en Archeologie	10
25	Onderzoekscollege Antieke Filosofie	5

Jaar 3

	Minor	30
27	Onderzoekscollege Grieks	5
28	Onderzoekscollege Latijn	5
29		
30	Specialisatieruimte	5
31	Zelfstandige literatuurstudie II	5
32	BA-scriptie	10

Alle onderdelen zijn opgenomen in de digitale universitaire onderwijscatalogus, OCASYS

Appendix 3. Programme of the site visit

Van	Tot	Wat	Rol
09:00	09:05	welkom / aankomst panel	Decaan Faculteit Letteren
			Vice Decaan Faculteit Letteren
09:05	09:45	Intern overleg	
09:45	10:30	Gesprek faculteitsbestuur	Decaan Faculteit Letteren
			Vice Decaan Faculteit Letteren
10:30	11:15	Gesprek programmamanagement	Voorzitter bestuur cluster 4
			Lid bestuur cluster 4
			Programmacoördinator BA GLTC en MA Classics & Ancient Civilizations
11:30	12:30	Gesprek studenten bachelor en master	Student BA; OC-lid
			Student BA; auteur studentenhoofdstuk
			Student MA (track classics); alumnus BA
			Alumna track Ancient History
			Student MA (track Ancient History)
12:30	13:30	Lunch en intern overleg panel	
13:30	14:30	Gesprek docenten bachelor en master	UD Latijn, voorzitter OC, coördinator voorlichting BA
			UD Oude Geschiedenis, secretaris OC
			Hoogleraar Oude Geschiedenis
			Hoogleraar Latijn
			UD Antieke Wijsbegeerte
14:30	14:45	Pauze en intern overleg panel	
14:45	15:15	Gesprek examencommissie	Lid Expertiseteam cluster 4
			Lid Expertiseteam cluster 4
			Ambtelijk secretaris examencommissie
			Voorzitter ECL (overkoepelende examencommissie)
15:15	17:00	Bespreken en opstellen bevindingen en conclusies	

Van	Tot	Wat	Rol
09:00	09:30	Welkom en intern overleg	
09:30	10:15	Terugkoppeling bevindingen en conclusies panel	Vice Decaan Faculteit Letteren
			Programmacoördinator BA&MA
			Voorzitter bestuur cluster 4
			Lid bestuur cluster 4
10:15	10:30	Pauze en wisseling van ruimte	
10:30	11:00	Ontwikkelgesprek 1 - werving studenten	UD Oude Geschiedenis
			UD Latijn
			Hoogleraar Latijn
		Ontwikkelgesprek 2 - herziening BA en MA	UD Antieke Wijsbegeerte
			Hoogleraar Grieks
			UD Oude Geschiedenis
		Ontwikkelgesprek 3 - voorbereiding op de arbeidsmarkt	Hoogleraar Oude Geschiedenis
			UD Oude Geschiedenis
			UD Grieks
			UD Latijn
11:00	11:30	Intern overleg panel	
11:30	11:45	Mondelinge rapportage	Alle betrokkenen bij de visitatie
11:45		Einde	

Appendix 4. Materials

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied 15 theses. Information on the theses is available from Academion upon request.

The panel also studied other materials, which included:

General

- Strategic Plan University of Groningen 2021-2026
- Strategic Faculty of Arts 2021-2026
- Assessment Policy University of Groningen 2021-2026
- Rules and Regulations of the Faculty Board of Examiners 2024-2025
- Annual reports faculty Board of Examiners 2021-2022, 2022-2023, 2023-2024
- Policy Plan about studying with a disability University of Groningen 2018

Programme-specific

- Self-evaluation BA Greek and Latin Language and Culture 2025
- Programme learning outcomes 2024-2025
- Matrix of learning outcomes 2024-2025
- Overview of teaching team
- Quantitative data of teaching-learning environment
- Teaching and Examination Regulations 2024-2025
- Programme assessment plan 2024-2025
- Programme year cards 2024 and 2025
- Study guide thesis trajectory 2024-2025
- Annual reports programme committee 2022-2023, 2023-2024, 2024-2025
- Example courses:
 - Course 1: Latin Language Skills I
 - Course 2: Introduction to the Ancient Greek World
 - Course 3: Research Seminar Ancient Philosophy
 - Course 4: Research Seminar in Latin: Tacitus' Dialogus de oratoribus