

Bachelor American Studies
Master North American Studies
University of Groningen
Assessment report

27 maart 2026



Contents

1.	Summary	3
2.	Introduction	7
	Procedure	7
	Institution	9
	Programmes	9
	Developments since the last accreditation	10
3.	Programme assessment	12
	Standard 1: intended learning outcomes	12
	Standard 2: teaching-learning environment	15
	Standard 3: student assessment	24
	Standard 4: achieved learning outcomes	28
	Final conclusion	31
4.	Annexes	33
	Annex 1: Administrative data	33
	Annex 2: Learning outcomes of the programme	35
	Annex 3: Curriculum overview	38
	Annex 4: Documents	40
	Annex 5: Visitation programme	42

1. SUMMARY

This report describes the programme assessment of the bachelor programme American Studies and the master programme North-American Studies, offered by the University of Groningen.

Standard 1 – Intended Learning Outcomes

The bachelor and master programmes in American Studies at the University of Groningen offer coherent, interdisciplinary, and internationally oriented curricula taught in English.

Both the bachelor and the master programme have a strong vision and profile, which have been narrowed down in response to the last panel's recommendations. They distinguish themselves from similar programmes in the Netherlands and abroad by their interdisciplinary approach to the domain of American Studies and the focus on political and cultural theory in the curriculum. Graduates obtain solid knowledge of cultural, political, historical, and social developments in North America, supported by transferable skills such as academic writing, critical reasoning, and intercultural communication.

In response to recommendations from the previous accreditation, both programmes have reduced and refined their intended learning outcomes (ILOs). The ILOs now feature clearer language, a better-articulated methodological component, and an improved alignment with the programmes' political-cultural focus. The panel finds that the ILOs correspond well to NLQF levels 6 (bachelor) and 7 (master), are in line with international benchmark statements (QAA), and reflect current developments in the field.

Engagement with alumni and the professional field is not yet structurally embedded. The panel advises the programme to formally establish an employability council and involve it in the validation of the intended learning outcomes and in discussions about the curriculum related to the implementation of the faculty-wide bachelor courses.

Standard 2 – teaching-learning environment

Overall, the panel finds that the programmes offer a stimulating and supportive learning environment that enables students to achieve the ambitious intended learning outcomes of an academically oriented bachelor or master degree in American Studies.

The panel concludes that the bachelor and master programmes in American Studies are thoughtfully designed and offer coherent curricula that effectively integrate content knowledge, methodological training, and transferable skills. The programmes provide clear learning paths in which students progressively build and deepen their knowledge and academic skills. The panel finds the curriculum to be well structured, ensuring students achieve the intended learning outcomes. In view of the forthcoming faculty-wide interdisciplinary courses, the panel advises the bachelor programme to reassess the alignment between intended learning outcomes, the curriculum, and thesis assessment criteria.

Students have ample opportunities to pursue their own interests through electives, minors, internships, and study abroad options. The panel highlights the valuable small-scale, supportive and student-centred learning environment of both programmes. Students benefit from close contact with lecturers, strong academic writing instruction, and a constructive and supportive learning environment. The bachelor mentorship programme is a notable improvement, contributing to students' successful integration into the academic environment. Given the strong emphasis on writing skills, the panel recommends a more explicit and proactive approach toward discussing generative AI, ensuring students develop both awareness and responsible academic use aligned with the intended learning outcomes.

In the master programme the 'Writing for the Real World' seminar is seen as a particularly strong element that provides students with real-life experience and strengthens their connection to the professional field. The panel agrees with the students that elements of this seminar could be integrated in the bachelor curriculum as well. The panel is satisfied to see that the feasibility of the thesis has improved in both programmes by giving more structure to the bachelor trajectory and by assigning the master thesis supervisor at an earlier stage, which have positively influenced completion rates.

The panel praises the quality and engagement of the teaching staff, as well as their ability to manage a very intensive and high-level programme in turbulent times. Their commitment to fostering high-level English proficiency and academic writing skills is noteworthy and aligns well with the programmes' international orientation. The panel endorses the deliberate choice for English as the language of instruction.

Standard 3 – Student Assessment

The bachelor and master programmes in American Studies have a well-developed and coherent system of assessment that is grounded in institutional and faculty-wide regulations. The programmes use annually updated assessment plans and assessment matrices to ensure that all intended learning outcomes are systematically covered. Assessment methods are varied, well aligned with the learning objectives, and designed to stimulate student learning. Students confirm that assessment formats and criteria are transparent and that they consistently receive extensive and helpful feedback.

Both programmes apply a wide range of assessment forms, including essays, research reports, presentations, class participation, and group work. The focus on academic writing is reflected in the chosen assessments and in the rubrics. In the bachelor programme, assessment complexity increases throughout the curriculum. The master programme emphasises independent research, with research essays playing a central role. The panel appreciates the explicit assessment of English language proficiency and the strong emphasis on academic writing. Given developments in generative AI, the panel advises the staff to be more proactive in discussing the challenges and opportunities of GenAI in relation to the assessment forms and to consider diversifying assessment formats beyond written assignments.

The thesis assessment procedures are robust and transparent, employing standardized assessment forms. To safeguard a systematic assessment of all criteria for the thesis, the panel recommends asking

assessors to comment on all the separate criteria in the assessment form instead of using the *holistic narrative*, thereby improving the comparability and accountability of the grades. The panel also advises making the writing process and students' independence part of the assessment.

The Faculty-wide Board of Examiners, working with disciplinary expert teams, safeguards validity, reliability, and compliance with institutional regulations. The panel finds the Board active and committed but advises it to extend its focus from procedural monitoring to fostering discussions on the content of the assessment and the quality of the rubrics, including calibration across programmes and dissemination of good practices. The panel encourages the Board of Examiners to take a more proactive role in coordinating discussions and sharing good practices related to GenAI across the faculty.

Standard 4 – Achieved Learning Outcomes

The panel reviewed a representative selection of bachelor and master theses and concludes that the overall quality is high. Bachelor theses demonstrate solid achievement of the intended learning outcomes, with strong academic writing, well-embedded use of literature, and original topics. Master theses likewise display high academic quality. All theses meet the requirements of the master level, and several exceed them through conceptual sophistication and strong analytical depth.

The panel finds that graduates of the bachelor programme are well prepared for further academic study, with many progressing to (research) master programmes. Their strong writing skills are recognised in master programmes they go on to enrol in. Graduates of the master programme transition successfully into academic and professional fields. Alumni confirm that the programme provides strong preparation for research-oriented careers. On the other hand some students experience difficulty translating academic competencies into non-academic pathways.

The panel values ongoing initiatives to strengthen employability, such as the 'Writing for the Real World' seminar, or the appointment of an alumni officer. It recommends establishing an employability council to structurally involve alumni and labour market perspectives in programme development and to support students in connecting academic skills to a broader professional context.

Evaluating this, the panel reaches the advice 'positive' to the NVAO for the accreditation of the bachelor programme American Studies and the master programme North-American Studies, at the University of Groningen.

The chair and secretary of the panel hereby declare that all members of the panel have considered this report and agree with the judgements recorded in the report. They confirm that the assessment was carried out in accordance with the requirements regarding independence.

Utrecht, 27 March 2026



Prof. Dr. Gert Buelens
(Chair)



Drs. Marjolein Boessenkool

2. INTRODUCTION

Procedure

The University of Groningen has appointed Odion Onderzoek to coordinate the external quality assessment of the bachelor programmes American Studies and Midden-Oosten Studies (Middle Eastern Studies) and the master programmes North-American Studies and Middle Eastern Studies. This assessment was conducted in the context of the accreditation of a cluster of programmes: WO Regiostudies I. The cluster consists of 24 programmes offered by four different institutes: Radboud University, the University of Groningen, University of Amsterdam and Leiden University. Dr. Alexandra Paffen served as cluster coordinator on behalf of Odion Onderzoek until August 1st 2025. She was succeeded by Julia Roosenboom MSc.

The assessment was conducted in accordance with the procedures and standards of the NVAO's "Assessment Framework for the Accreditation System of Higher Education in the Netherlands" (Government Gazette 2024, no. 6405). The programmes within the cluster Regiostudies I are existing programmes, and all institutions involved hold a positive institutional audit decision on quality assurance.

In consultation with the programmes, Odion Onderzoek composed a panel of peers (assessment panel) to carry out the assessment of the programmes at the University of Groningen:

- Prof. Dr. G. (Gert) Buelens (chair), professor of English and American literature, Universiteit Gent;
- Prof. Dr. C.R. (Christian) Lange (panel member), professor of Arabic and Islamic studies Utrecht University;
- Prof. Dr. E. (Esther) Peeren (panel member), professor of Cultural Analysis, University of Amsterdam;
- W. (Wladimir) Riphagen MA (panel member), Policy Advisor at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and PhD candidate, University of Amsterdam;
- R.J. (Rashed) Nazrabi BA (student member), master student Middle Eastern Studies at Leiden University;
- Prof. Dr. D.A. (Damian) Pargas (external reader), professor of History and Culture of North America, Leiden University;
- Prof. Dr. G.A. (Gerard) Wiegers (external reader), professor of History and Comparative Study of Religions at University of Amsterdam.

The panel was supported by Marjolein Boessenkool, as both location coordinator and secretary. She has appropriate experience as NVAO-certified secretary. The NVAO reviewed the accountability form concerning the composition of the panel and concluded that the panel met the required expertise criteria. In addition, the panel members, the institution, and the secretaries submitted written declarations confirming that the panel and secretaries would carry out their tasks independently. On 21 October 2025 the NVAO approved the proposed panel composition.

Prior to the assessment process, the cluster coordinator discussed the standards, procedures, and responsibilities with the chair in accordance with the “Profile of the Chair” (NVAO, 2016) and the guidelines provided in the NVAO training course “Train the Chair”. The other panel members received instructions during a cluster-wide kick-off meeting, where the cluster coordinator and chair informed them about the content and purpose of the assessment framework, as well as the procedure, intended attitude, working methods, and timeline within the cluster.

Prior to the site visit, the programmes submitted a list of recent graduates for each programme to the secretary. In consultation with the secretary, the panel chair selected fifteen final projects per programme, taking into account a spread of final grades, assessors, and programme specializations. The panel reviewed the selected final projects and accompanying assessment forms, as well as the self-evaluation reports of the programmes. The panel assessed the theses in accordance with the NVAO guidelines for the review of final projects (Implementation Regulations, September 2024). An overview of the reviewed materials, including the selected theses, is provided in annex 5.

After studying the documentation, the panel members formulated their initial impressions and shared these with the secretary. The secretary compiled the input and distributed the compilation to the full panel. During a preparatory meeting on 10 November 2025, the panel discussed these impressions and identified key topics to address during the site visit.

Faculty and students of the programmes were informed in advance by the faculty about the opportunity to speak with the panel in confidence. Interested participants could register with the secretary. A week prior to the site visit, an open consultation hour was scheduled for registered participants. Since no responses were received, the open consultation hour was cancelled.

The panel visited the University of Groningen on 19 and 20 November 2025. The draft programme of the site visit, including representative interviewees, was submitted by the Faculty of Arts to the chair and the secretary for approval. Further information about the visit schedule is provided in annex 4.

At the end of the site visit, the panel formed its independent judgement on the programmes, based on the four standards of the NVAO’s assessment framework for the accreditation of existing programmes (2024). The chair presented the panel’s main conclusions in a public oral feedback session. The development dialogue took place during the site visit. A separate report about the development dialogue was drafted by the Faculty of Arts and adopted by the panel chair.

This final report provides a systematic account of the panel’s findings, considerations, and conclusions. After the site visit, the secretary drafted a preliminary version of the report and submitted it to the panel members for feedback. Based on their comments, the report was revised in consultation with the chair. The draft report was then sent to the University of Groningen for a check of factual inaccuracies. After processing any corrections, the report was finalized and approved by the chair.

Institution

The programmes are offered by the University of Groningen and are part of the Faculty of Arts. The Faculty of Arts is a broad arts faculty with over 5,000 students and 700 staff members. The faculty has a diverse educational offering of 16 Bachelor programmes and more than 40 Master tracks within 20 Master programmes. The university sees it as its mission to offer students a challenging and activating learning environment that matches their talents and ambitions and prepares them for the that matches their talents and ambitions and prepares them for the often global labour market, where they will participate as professionals equipped with appropriate academic knowledge and skills and an awareness of and sensitivity to intercultural diversity.

The Institute of Education (OWI), led by the OWI director, is responsible for the organisation of education and quality assurance within the Faculty of Arts. To facilitate decision-making with regard to the organisation and staffing of education at a more local level, education is organized into five clusters of (more or less) related programmes. The programmes in American Studies are situated within cluster 4, together with the programmes in Archaeology, Classics, History and Middle Eastern Studies.

Programmes

The bachelor programme in American Studies is an English-taught programme that aspires to prepare its graduates for a wide range of (Research) master programmes in the Humanities, or for entering the labour market in professions that require knowledge and skills at the bachelor level. The programme is shaped by three interrelated key features: (1) its interdisciplinary approach; (2) its international orientation; and (3) its emphasis on political and cultural theory. The programme is 180 EC and is offered full-time.

The master programme in North-American Studies aims to train students to become global and ethical citizens in an environment that is increasingly international, multi-lingual, and multicultural. Graduates in North-American Studies possess in-depth interdisciplinary knowledge and understanding of specific cultural, social, historical and political developments on the North-American continent, a high level of intercultural skills, open-mindedness, flexibility in critical thinking, adaptability, attunement to diversity as well as an in-depth understanding of global challenges and developments. The programme prepares students for employment in academic research as well as a broad range of fields in the (international) public and corporate domain, such as journalism, policy-making, business, international relations and diplomacy. The master programme consists of one specialization (track American Studies) and is offered full-time.

Because of the decrease in student numbers and the recent budget cuts, the faculty has developed plans to streamline the curricula of all bachelor programmes. From 2026-2027 onwards faculty-wide courses of in total 20 EC will be introduced in all programmes. In addition, the future positioning of the master programme North-American Studies is part of a broader faculty discussion on the masters' portfolio. The

faculty is exploring the option of integrating American Studies as a specialization in the master programmes History and Literary Studies.

The administrative information of the programmes and institution are incorporated in annex 1.

Developments since the last accreditation

The last accreditation of the programmes took place in 2019, when both programmes received a positive assessment. The panel made the following recommendations and suggestions.

Bachelor American Studies

It recommends safeguarding a strong, recognisable focus which can be clearly communicated to future students and employers, and on which the relevant expertise can be concentrated.

The panel underscores that the programme should also be rewarding and effective for the average student and asks the programme to keep their interests in mind.

It suggests that the specific methods of the different individual disciplines should be taught and highlighted explicitly, and not be learned in passing.

It suggests giving more structure to the thesis trajectory, so that all lecturers operate roughly in the same manner when supervising a student.

It encourages the programme to monitor the (heavy) study load and take additional measures if necessary

In the panel's view, the individual assessments of the first and second examiners should be made more explicit in order to show independent judgment.

Also the panel underscores that exceptionally high marks should be solidly substantiated.

Master North-American Studies

The panel finds the current profile too broad and advises the programme to make it more specific.

The panel agrees with the programme staff that the intended learning outcomes need to be revised to be adapted to this more focused profile and to formulate them more clearly and on a more general level.

The panel recommends linking up the students and thesis supervisors at an earlier stage,

The panel recommends making a serious effort to help the students find suitable internships that are in fact worth 10 EC, instead of much longer internships, and create a culture in which the students feel facilitated and stimulated to finish their study projects within the nominal time.

The panel identifies two points for improvement regarding the thesis assessment: adding structure to the thesis form with different categories according to which students' theses are being assessed, and making the independent assessments of the first and second examiners more explicit.

The programmes have reflected on the recommendations and the follow-up actions in their self-assessment report. The current panel has investigated how the programmes have implemented the

recommendations and has discussed this during the site visit. The panel assesses that the recommendations have been implemented adequately, although the current panel has some further recommendations regarding thesis assessment and employability. This assessment is further substantiated under the related standards.

3. PROGRAMME ASSESSMENT

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.

Finding and considerations

Profile of the programmes

The bachelor and master programmes American Studies at Groningen University offer English-taught interdisciplinary programmes.

The bachelor programme in American Studies is an English-taught programme that aspires to prepare its graduates for a wide range of (Research) master programmes in the Humanities, or for entering the labour market in professions that require knowledge and skills at the Bachelor level. The master programme (MA) in North-American Studies aims to train students to become global and ethical citizens in an environment that is increasingly international, multi-lingual, and multicultural.

The programmes are founded on the following key components: a high degree of interdisciplinarity; an international orientation; strong methodological and conceptual coherence; an emphasis on the acquisition of conceptual and metacognitive knowledge; and excellent transferable skills. Graduates possess interdisciplinary knowledge and understanding of specific cultural, social, historical and political developments on the North-American continent, intercultural skills, open-mindedness, flexibility in critical thinking, as well as an understanding of global challenges and developments.

The programmes distinguish themselves from similar programmes in the Netherlands and abroad by their interdisciplinary approach to the domain of American Studies, their international orientation and the focus on political and cultural theory in the curriculum. The programmes aim for a strong methodological and conceptual coherence, with an emphasis on the acquisition of academic writing skills and metacognitive knowledge.

Both programmes comply with the domain's international benchmarks, for example the QAA Subject Benchmark Statements for Area Studies (April 2024), English (September 2023), History (March 2022), and Communication, Media, Film, and Cultural Studies (April 2024).

The bachelor programme studies culture, politics, history, literature and economics of the United States, and the connections between the Americas and the wider world and trains students in academic skills. The master North American Studies builds on the foundation provided by the bachelor programmes of the students, training them to achieve more in-depth levels of knowledge, greater independence as investigators, and a more extensive level of critical reflection. It focuses directly on the intersection of US politics and culture and the history and methods of American Studies.

The programmes aim to prepare students for a diverse array of academic and professional opportunities for which skills such as analytical thinking, intercultural awareness, and strong communication in different registers are essential. Bachelor graduates continue to a wide range of (Research) master programmes in the Humanities, or enter the labour market in professions that require knowledge and skills at the bachelor level. The master programme is shaped by an academically challenging research-intensive vision and aims to prepare students for a research career as well as for positions in (international) public and corporate leadership, in journalism and the media industry, policy making, business, international relations and diplomacy.

Based on the documentation and the conversations during the site visit, the panel finds that the programmes offer a broad and solid academic foundation in American Studies, underpinned by the diverse specializations of the staff. Both programmes display a strong interdisciplinary character, integrating methodologies from both the humanities (history, philosophy, literature and linguistics) and social sciences (political science, sociology). The panel notes that the hemispheric approach is less pronounced in the actual courses and theses than in the programme's self-understanding, as reflected in the self-evaluation report.

Intended Learning Outcomes

Bachelor programme

The bachelor programme has defined 16 intended learning outcomes across five categories which align with the Dublin descriptors. These learning outcomes reflect the programme's interdisciplinary profile and its academic orientation. For an overview of the intended learning outcomes, see annex 2.

In response to the previous accreditation, the programme has reduced the number of intended learning outcomes from 23 to 16. It has simplified the language used in describing the learning outcomes and significantly revised the methodology-focused learning outcomes, clarifying that "close reading" and "contextualization" are the two central methods in which students are trained (see learning outcomes 1b, 2c).

The intended learning outcomes are, according to the panel, coherently phrased and align well with the level of a bachelor programme (NLQF 6) as defined by the Dublin descriptors, as well as with the international orientation of the field of American Studies as defined by the QAA benchmarks. The link between the learning outcomes and the hemispheric, international approach to American Studies is convincingly made, though it is to be noted here that the programme itself does not reflect a hemispheric 'The Americas' approach quite as substantively as the ILOs would lead one to expect.

The panel is positive about the reformulation of the learning outcomes since the previous site visit because it sees that the methodological component has been clarified, the number of intended learning outcomes has been reduced and the focus on writing skills and on political analysis is now better reflected.

The programme demonstrates engagement with alumni and the professional field, but as yet this input is not structurally embedded in a formal advisory body. The introduction of an employability council (werkveldadviescommissie) is currently being discussed in both programmes (see standard 4). The panel commends this initiative. As it is important to continuously assess whether learning outcomes are relevant to professional contexts, the panel advises involving the employability councils, once established, actively in the validation of the intended learning outcomes and in assessing whether the faculty-wide bachelor courses necessitate an adaptation of the bachelor programme's learning outcomes or curriculum.

Master programme American Studies

The master programme has defined 16 intended learning outcomes across five categories which align with the Dublin descriptors. These learning outcomes reflect the profile and the academic orientation of the programme, emphasising its interdisciplinary profile with a strong theoretical focus, international orientation and wide range of transferable skills. For an overview of the intended learning outcomes, see annex 2.

In response to the previous accreditation, the programme has reduced the number of learning outcomes from 21 to 16 and scaled down their ambition. The programme has simplified the language used in describing the learning outcomes and revised learning outcomes so they better reflect the level of the students and emphasise the political dimension of the programme's profile.

The intended learning outcomes are, according to the panel, clearly formulated and align well with the level of a master programme (NLQF 7) as defined by the Dublin descriptors, as well as with the international orientation of the field of American Studies as defined by the QAA benchmarks. The panel is positive about the reformulation of the learning outcomes since the previous site visit because it sees that the focus has been clarified and *transferable skills*—notably research skills, analytical skills, ethical reasoning, teamwork, and advanced communication in English - are more clearly specified.

The master programme demonstrates engagement with alumni and the professional field, but as yet this input is not structurally embedded in a formal advisory body. As for the bachelor programme, the master discusses the introduction of an employability council (werkveldadviescommissie, see standard 4). The panel commends this initiative and advises to involve this council when adapting the learning outcomes or changing the curriculum.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the panel commends the bachelor and master programmes' strong vision and profile, which have been narrowed down in response to the last panel's recommendations. 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.

Both the bachelor and the master programme distinguish themselves from similar programmes in the Netherlands and abroad by their interdisciplinary approach to the domain of American Studies and the focus on political and cultural theory in the curriculum.

The programmes stand out as exemplary academic offerings that provide students with an ambitious, academic, interdisciplinary and internationally oriented education. Both programmes align their intended learning outcomes with the Dublin descriptors and the NLQF level 6 (bachelor) and 7 (master). The panel advises the programme to involve any future employability councils actively in the validation of the intended learning outcomes and in discussions about the curriculum related to the implementation of the faculty-wide bachelor courses.

Based on the documentation and the interviews during the site visit, the panel finds that the bachelor and master offer ambitious programmes with a strong international orientation, which meet international field requirements. The panel concludes that the programmes **meet standard 1: Intended learning outcomes**.

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.

Finding and considerations

2.1. Curriculum

Bachelor programme

The bachelor programme in American Studies consists of a major (150 EC) and a minor (30 EC) taken during the first semester of the third year. The course modules that students take as part of their minor allow them to specialize in areas of their own choice. The various courses of the curriculum contribute to the intended learning outcomes. This is underpinned by the programme in a matrix which links the components of the curriculum to the intended learning outcomes.

Following developments in the Faculty of Arts all bachelor programmes will implement a total of 20 EC for interdisciplinary education: 10 EC in the second semester of the first year and 10 EC in the second year. Starting in 2026/27, students from all programmes will have to take the faculty-wide courses, in which interdisciplinary teaching on key topics in the Humanities will be offered. This development will have implications for the American Studies curriculum. The programme is planning to merge courses, for instance Theory of Culture II and III, to make room for the faculty-wide courses.

For a full overview of the curriculum, see Annex 3.

The curriculum has a mandatory core consisting of three learning paths:

- ‘The Americas’ I-III (30 EC),
- ‘Theories of culture’ I-III (30 EC), and
- ‘American Studies in Practice’ I-II (20 EC).

This core is supplemented by several special topics and a research seminar. It culminates in the bachelor thesis. During the third year, students can choose a minor or study a semester abroad. All the courses

build on the three focus aspects of the profile: interdisciplinarity; international orientation; and political & cultural theory.

During their first year, the students build a foundation of knowledge and skills by completing a survey of American history (in 'The Americas' I and II, 20 EC) and 'Theories of Culture I' (10 EC). The learning pathway 'American Studies in Practice' fosters students' English language skills, with special emphasis on written and oral argumentation. From 2025-26, to address declining reading skills and attention spans, 'American Studies in Practice' will devote more in-class time to instructing students on how to "read academically".

In their second year, students deepen their knowledge by reading classic works of theory, and learn about political theory and media theory. There is also an advanced course in 'American Studies in Practice' to further develop their academic writing skills. In their second year, students can tailor the programme to their interests. They can choose 30 EC of special topics and electives (e.g. 'Global USA' or 'Cultural Analysis').

The third bachelor year consolidates the students' learning process and prepares them for a master programme or a professional career. They choose a 30 EC minor, for instance a minor abroad, a multidisciplinary university minor, or a career minor. It is possible to do a bachelor internship within the career minor. In the second semester, students take two final courses: 'Migration, mobility, transculturation' and 'Theories of culture' III. The capstone of the bachelor programme is the bachelor thesis (10 EC).

The panel finds the programme to be well-structured, with clear, coherent learning paths ensuring that all students achieve the intended learning outcomes. During the site visit, the panel heard that the staff meet regularly to coordinate courses and safeguard the programme's coherence, which it appreciates. The staff expressed the view that the profile of the programme, with its focus on politics, provides a clear vision for the continuous development of the courses. The staff ensures that courses are regularly adapted to current topics in the Americas and align with their research. In view of the impending implementation of faculty-wide courses the panel advises the programme to reassess the alignment of the intended learning outcomes, the curriculum and the assessment criteria of the thesis.

The panel agrees that the structure of the programme gives students ample possibility to follow and develop their own interests by choosing electives in the second year and a minor (abroad) in the third year. This is an excellent feature of the programme in the panel's view.

The panel studied a sample of the course materials and found it to be relevant, and fitting to the level of the courses. The materials are comparable to what students at research-intensive universities receive. These subjects are taught with rigour and passion. Overall, students receive lots of training and extensive feedback, with good results, as the panel concluded on the basis of the theses it studied.

Finally, the panel is impressed by the attention paid by the staff to the students' mastering the English language at a high level, overall and for academic writing skills specifically,.

Master programme

The curriculum is structured around three compulsory research seminars (10 EC each) and a 20 EC master thesis. The various courses in the curriculum ensure that students achieve all the intended learning outcomes. This is underpinned by the programme in a matrix which links the components of the curriculum to the intended learning outcomes. For a full overview of the curriculum, see Annex 3.

In the first semester, the students take three seminars. The subjects of the seminars may vary from year to year, reflecting staff members' ongoing research projects. This ensures that the courses are aligned with current developments in the field of American Studies. The seminars are intended to reflect the programme's profile and its focus on interdisciplinarity, political and cultural theory, and inter-American perspectives. In the academic year 2024-2025, for instance, the seminars addressed:

- 'Surveillance and Empire in the United States' (the intersection of digital media and American empire)
- 'American Revolution Today' (contemporary debates about the American Revolution)

The programme has recently been restructured, replacing one of the first-semester research seminars with a new 10-EC module ('Histories and Methods in American Studies'). The motivation for this was to ensure that methodology is taught more explicitly, in order to better equip students to design and complete their own research project. Because of the high theoretical level this course is currently being considered by the Netherlands American Studies Association (NASA), as a nation-wide doctoral course.

In the second semester, students may choose the seminar 'Writing for the Real World', an internship (10 EC) or study abroad in addition to the thesis.

Students are only allowed to do an internship based on an approved proposal, which contains at least a description of the employment setting; a list of the learning aims; and a detailed plan of activities.

The procedure and assessment criteria are published in the Master's Internship Guidelines. Prior to embarking on an internship, students, together with their academic internship supervisor (a member of the academic staff) as well as their workplace supervisor, define the specific and generic learning outcomes of the internship. At the end of their internship, students write a final report in which they describe their actual work experience. The report is assessed by the student's academic supervisor in consultation with the workplace supervisor to ensure that the learning outcomes have been met. Past internships were completed, among others, at Washington State University, the National Endowment for Democracy, the Dutch Embassy in Washington, D.C., the Dutch Embassy in Ottawa, and the Dutch Consulate in New York.

To strengthen the master programme's connection to the labour market, as was recommended by the previous panel, the seminar 'Writing for the Real World' was developed. It is strongly focused on public writing and speaking and other career-related skills. Within the course, students collaborate with local cultural and heritage organizations in ways that are similar to the work associated with an internship.

The panel finds the master programme to be well structured. It applauds the efforts to strengthen the methodology aspect in the seminar 'Histories and Methods in American Studies'. This ensures that

students who come from different bachelor programmes build a shared, solid foundation in American Studies. The small-group and research-driven teaching promotes active student participation and develops advanced writing and analytical skills.

The programme's content is broad and ambitious, the panel found, which fits the profile. It studied a sample of the course literature and found the level to be excellent. It fully supports the practice of letting the content of the seminars be partly determined by the staff's ongoing research. This is suitable for a master programme. 'Writing for the Real World' struck the panel as a very worthwhile addition to the programme.

2.2. Learning environment

Language of instruction

The bachelor and master programmes are taught in an immersive English context. The language of instruction for both programmes is English, in order to develop students' command of the global, intercultural lingua franca; to prepare them for master programmes that may be taught in English; and to prepare them for employment scenarios in which English is likely to remain important. The teaching staff possesses native or near-native proficiency in English. The panel approves of the choice of the English language for the programme's education and name. The ability to communicate effectively in English is a key aspect of what the programme wants to teach its students. Teaching in English is well justified for academic, intercultural, and employability reasons. The immersive setting prepares students for an international career and enables the programme to attract international staff. The English proficiency of the teaching staff is excellent, as is also confirmed by the students. The panel endorses the clear choice for English wholeheartedly.

Vision on teaching

The programmes place the faculty's international research expertise at the heart of their teaching, and train students to carry out interdisciplinary American Studies research themselves. The staff teaches as much as possible face-to-face in small-group seminars. This allows for intensive interaction between students and instructors, as well as between individual students during joint assignments. As explained in the self-assessment report, the learning experience is becoming increasingly problem- or task-based, training students to develop and apply independent learning and research skills over the course of the curriculum. During the interviews, students expressed strong appreciation for this activating approach and the extensive contact they have with the staff. The panel was impressed by the shared vision on teaching the staff displayed during the interviews.

Teaching methods

Both programmes use a variety of teaching methods to activate students with different learning styles and to highlight various aspects of American Studies. Teaching methods include a variety of "active learning" methods, including presentations and discussions, visits to archives and cultural institutions, and seminar-based teaching.

As part of a faculty-wide *Active Learning Initiative*, two bachelor courses (North and South Americas and Mobility, Migration, and Transculturation) were redesigned around group-based, in-class presentations,

contributing to a more varied portfolio of teaching methods and assessments. The students value the small-scale education and interactive teaching methods in the bachelor and master programmes as well as the strong focus on academic writing in English. The panel appreciates the fact that the lecturers meet regularly (for so-called “heidagen”) to review courses and ensure that teaching and assessment methods are aligned.

The bachelor programme features about 12 contact hours per week in the first year, plus several mentor meetings, decreasing to around 8 contact hours per week and one-on-one thesis supervision in the final semester of the third year. The master programme starts with about 9 contact hours per week during the first semester, declining to about 5 contact hours per week in the thesis-writing phase, when one-on-one supervision is again offered. Small class sizes in both programmes enable close interaction between students and lecturers, fostering personalized feedback and academic support.

In the bachelor programme, students can tailor their study path, following their own interests by choosing a minor programme, an internship, or a semester abroad. The Faculty of Arts offers several minors, including a multidisciplinary minor and a career-oriented minor.

The panel found that the students in the master programme have a lot of autonomy and can choose their own direction. They combine self-study with small-scale seminars.

The teaching approach aims to deepen and broaden students’ understanding by fostering interactive group discussion and encouraging contributions grounded in independent reading, thereby facilitating students’ autonomous engagement with the seminar topics. The students praised the small-scale interactive seminars as well as the opportunity to make individual choices in the seminars. They commented that they would like to get more career orientation in the programme. The ‘Writing for the Real World’ seminar is a very useful addition to the master programme, and most students take this course instead of the internship or the study abroad programme.

From the documentation and discussions during the site visit, the panel gathered that the programmes provide a safe and supportive learning environment that fosters active student participation. Students appreciate the small-scale setting, the short communication lines to lecturers and the constructive and detailed feedback that is provided to them. Students feel they are taken seriously and that their opinions and needs are respected and valued within both programmes. Another attractive feature of the programmes, according to the students, is that they can choose their own direction and study path, following their own interests. The programmes, they also note, offer clear and detailed information about the curriculum and learning objectives.

The panel approves of the teaching methods in both programmes. It considers the small-scale teaching methods very suitable for the programmes’ aims. The bar is set high, and a lot of personal initiative is expected of the students. This fits in with the programmes’ profiles.

Generative AI

Because of the emphasis on academic writing, the development of GenAI could have serious implications for the learning environment. When discussing this during the site visit, the panel observed hesitation

and serious reservations on the part of the staff. The staff are adamant that they do not wish the students to be “de-skilled” or take shortcuts in their learning process. The programme committee and the staff in general discuss GenAI regularly.

The panel understands the programmes’ cautious approach to the use of generative AI, given the strong emphasis on academic writing and the importance of safeguarding students’ independent analytical and writing skills. At the same time, the panel notes that AI literacy is becoming an increasingly relevant academic competence. It therefore advises the programmes to move beyond a primarily restrictive approach and to have students engage more explicitly with the possibilities and limitations of generative AI, in a manner that is aligned with the intended learning outcomes, though it notes that some steps have been taken in this direction in the ‘Writing for the Real World’ course.

Intake and admission

The admission requirements for the bachelor programme require students to hold a Dutch VWO diploma or a propaedeutic or final diploma from a Dutch university of applied sciences. The bachelor programme requires incoming students to have sufficient English language proficiency. The additional English language requirements are: a VWO diploma or a subject certificate for VWO English (mark 6 or higher), minimum requirement of TOEFL iBT 90 (with a minimum of 21 on all items), or IELTS 6.5 (with a minimum of 6 on all items) or Cambridge C1 Advanced or C2 Proficiency with a minimum score of 180.

The Faculty of Arts believes that students can decide for themselves whether they match their chosen programme based on the available information, by visiting the Open Days, and by participating in a Webclass and/or Student for a Day. The degree programme organizes an additional matching procedure for students. Attendance is optional.

The master programme is open to students who have completed a bachelor programme in American Studies from the University of Groningen or from another Dutch university. Additionally, UG students with another Humanities/Arts programme in combination with the minor programme in American Studies are admissible. For all other cases, the programme’s Admission Board decides about admission to the master programme.

The master programme requires incoming students to have sufficient English language proficiency. The additional English language requirements are: a VWO diploma or a subject certificate for VWO English (mark 6 or higher), a minimum requirement of TOEFL iBT 100 (with a minimum score for speaking and writing of 25 (each)), or an IELTS score of 7 (with a minimum of 6.5 on all items) or Cambridge C1 Advanced or C2 Proficiency with a minimum score of 185.

Since 2019, the intake in the master programme has been an average of 11 students. The large majority of students have a background in American Studies, History or English. The students with a non-American Studies background assured the panel that they were well prepared for the programme.

The panel understands that the low average intake is a reason for the faculty board to explore the option of integrating American Studies as a specialization in the master programmes History and Literary Studies. The panel discussed this difficult situation with the staff and was pleased with their constructive attitude. Although they would understandably prefer to retain the master as an independent

programme, they see opportunities for better visibility and cooperation in becoming a specialization in one or more other programmes. Becoming a specialization in a larger programme might enhance the visibility of the field of American Studies and could open up new possibilities for cooperation between staff members.

Based on the documentation and the conversations during the site visit, the panel finds that the programmes apply appropriate admission requirements.

Feasibility

The feasibility of the programmes is supported, among others, by careful curriculum design, with study loads distributed progressively and more challenging subjects and skills placed later in the programmes. The panel learned from the data on the programme cards that study duration fluctuates greatly, especially in the master programme. Study duration in the bachelor programme is on average 3.5 years, while in the master programme it is nearly two years.

The new Faculty of Arts bachelor thesis policy, designed to ensure more students complete on time, has been successful. During the writing process, all students supervised by the same instructor regularly meet in small groups. They submit a draft of the thesis and receive written and oral feedback on both this draft and the final version of the thesis.

Even though the average master duration is close to two years, the rate of master students finishing the programme within one year has improved substantially since 2019, when the programme started streamlining the proposal process and enforcing stricter submission deadlines.

In response to the advice of the previous panel, the master programme now dedicates the second half of the 'Histories and Methods' course to the writing of a thesis proposal, which is submitted at the end of the first semester. Based on these proposals, the supervisor is assigned before the start of the second semester. These measures have had a positive effect on the completion rates. The students mentioned to the panel that it is difficult to combine a study abroad or an internship with the thesis work. At the same time, they appreciate the possibility of doing an internship or study abroad. The programme is aware of this problem and offers students supportive information about the internship process in the . The students find this very helpful and feel well informed about the consequences of a long internship.

According to the students, both programmes are intensive but feasible. They mention that working in the bachelor seminar group has really helped to improve the achievability of the bachelor thesis. During the previous accreditation, students remarked that the combination of the master thesis with an internship was very difficult. The programme has improved the information provided in the Master's Internship Guidelines and has restructured the master thesis process. Students told the panel that the combination of thesis and internship is still challenging, but that they feel well informed and supported by the programme.

The panel is satisfied to see that the previous panel's recommendation to give the bachelor thesis trajectory more structure and to assign the master thesis supervisor at an earlier stage has been taken to heart. These measures have had a positive effect on the completion rates.

Based on the documentation and the interviews during the site visit, the panel finds that the feasibility of the programmes is adequate.

Information and guidance

Information provision to students is managed through online study guides and course syllabi, detailing course objectives, assessment methods, and transferable skills. To increase students' awareness of the relationship between their courses and employability, each bachelor syllabus includes an "Employability" section highlighting the transferable skills acquired. Communication between lecturers and students is facilitated via the Brightspace platform, which is also used for disseminating course materials and providing feedback.

The bachelor programme implemented a mentorship programme during the first year, where a staff member, together with a senior student, supports new students socially and academically, helping them acclimatise to university life and study demands. The students find this very helpful. Supervisors provide close one-on-one guidance for theses and internships in both programmes, supplemented by peer feedback in thesis seminars.

At the start of the programme, master students receive information from the programme coordinator and the study adviser, who also provides support and guidance. Students are invited to an introduction day event at the start of the semester and, during the academic year, receive news and information about the programme in person, via email, and via the online course platform Brightspace, which has an area dedicated to the master programme.

The American Studies student association EPU organizes activities ranging from academic talks to community-building events. EPU also regularly organizes career and alumni events.

In addition to this, students have the support of one or more study advisers who serve as the student's first point of contact for questions and/or problems related to the study.

Regarding facilities for students with special support needs, the faculty study adviser serves as the primary point of contact within the care structure. The study adviser has a mandate, granted by the Board of Examiners (the body ultimately responsible), to assign and register the necessary accommodations. Study advisers consult with the student counsellors at university level about suitable accommodations for students.

The panel sees that students benefit from the well-organized study counselling. The bachelor mentorship programme is a great addition, helping students to find their way in the academic environment.

2.3. Teaching staff

The small, dedicated teaching staff is responsible for both the bachelor and the master programme. They come from various international backgrounds, including the USA and Canada. They all have a PhD and all

but one have a BKO teaching qualification, and all the core staff publish internationally and design and teach courses closely related to their own research.

The core of the teaching staff consists of seven lecturers, with two additional lecturers for the bachelor programme. Over the past couple of years, the American Studies programme has seen turbulent times, with the untimely death of a senior staff member and the departure of the recently appointed chair. The year-long search for a new full professor was terminated in 2023. An internal candidate entered the tenure track to become a full professor in American Studies. The staff organize regular staff meetings and so-called “heidagen” to discuss ongoing developments in the curriculum and the faculty and to discuss pedagogical and organizational matters.

The panel was impressed by the enthusiasm and fervour of the team and the high quality of the staff: an international team with strong research profiles and a good variety of expertise. The BKO-certified instructors ensure content expertise and didactical competence. The regularly organized “heidagen” ensure coherence and coordination of the courses and didactical approach.

The students endorse these observations. In the interviews, they reported that the staff are a strong asset of the programme: they are approachable and very involved. In the student chapter, they consider the quality of the staff to be a strength of the programme. This is reflected in high student ratings, with the bachelor programme scoring an above-average 4.3 out of 5 in the 2024 National Student Survey (the response for the master programme is too low to report results). The students also reward the staff involvement and contact with a score of 4.1.

Conclusion

The panel appreciates the bachelor and master programmes’ thoughtful design of their curriculum and learning paths, which not only cover relevant content but also integrate various methods and transferable skills. This leads to well-structured programmes with clear, coherent learning paths, ensuring that all students achieve the intended learning outcomes. The panel advises the bachelor programme to reassess the alignment of the intended learning outcomes, the curriculum and the assessment criteria of the thesis in view of the implementation of the faculty-wide courses.

The panel appreciates the opportunity for students to focus on their individual interests within the curriculum and approves of the teaching methods in both programmes. The interdisciplinary approach and strong focus on academic writing contribute to a well-rounded learning trajectory. The panel highlights the valuable small-scale, supportive and student-centred learning environment of both programmes, with important roles for the study advisor, lecturers and supervisors. The bachelor mentorship programme is a great addition, helping students to find their way into the academic environment. The panel considers the small-scale teaching methods very suitable for the programmes’ aims. Because of the strong focus on writing skills, the panel advises being more proactive in discussing the reality of GenAI with both staff and students and addressing its limitations and potential in an appropriate way, aligned with the intended learning outcomes.

The 'Writing for the Real World' seminar in the master programme is seen as a particularly strong element that provides students with real-life experience and strengthens their connection to the professional field. The panel agrees with the students that elements of this seminar could be integrated in the bachelor curriculum as well. The panel is satisfied to see that the feasibility of the thesis has improved in both programmes by giving more structure to the bachelor trajectory and by assigning the master thesis supervisor at an earlier stage.

The panel praises the quality and engagement of the teaching staff, as well as their ability to manage a very intensive and high-level programme in turbulent times. The panel endorses the clear choice for English wholeheartedly and is impressed by the attention paid by the staff to helping the students master the English language and academic writing skills at a high level.

The panel concludes that, all in all, the programmes in American Studies offer their students a stimulating and supportive environment, in accordance with the ambitious intended learning outcomes. In its view, the learning environment convincingly enables students to achieve an academically oriented bachelor or master degree.

Based on the interviews and the review of the underlying documentation, the panel concludes that the programmes **meet standard 2: Teaching-learning environment**.

Standard 3: student assessment

<i>The programme has an adequate system of student assessment in place.</i>

System of assessment

The assessment policy of the programmes is built on the UG policy on assessment and the faculty-wide policies outlined in the faculty's Teaching and Examination Regulations, and the Guidelines of the Faculty Board of Examiners. The programmes have implemented several measures to safeguard the quality of assessment. The programmes use annually updated assessment plans that provide a detailed overview of the various modes and moments of assessment and their relative weights. In addition, the Assessment Matrix links courses to the intended learning outcomes of each programme, thus monitoring that all intended learning outcomes are covered in the curriculum.

The various modes of assessment are considered tools that stimulate and guide students' learning process while at the same time helping staff verify whether students have reached the intended learning outcomes. All course syllabi contain details about the modes of assessment, the criteria of evaluation, the relative weight of the various components of the aggregate grade, and the deadlines for written assignments. In each course module, the programme uses grading guidelines with clearly specified criteria for each assignment.

Both programmes adopt a variety of assessment methods designed to evaluate different types of learning outcomes and accommodate diverse learning styles. Assessment methods include short and long essay writing assignments, research reports, oral presentations and occasional group work. On the

annual “heidagen” the staff always incorporates a grading exercise to calibrate assessment standards among themselves. The staff reviews the assessment methods regularly, lately mostly in view of GenAI developments (see later in this standard).

In the bachelor programme, assessments progress in complexity over the years to test more integrated knowledge and skills. Given that the acquisition of advanced-level English language skills is an important learning outcome of the programme, in-class participation is part of the assessment for many course modules. In larger courses with a teaching team, exams and essay assignments are collaboratively designed. Narrow fails are routinely double-graded. Students comment positively on the extensive feedback they receive on all modes of assessment, either in written format (on essays, position papers, and exams), or orally (for presentations and during exam inspections).

Course-specific objectives and assessment strategies are communicated to students via online study guides and syllabi, supplemented by the Brightspace platform for communication and feedback. Students have expressed appreciation for the variety and fairness of assessment, rating examinations via the National Student Survey 2024 at a solid 3.9 out of 5 for the bachelor programme (response for the master programme is too low to be meaningful). In the interview, students informed the panel that they are well informed about the assessment forms and criteria, and that they get a lot of feedback on their work.

Assessment in the master programme takes a variety of forms across the different seminars, from research essays that develop students’ ability as independent investigators to in-class group discussions, presentations, and class participation. In line with the research-intensive learning environment, all forms of assessment ask students to conduct independent research and to engage critically with their findings. The production of research essays is important throughout the programme. In the elective seminar ‘Writing for the Real World’ students are assessed on their ability to write for a non-academic public.

The panel finds that the range and well-organized spread of assessment methods throughout the curriculum is well thought-out. The assessments are challenging and activating and fit in well with the programme’s aims. The students informed the panel that they receive feedback on all assignments and that they appreciate the strong improvement in their writing skills. The panel appreciates that command of the English language is an explicit object of assessment. However, for the bachelor programme, it advises to reconsider the emphasis on written assessments (essays) in favour of a wider range of assessment methods in light of developments in the field of GenAI.

Grading guidelines specify criteria to mark assignments such as presentations, essays or exams. In the panel’s view, these guarantee consistent and transparent assessment throughout the courses. The double grading of near-failing grades is a good example of the energy the team puts into achieving a strong quality culture. Combined with the carefully designed assessment plan and assessment matrix, this evinces that the programme has its assessment well under control.

The programmes demonstrate strong student-oriented communication by providing transparent information about learning objectives, assessment formats, and grading criteria in the syllabi and on Brightspace. This transparency ensures that students are well-informed about what is expected from

them and how their performance will be judged, which was confirmed during the interviews with the students. The panel identifies a clear progression in the complexity of assessment methods in the master programme compared to the bachelor programme, which aligns with the expected academic development at the master level.

Thesis assessment

The bachelor thesis is around 8,000 words (10 EC). An American Studies master thesis is typically around 15,000 words (20 EC). The theses are assessed on the basis of specific criteria outlined in the Bachelor Thesis Guidelines and the Master's Dissertation Guidelines. These guidelines provide detailed instructions on the process, a description of the assessment procedure, an overview of the learning outcomes and a detailed set of grading guidelines. All theses are graded independently by two examiners (the supervisor and a second reader appointed by the thesis coordinator) using thesis assessment forms. The examiners grade the thesis independently. Once they have done so, they discuss the assessments and agree on a final grade. If large discrepancies arise in grading or no agreement can be reached, a third examiner is appointed by the Board of Examiners.

In response to the advice of the previous panel the faculty introduced a digital system for the thesis assessment forms, which has greatly simplified administration and has made the assessment more transparent for the students. The assessment forms include an area for comments that calls for specific references to the learning outcomes and grading guidelines. The use of standardized assessment forms for the thesis ensures consistency and transparency of grading criteria. The four-eyes principle is applied to the assessment of theses. Calibration is assured through grading exercises during staff meetings.

According to the panel, the protocol for thesis assessment is clear and well-defined, providing transparency and structure for both students and examiners. The dual assessment approach supports the reliability of the evaluation process, while the incorporation of the four-eyes principle in the assessment of theses contributes to fairness in grading. The panel finds the criteria in the thesis assessment forms well-chosen. Based on the interviews with students, the panel learned that students find the criteria helpful while writing their thesis and that they receive extensive feedback during the thesis process. However, it found that final feedback via the assessment forms is sometimes very brief. Feedback with regard to the different assessment criteria is provided in a holistic narrative, resulting in not all assessment criteria being consistently covered. Some forms also feature very short assessments.

To safeguard a systematic, comparable assessment of all criteria, the panel recommends asking assessors to comment on all the separate criteria in the assessment form instead of using the *holistic narrative*. This contributes to a systematic assessment and prevents bias, thereby improving the accountability of the grades. The panel also advises making the writing process and students' independence part of the assessment.

Board of Examiners

The Faculty of Arts has one Board of Examiners, which supervises the quality, validity, and reliability of assessment. The Board of Examiners oversees six expert teams for different disciplines within the Faculty. The programmes of American Studies belong to the expert team of Cluster 4. This expert team consists

of five staff members (one of whom serves as chair) and an ex officio assessment expert. In accordance with the Dutch Higher Education and Research Act (WHW), the Board of Examiners functions autonomously and issues guidelines and instructions on quality control of assessments. It furthermore determines which staff members are qualified as examiners for the programmes, monitors the programme's compliance with its Teaching and Examination Regulations, and assures the quality of the assessment in individual courses.

The Board of Examiners systematically monitors this alignment through quality assurance checks. Every semester, it selects several theses as well as several courses for evaluation, either at random or following feedback from student evaluations or the Programme Committee. All examiners must ensure that a so-called "testing report" is made available to the Board of Examiners after a course is completed, which includes the course syllabus, the assignment plus instructions, the assessment criteria, as well as an evaluation form which has been filled in by the examiner and a colleague acting as peer reviewer. The Board of Examiners reports its findings and instructions to the examiners involved and shares the results with the Cluster Board to undertake further action in case of problems.

The panel finds the Board of Examiners to be active and well aware of its duties. The assessments of the programmes are systematically monitored. The Board of Examiners leaves programmes a lot of autonomy in its assessment practices and for differentiation between the programmes. It would be helpful if the Board of Examiners would not only monitor whether the assessment procedures have been followed, but would also facilitate discussions on the content of the assessment and the quality of the rubrics, as well as on grade calibration. The panel advises the Board of Examiners to be more active in sharing best practices and to calibrate grading throughout the faculty. The conclusions and results of the samples could be shared and discussed much more widely for the further development of the quality of teaching and assessment.

Artificial Intelligence

As programmes differ considerably, the Faculty of Arts has not yet adopted a general policy with regard to generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI). The programmes in American Studies actively address the challenges and opportunities in assessment presented by GenAI. Currently, the programmes choose to restrict the use of GenAI; the use of AI-generated content in assessments is not allowed unless explicitly permitted by the examiner under certain conditions. All syllabi have a clear statement regarding how generative GenAI may or may not be used in coursework.

The panel discussed the ongoing debate on the use of GenAI with the Board of Examiners and the staff and found them to be actively considering the challenges. The idea to incorporate more oral assessments in feedback conversations or a thesis defence is useful to counteract AI-related academic integrity issues. The panel understands that the consequences of GenAI are still unclear and ever changing. It does, however, advise the Board of Examiners, but even more the American Studies staff, to discuss the topic regularly, and to consider gradually incorporating the use of GenAI in teaching and assessment, so as to promote AI literacy among students. Actively sharing good practices and experiences in the faculty can be very useful to come to a shared vision on GenAI.

Conclusion

The panel appreciates the programmes' assessment system for being valid, reliable, transparent, and aligned with the intended learning outcomes. The panel commends the clarity and explicit linking of final qualifications to the assessment criteria at course level. The focus on academic writing is reflected in the chosen assessments and in the rubrics. The systematic use of varied assessment forms respects diverse learning styles and assesses different learning outcomes and skills. The panel advises the staff to be more proactive in discussing the challenges and opportunities of GenAI in relation to the assessment forms and intended learning outcomes. The panel advises the Board of Examiners to share experiences with GenAI within the Faculty of Arts.

The panel sees a systematic alignment of assessments through the annually updated assessment plans, which help the programmes to obtain coherence throughout the curriculum and to support the validity and transparency of the examination process. The use of standardized assessment forms for the thesis and the presence of faculty-wide guidelines for assessment enhance fairness and standardization across courses. The use of dual assessors and standardized thesis forms contributes to consistency and fairness in grading practices for the thesis. The panel observes that constructive feedback is a substantial and integral part of the assessment system, with students receiving feedback on draft versions of assignments whenever practicable. However, to safeguard a systematic assessment of all criteria for the thesis, the panel recommends asking assessors to comment on all the separate criteria in the assessment form instead of using the *holistic narrative*, thereby improving the comparability and accountability of the grades. The panel also advises making the writing process and students' independence part of the assessment.

The panel notes that the Board of Examiners carries out its legal duties effectively in overseeing the assessment system, thereby ensuring the quality and integrity of student assessments. The collaboration between the Board of Examiners and the programmes is effective and leads to continuous attention for the quality of assessment. As the Board operates faculty-wide, the panel advises it to focus not only on the procedures, but to be more active in sharing best practices and calibrating grades throughout the faculty, thus further enhancing the quality of teaching and assessment.

Based on the interviews and the review of the underlying documentation, the panel concludes that the bachelor and the master programme **meet standard 3: Student assessment**.

Standard 4: achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Finding and considerations

Bachelor and master thesis

Prior to the site visit, the panel reviewed a representative selection of 15 recently completed bachelor theses and 15 master theses. The selection process considered a fair distribution across grades and various assessors.

The panel finds that the bachelor theses are of a high level and convincingly demonstrate that students have achieved the intended learning outcomes, with topics often being original, relevant to the field of American Studies, and well embedded in the literature. The theses demonstrate a high level of academic writing and a good command of English. All theses meet the expectations of the bachelor level, with the strongest examples exceeding them, showing theoretical awareness and methodological sophistication.

The quality of the master theses is also considered high by the panel and convincingly demonstrate a high level of academic writing and a good command of English. Some theses demonstrate great mastery of methods and literature, originality, and academic rigour. Across all key learning outcomes, students display strengths in integrating literature, using advanced academic sources, demonstrating originality, and engaging in forward-looking research reflection. While execution varies—from more descriptive work or methodological reflections that remain relatively brief to conceptually refined and academically mature writing—all theses meet the expectations of the master level, with the strongest examples clearly exceeding them. The panel praises these theses for their creative and well-structured approach and deep analytical insights.

The panel notes that while the assessment forms for the bachelor theses offer the possibility of giving feedback for each assessment criterion, the assessment form for master theses only offers one feedback field. Although the forms are mostly adequately filled out with a logical motivation supporting the grades, as mentioned in Standard 3, assessments would be more comparable and accountable if feedback were systematically provided for each criterion (this is now rarely done even on the bachelor assessment forms).

Performance of graduates

The majority of American Studies bachelor graduates pursue a master degree, mostly in the humanities. Frequently chosen master programmes are in the fields of journalism, European culture, criminology, modern history and international relations. Several students pursue their education in research masters. The effect of the strong focus on writing skills in the programme is evident in the bachelor theses the panel has read. Accordingly, students who continue their education in other programmes than American Studies find that their writing skills stand out compared to others.

On the basis of the documentation and conversations during the site visit, the panel finds that alumni of the bachelor programme are well equipped for admission into (research) master programmes and incidentally for careers in education, policy work and journalism, among others.

The master programme prepares graduates for both academic and professional arenas. As a measure of its international academic success, several past graduates of the programme have been accepted into competitive and fully funded PhD programmes in the United States and in the Netherlands. Most graduates transition effectively into professions in fields that require expertise in American Studies, such as media and journalism, government and diplomacy or the educational sector. Feedback from alumni confirms that the skills developed during the master programme have been instrumental in their career

development. In the student chapter, the students mention the strong emphasis on critical thinking and the excellent preparation for *academically oriented* careers as a strength of the programme.

They also mention, however, that many find it difficult to translate the academic knowledge and competencies into *non-academic career paths*. They find it challenging to envision how their academic training can be applied outside of university settings. To address this, the student chapter suggests creating closer ties to governmental or media organizations and highlighting in the bachelor and master courses how their skills are relevant in professional environments beyond academia. The panel endorses this idea, although it noted that the course manuals contain an employability section already.

The programme has improved employability by introducing the master seminar 'Writing for the Real World'. Furthermore, the faculty has recently appointed an alumni officer to enhance contact and events with alumni. The panel commends these initiatives but urges the programmes to proceed with the introduction of an employability council (*werkveldadviescommissie*) to ensure structural involvement of alumni and labour market representatives in curriculum development and employability activities. This gives insight into the broad profile of the jobs the students find and it also helps to align the learning outcomes of the programme with developments in the professional field. As mentioned in standard 1, the council can also advise the bachelor programme on the learning outcomes when implementing the faculty-wide courses.

Conclusion

Judging by the quality of the bachelor and master theses, the discussions the panel had with students and alumni, and informal reports and comments about student and alumni success facilitated by the programme, the panel concludes that students of the bachelor and master programmes American Studies convincingly realise the intended learning outcomes. As mentioned in standard 3 the panel recommends asking assessors to comment on all the separate assessment criteria instead of using the *holistic narrative* to safeguard a systematic assessment of all criteria for the thesis.

The theses provide strong evidence of the programmes' success in preparing their students for academic and professional careers. It pleases the panel to see that the bachelor programme effectively equips students with the necessary competencies to not only engage successfully in further academic (research) master programmes, but also in professional careers. The master programme succeeds in developing academic skills that align well with the expectations of postgraduate education and the professional field. At the same time students find it challenging to envision how their academic training can be applied outside of university settings. The panel recommends proceeding with the establishment of an employability council (*werkveldadviescommissie*) to ensure structural involvement of alumni and labour market representatives in curriculum development and employability activities. The panel endorses the suggestion of the students to create closer ties to the labour market to illustrate how the academic skills fostered by the programmes are relevant in professional environments beyond academia.

Based on the interviews and the review of the underlying documentation, the panel concludes that the bachelor and the master programme **meet standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes**.

Final conclusion

The NVAO-approved panel has assessed both programmes against four standards. The panel concludes that the bachelor American Studies and the master North-American Studies meet all standards (intended learning outcomes, teaching-learning environment, student assessment and achieved learning outcomes) and therefore rates the overall quality of the two programmes as positive.

Standard	Judgment bachelor	Judgment master
Intended learning outcomes <i>Standard 1: The intended learning outcomes tie in with the level and orientation of the program; they are geared to the expectations of the professional field, the discipline and international requirements.</i>	Meets the standard	Meets the standard
Teaching-learning environment <i>Standard 2: The curriculum, the teaching-learning environment and the quality of the teaching staff enable the incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.</i>	Meets the standard	Meets the standard
Student assessment <i>Standard 3: The program has an adequate system of assessment in place.</i>	Meets the standard	Meets the standard
Achieved learning outcomes <i>Standard 4: The program demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.</i>	Meets the standard	Meets the standard
Final conclusion	Positive	Positive

In the preceding paragraphs, the panel has discussed and substantiated its positive comments on the programmes for each standard. The programmes are commended for the following features of good practice:

- Rich, ambitious, multidisciplinary, and internationally oriented curricula;
- Master course ‘History and Methods of American Studies,’ being considered by the Netherlands American Studies Association (NASA), as a high theoretical level doctoral course
- A small-scale, supportive, and student-centered learning environment;
- A strong emphasis on academic writing in English;
- Clear learning paths with extensive supervision and feedback on assignments;
- High-quality, engaged teaching staff;
- Valid, reliable, and transparent assessment system;

- Strong academic focus of the bachelor and master theses;
- The bachelor thesis seminar;
- Improved attention towards preparation for non-academic careers in the ‘Writing for the Real World’ master seminar.

In this report, the panel makes several suggestions and observations, which are **not** strictly recommendations.

For both programmes the panel advises the following:

- To have students engage more explicitly with the possibilities and limitations of generative AI;
- To reconsider the emphasis on written assessments (essays) in favour of a wider range of assessment methods in light of developments in the field of GenAI (bachelor programme);
- For the Board of Examiners to become more active in sharing best practices, calibrating grading throughout the faculty and discussing the conclusions and results of the samples more widely for the further development of the quality of teaching and assessment;
- To strengthen ties to future employers, such as governmental and media organizations for labour market preparation.

The panel recommends several follow-up actions to further improve the programmes. These recommendations do not detract from the positive assessment of the quality of the programmes:

- Enhance the alignment of the intended learning outcomes, the curriculum and the assessment criteria of the thesis in view of the implementation of the faculty-wide courses;
- To safeguard a systematic assessment of all bachelor and master thesis criteria, the panel recommends asking assessors to comment on all criteria in the assessment forms instead of providing a *holistic narrative*. The panel also advises making the writing process and students’ independence part of the assessment;
- To proceed with the establishment of an employability council (werkveldadviescommissie) to structurally involve alumni and labour market representatives in curriculum development and employability activities.

4. ANNEXES

Annex 1: Administrative data

Institution	
Name in RIO	Universiteit Groningen
Adress	Postbus 72, 9700 AB Groningen
Website	www.rug.nl
BRIN number	21PC

Programme	
Programme name in RIO	Bachelor American Studies
International name	Bachelor American Studies
Location	Groningen
Programme number in RIO	50623
Orientation and level	WO bachelor
Research master	No
Language of instruction	English
(Legal) professional requirements	No
Specialisations	-
Joint programme	No
Distinctive feature	No
Degree awarded and addition to the degree	Bachelor of Arts
Study load in EC	180
Variant(s) (full-time, part-time, dual)	full-time
Working with units of learning outcomes (full-time, part-time, dual)	No
External assessment group classification	WO cluster Regiostudies I
Submission date of accreditation report	1 May 2026
Other (e.g. name change or extension of study duration)	

Programme	
Programme name in RIO	Master Noord-Amerika Studies
International name	Master North American Studies
Location	Groningen
Programme number in RIO	60845
Orientation and level	WO master
Research master	No
Language of instruction	English
(Legal) professional requirements	No
All study programmes/tracks/specialisations	-
Joint programme	No
Distinctive feature	No
Degree awarded and addition to the degree	Master of Arts
Study load in EC	60
Variant(s) (full-time, part-time, dual)	full-time
Working with units of learning outcomes (full-time, part-time, dual)	No
External assessment group classification	WO cluster Regiostudies I
Submission date of accreditation report	1 May 2026
Other (e.g. name change or extension of study duration)	

Annex 2: Learning outcomes of the programme

Intended learning outcomes of the bachelor programme American Studies

Dublin Descriptors for BA Level	Learning Outcomes for the BA programme in American Studies articulated in Key Competences A Bachelor Degree in American Studies is awarded to students who demonstrate:
Acquiring Knowledge and Understanding Students have demonstrated knowledge and understanding in a field of study that builds upon their general secondary education, and is typically at a level that, whilst supported by advanced textbooks, includes some aspects that will be informed by knowledge at the forefront of their field of study.	1a. broad, interdisciplinary knowledge and understanding of major themes and developments in history and culture of the American continents, from the late fifteenth century to the present. 1b. understanding of methodologies within the discipline of American Studies (especially “close reading” and “contextualization”), as well as familiarity with theories relevant to the analysis of culture, politics, society, and media in the Americas.
Applying Knowledge and Understanding Students can apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner that indicates a professional approach to their work or vocation, and have competences typically demonstrated through devising and sustaining arguments and solving problems within their field of study.	2a. the ability to close-read a wide variety of texts, and contextualize them within broader events and developments in the Americas. 2b. the ability to work constructively with others to accomplish specific goals. 2c. the ability to plan and complete appropriate coursework in the form of argument-driven essays. 2d. the ability to organize and carry out a substantial research project (i.e. a 8,000-word thesis) within an established time frame. 2e. awareness of and commitment to scholarly standards in terms of accuracy, ethical behavior, and breadth of sources used and cited in assignments and in the final BA thesis.
Making Informed Judgments and Choices	3a. the ability to conduct guided and semi-independent research, as well as to gather, select, and critically evaluate relevant information from print and electronic resources.

Students have the ability to gather and interpret relevant data (usually within their field of study) to inform judgements that include reflection on relevant social, scientific or ethical issues.	3b. the ability to select relevant insights from a range of disciplines to critically examine contemporary sociopolitical challenges facing multicultural societies. 3c. the ability to form well-grounded opinions about U.S. politics, culture, and media, taking into account historical specificities and power relations.
Communicating Knowledge and Understanding Students can communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences.	4 a. the ability to communicate effectively the results of one's research to both academic and non-specialist audiences, in both written and oral presentations. 4b. the ability to communicate effectively in an international and intercultural context. 4c [E]. proficiency in the target language of English at C2 level (near native) in the areas of listening and reading, and at C1 level (proficient) in written and spoken production (based on the CEFR). 4c [S]. proficiency in the target language of English at C2 level (near native) in the areas of listening and reading, and at C1 level (proficient) in written and spoken production, and have demonstrated proficiency in the target language of Spanish at A2/B1 level in the areas of listening, reading, writing and speaking (based on the CEFR), depending on their prior knowledge of Spanish
Capacities to Continue Learning Students have developed those learning skills that are necessary for them to continue to undertake further study with a high degree of autonomy.	5a. domain-specific and general knowledge, understanding, and skills to undertake independent research in academic (second-cycle degree programs requiring BA-level domain specific knowledge) or workplace contexts. 5b. the requisite intercultural awareness and skills to successfully work in an international employment and/or academic context.

* 4b [E] This learning outcome applies to students who do not opt for the Spanish Specialization Option as part of their electives.

* 4b [S] This learning outcome applies to students who choose the Spanish Specialization Option in year 2. Students with little or no previous knowledge of Spanish will reach level A2. Students who qualify for the advanced level Spanish course will reach B1. Students who have chosen the Spanish Specialization Option in year 2 have the possibility of taking additional 10 EC of Spanish language courses during their Study Abroad period.

Intended learning outcomes of the master programme North American Studies

Learning Outcomes for the MA Degree Programme in North American Studies articulated in Key Competences A Master Degree Programme in North American Studies is awarded to students who demonstrate:
1a. in-depth interdisciplinary knowledge and understanding of specific developments in cultures, politics, and media of the American continents, and their relevance in a global context. 1b. an understanding of the history of the field of American Studies both in the United States and Europe, and of how different conceptual, theoretical, and methodological approaches relevant to that field can be synthesized into interdisciplinary frameworks for understanding American culture.
2a. the ability to independently apply one or more theories and methodologies of the core disciplines of American Studies to the analysis of specific sociopolitical and/or cultural problems in the Americas, past or present. 2b. the ability to work constructively with others to accomplish specific goals. 2c. the ability to plan and complete appropriate coursework in the form of argument-driven research essays 2d. the ability to organize and carry out a substantial research project (i.e. a 15,000 word dissertation) within an established time frame. 2e. advanced awareness of and commitment to scholarly standards in terms of accuracy, ethical behavior, and the breadth of sources used and cited in assignments and in the final dissertation.
3a. the ability to formulate and refine a significant research problem, as well as to gather, select, and critically evaluate relevant information from a wide variety of print, archival, and electronic resources. 3b. the ability to integrate relevant insights from a range of disciplines to critically examine, and articulate possible solutions to, contemporary sociopolitical challenges facing multicultural societies. 3c. the ability to form well-grounded opinions, and engage in informed debate about U.S. politics, culture, and media, taking into account the historical and global dimensions of those problems.
4a. the ability to communicate effectively and convincingly the results of one's research, and to present complex/abstract information, to both academic and non-specialist audiences, in both writing and oral presentations. 4b. the ability to work and communicate effectively in an international and intercultural context, in-person and using digital technologies. 4c. proficiency in the target language of English at C2 level (near native) in the areas of listening and reading, in written and spoken production (based on the CEFR).
5a. domain-specific and general knowledge, understanding and skills to study autonomously and to formulate an original research problem, in academic (third-cycle degree programs requiring MA-level domain specific knowledge) or workplace contexts. 5b. the ability to demonstrate up-to-date knowledge about current developments in the United States and/or in the field of American Studies, and to fill specific knowledge gaps. 5c. the requisite intercultural awareness and skills to successfully work in an international employment and/or academic context.

Annex 3: Curriculum overview

Curriculum outline 2024-2025 Bachelor American Studies

	Semester 1	Semester 2
Course modules Year 1	Theories of Culture Ia and b: Race, Class, and Gender (5+5 ECTS)	The Americas IIa and b: New Frontiers (5+5 ECTS)
	The Americas Ia and b: The American Century and Beyond (5+5 ECTS)	American Politics I and II (5+5 ECTS)
	American Studies in Practice Ia and b (5+5 ECTS)	North and South Americans I and II (5+5 ECTS)
Course modules Year 2	The Americas III: From Exploration to Early Republic (10 ECTS)	
	American Studies in Practice II (10 ECTS)	Special Topics (20 ECTS) 2024-2025 Topics: American Conspiracy Culture Capitalism and Environment in Latin America; Decolonize This!; The 1960s and the New Left
	Theories of Culture II: Media Theory (5 ECTS) Theories of Culture II: Political Theory (5 ECTS)	Global USA or Cultural Analysis (10 ECTS)
Course modules Year 3	Minor (30 ECTS; Career Minor or Study Abroad Minor or Faculty of Arts Minor or University Minor)	Theories of Culture III: Consumer Nation (10 ECTS)
		Research Seminar: Migration, Mobility, Transculturation (10 ECTS)
		Bachelor's Thesis (10 ECTS)

Curriculum outline 2024-2025 Master North American Studies

Semester 1	Semester 2
Seminar 1: Histories and Methods of American Studies (10 EC)	<i>Either:</i> Seminar 4: Writing for the Real World (10 EC) <i>Or:</i> Study Abroad programme (10 EC ⁷)
Seminar 2: Surveillance and Empire in the United States (10 EC)	<i>Or:</i> Internship (10 EC)
Seminar 3: The American Revolution Today (10 EC)	Dissertation (20 EC)

Annex 4: Documents

Self-evaluation report Bachelor American Studies

Appendices:

- appendix 1: Positioning (QAA-Subject Benchmark Area Studies 2024)
- appendix 2: Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)
- appendix 3: Curriculum Alignment Table ILOs versus Courses
- appendix 4: Teaching team (see Documents for panel members)
- appendix 5: Quantitative data of teaching-learning environment
- appendix 6: Teaching and examination regulations
- appendix 7: List of graduates and information on the final works

Additional appendices:

- Teaching and Examination Regulations (TER) Part A, part B and Assessment plan
- Onderwijsjaarkaart / Educational annual card BA American Studies - 2024
- Thesis Documentation
 - BA American Studies - syllabus
 - Thesis Assessment Form BA American Studies
- Annual reports programme committee 2022-2023; 2023-2024, 2024-2025

Self-evaluation report Master North American Studies

Appendices:

- appendix 1: Positioning (QAA-Subject Benchmark Area Studies 2024)
- appendix 2: Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)
- appendix 2a: Curriculum Alignment Table ILOs versus Courses
- appendix 2b: Dublin Descriptors
- appendix 3: programme overview
- appendix 4: Teaching team
- appendix 5: Quantitative data of teaching-learning environment
- appendix 6: Teaching and examination regulations
- appendix 7: MA dissertation syllabus
- appendix 8: MA internship syllabus
- appendix 9: Recent MA dissertation titles (see Documents for panel members)
- appendix 10: Overview of findings from the previous accreditation panel & actions taken

Additional appendices:

- Teaching and Examination Regulations (TER) Part A, part B and Assessment plan
- Onderwijsjaarkaart / Educational annual card BA American Studies - 2024
- Thesis Documentation
 - MA North American Studies - syllabus
 - Thesis Assessment Form MA North American Studies
- Annual reports programme committee 2022-2023; 2023-2024, 2024-2025

Faculty introduction self-evaluation

- Appendix 1: Strategic Plan UG 2021-2026 (English version)
- Appendix 2: Strategic Plan Faculty of Arts 2021-2026 (English version)

- Appendix 3: RUG Toetsbeleid 2021-2026 / RUG Assessment Policy 2021-2026 (only available in Dutch)
- Appendix 4: Rules and Regulations faculty Board of Examiners (ECL)
- Appendix 5: Annual reports faculty Board of Examiners (ECL):2021-2022; 2022-2023; 2023-2024
- Appendix 6: Beleidsplan Studeren met een functiebeperking / Policy plan about studying with a disability (only available in Dutch)

Final projects

The programmes made available a list of final projects. This list contained all final projects of the last academic years. The chair of the panel selected 15 final projects per programme. Care was taken during the selection to obtain a balanced overview of grades, majors or tracks and diversity of examiners.

- **Bachelor American Studies:**

The list covering the period 01-07-2023 to 01-07-2025 includes 50 recent graduates. From these, the following selection of 15 final projects was made:

Grade range	Total nr	Selection
5.5 - 6.9 sufficient	25	7
7.0 - 8.4 good	19	5
8.5 - 10.0 very good	6	3

- **Master North American Studies:**

The list covering the period 01-07-2021 to 01-07-2025 includes 50 recent graduates. From these, the following selection of 15 final projects was made:

Grade range	Total nr	Selection
5.5 - 6.9 sufficient	9	5
7.0 - 8.4 good	30	6
8.5 - 10.0 very good	11	4

Further details on the selected final projects are available on request from Odion Onderzoek.

Annex 5: Visitation programme

Date: 19 and 20 November 2025

Location: Röling Building, Oude Boteringestraat 18, Groningen

Day 1 19 November 2025

8:45	9:30	Ontvangst + intern overleg
9:30	10:15	Gesprek faculteitsbestuur
10:15	11:00	Gesprek programmamanagement (programmacoördinatoren en clusterbestuur)
11:00	11:30	Intern overleg panel
11:30	12:30	Gesprek studenten & alumni B and M Middle Eastern Studies
12:30	13:30	Lunch en intern overleg panel
13:30	14:30	Gesprek docenten B and M Middle Eastern Studies
14:30	14:45	Intern overleg panel
14:45	15:45	Gesprek studenten & alumni BA and MA American Studies
15:45	16:00	Intern overleg panel
16:00	17:00	Gesprek docenten & alumni BA and MA American Studies
17:00	17:45	Intern overleg panel

Day 2: Thursday, November 20

8:45	9:15	Welkom en Intern overleg
9:15	10:00	Gesprek examencommissie
10:00	10:45	Intern overleg panel/voorbereiden afsluitend gesprek
10:45	11:30	Eindgesprek opleidingsmanagement alle opleidingen en eventuele vragen
11:30	13:15	Lunch en intern overleg panel/opstellen conclusies
13:15	13:45	Ontwikkelgesprek
14:00	14:15	Mondelinge rapportage

Vondellaan 138
 3521 GH Utrecht
 m 030-2819804
 e info@odion-onderzoek.nl
 w www.odion-onderzoek.nl