

B Japanstudies
Leiden University
Assessment report

20 April 2026



Content

1. Summary	3
2. Introduction	7
Procedure	7
Institution	10
Programme	10
Developments since the last accreditation	10
3. Programme assessment	12
Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	12
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	14
Standard 3: Student assessment	19
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	23
Final conclusion	25
4. Annexes	28
Annex 1: Administrative data	28
Annex 2: Intended learning outcomes	29
Annex 3: Curriculum outline	31
Annex 4: Programme site visit	34
Annex 5: Documents	36

1. Summary

This report describes the programme assessments of the academic bachelor's programme Japanese Studies (Dutch: *B Japanstudies*) offered by Leiden University.

Standard 1 – Intended learning outcomes

The bachelor's programme in Japanese Studies has a clear and distinctive profile, combining intensive Japanese language training with a broad multidisciplinary introduction to Japan as both a contemporary society and a historical and transnational cultural presence. Students develop autonomous proficiency in Japanese and gain insight into Japan through perspectives from the Humanities and Social Sciences, supported by academic skills that prepare them for further study and a wide range of professional contexts. The panel notes that maintaining the level of language proficiency, disciplinary breadth and a distinctive profile requires continued attention in light of faculty-wide budget constraints and staff turnover, especially as the faculty moves towards shared courses with adjacent Area Studies programmes. The intended learning outcomes reflect the programme's profile and align with national and international frameworks, articulating the linguistic, disciplinary and academic foundations expected at bachelor level. The programme's profile and intended learning outcomes are kept current through staff expertise, input from the Advisory Board and international partnerships, ensuring continued alignment with developments in the field.

Overall, the panel concludes that **Standard 1 – Intended learning outcomes** is met.

Standard 2 – Teaching-learning environment

The bachelor's programme in Japanese Studies (180 EC) offers a coherent and well-structured teaching-learning environment in which students progress from introductory language and content courses to advanced, research-oriented components. Intensive Japanese language acquisition forms the backbone of the curriculum, amounting to 55–60 EC in the first two years and closely integrated with thematic courses that introduce students to historical, cultural and social-scientific perspectives on Japan, alongside consistent attention to academic and transferable skills. The structured progression, the option of a study abroad semester and the choice between Humanities and Social Sciences clusters provide students with both a solid foundation and meaningful opportunities for academic profiling. The graduation trajectory is well designed, with clear supervision structures, strong integration of Japanese-language source work and the possibility of alternative formats that link academic research to professional experience. Students benefit from small-scale teaching, accessible staff and committed study guidance, which is particularly important given the growing number of students with special needs.

At the same time, the panel notes that the increased use of shared courses with the other Area Studies programmes (Chinese Studies, Korean Studies and South and Southeast Asian Studies) from 2026–2027

onwards requires careful implementation to safeguard the programme's distinctive profile, and that limited academic expertise in certain popular areas, such as anime, constrains curricular breadth. Most urgently, the current staffing shortages place pressure on the quality and sustainability of the teaching-learning environment, underscoring the need for a structural solution.

Overall, the panel concludes that **Standard 2 – Teaching-Learning environment** is met.

Standard 3 – Student assessment

The bachelor's programme in Japanese Studies has an adequate and consistently implemented assessment system that is firmly embedded in faculty-wide policies and constructive alignment. Assessment formats are well matched to course objectives, ranging from written exams in the first year to essays, presentations and research papers later on, while language courses use a broad mix of written and oral tests. Transparency is supported through sample questions, structured feedback and opportunities to review graded work. The Board of Examiners operates systematically and professionally, applying a multi-year monitoring cycle, sampling of examinations and theses, and clear procedures for safeguarding academic standards. Final projects are assessed by two independent examiners using standardised forms, with a third examiner involved in cases of major discrepancies and a knock-out requirement to use at least one Japanese-language academic source. Alternative graduation formats, such as the External Research Project, offer meaningful links to professional practice, though the integration of assessment components across the internship and research elements requires further strengthening. At the same time, staffing shortages pose a risk to maintaining assessment quality, making continued calibration important. The panel also values the programme's attention to generative AI, while encouraging a more integrated strategy that explicitly links GenAI to intended learning outcomes, teaching-learning environment and assessment practices.

Overall, the panel concludes that **Standard 3 – Student assessment** is met.

Standard 4 – Achieved learning outcomes

A review of a representative selection of theses and External Research Projects shows that graduates of the bachelor's programme in Japanese Studies achieve the intended learning outcomes. The final projects demonstrate relevant topics, clear research questions, appropriate academic methods and the required integration of active and passive Japanese-language competencies, which the panel encourages the programme to continue safeguarding. ERP projects also meet the academic threshold and provide valuable work-field experience for students aiming for professional pathways. Graduates are well prepared for further study: around 70% progress to master's programmes—most commonly in Asian Studies, Linguistics, International Relations or Media Studies—and alumni report feeling academically well equipped. Labour-market outcomes are likewise positive, with most graduates finding employment within six months in sectors such as government, ICT, education and international organisations, in roles

ranging from regional manager Asia and policy officer to product developer, coordinator of international relations and PhD researcher.

Overall, the panel concludes that **Standard 4 – Achieved learning outcomes** is met.

The bachelor programme Japanese Studies meets all four standards. Considering this, the panel arrives at the final opinion 'positive' to the NVAO for the accreditation of the bachelor's programme Japanese Studies at Leiden University.

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.

20 April 2026:



Dr. Remco Raben
(chair)



Julia Roosenboom MSc, drs. Vladimir Bartelds
(secretary)

2. Introduction

Procedure

Leiden University has appointed Odion Onderzoek to coordinate the external quality assessment of the following programmes: the master's programme in North American Studies, the bachelor's and master's programmes in African Studies, the bachelor's and master's programmes in Middle Eastern Studies, the bachelor's and master's programmes in Latin American Studies, the bachelor's programme in Russian Studies, the master's programme in Russian and Eurasian Studies, the bachelor's programme in International Studies, the bachelor's programme in Chinese Studies, the bachelor's programme in Korean Studies, the master's programme in Asian Studies (60 EC), the master's programme in Asian Studies (120 EC), the bachelor's programme in South and Southeast Asian Studies, and the bachelor's programme in Japanese Studies. This assessment takes place in the context of the accreditation of the programme cluster *Area Studies I*. This cluster comprises 24 programmes offered by four institutions: Leiden University (16 programmes, reviewed during two multi-day site visits), University of Groningen (4 programmes), University of Amsterdam (3 programmes), and Radboud University Nijmegen (1 programme). From Odion Onderzoek, dr. Alexandra Paffen served as cluster coordinator until August 1, 2025, after which Julia Roosenboom MSc took over her role.

The assessment was conducted in accordance with the procedures and standards of the *Assessment Framework for the Accreditation System of Higher Education in the Netherlands* of the NVAO (*Staatscourant* 2024, no. 6405). The programmes within the Area Studies 1 cluster are existing programmes, and the institutions involved have successfully completed the Institutional Quality Assurance Audit.

Given the number of programmes at Leiden University, it was decided to divide the programmes into two site visits. During the first visit (3, 4, and 5 November 2025), the master's programme in North American Studies, the bachelor's and master's programmes in African Studies, the bachelor's and master's programmes in Middle Eastern Studies, the bachelor's and master's programmes in Latin American Studies, the bachelor's programme in Russian Studies, and the master's programme in Russian and Eurasian Studies were reviewed. During the second visit (8, 9, and 10 December 2025), the bachelor's programme in International Studies, the bachelor's programme in Chinese Studies, the bachelor's programme in Korean Studies, the master's programme in Asian Studies (60 EC), the master's programme in Asian Studies (120 EC), the bachelor's programme in South and Southeast Asian Studies, and the bachelor's programme in Japanese Studies were reviewed.

In consultation with the programmes, Odion Onderzoek composed a panel of peers (assessment panel) to carry out the assessment of the second seven programmes at Leiden University.

- Dr. Remco Raben (chair), Utrecht University, Associate professor, Department of History of International Relations
- Prof. dr. Henning Klöter (member), Humboldt University of Berlin, professor of Modern Chinese Languages and Literatures
- Prof. dr. Mark Teeuwen (member), University of Oslo, professor of Japanese Language and History
- Dr. Lisa Gaufman (member and external reviewer), University of Groningen, Assistant professor of Russian Discourse and Politics
- Elliott Bickerton (student-member), University of Amsterdam, student American Studies
- Dr. Vladimir Glomb (external reviewer), Free University of Berlin, Guest professor at the Institute of Korean Studies
- Dr. Anders Karlsson (external reviewer), University of London, senior lecturer in Korean Studies
- Prof. dr. Christian de Pee (external reviewer), University of Michigan, professor of Chinese History
- Prof. dr. Christoph Anderl (external reviewer), Ghent University, professor of Chinese Language and Culture
- Dr. Jonathan Spencer (external reviewer), University of Edinburgh, emeritus professor of South Asian Language, Culture and Society
- Prof. Roger Goodman (external reviewer), University of Oxford, professor of Modern Japanese Studies
- Dr. Lorena De Vita (external reviewer), Utrecht University, Associate professor in the History of International Relations
- Prof. dr. Gerben Nooteboom (external reviewer), Radboud University, Professor Anthropology and Development Studies

The panel was supported by Odion Onderzoek through Julia Roosenboom MSc (process coordinator and secretary for the bachelor Japanese Studies, bachelor Korean Studies, bachelor South and Southeast Asian Studies, de master Asian Studies 60 EC and the master Asian Studies 120 EC) together with drs. Vladimir Bartelds, and Inge van der Hoorn (secretary for the bachelor China Studies and the bachelor International Studies). Both secretaries have extensive experience as NVAO-certified secretaries. The NVAO reviewed the accountability form for the panel composition and confirmed that the panel meets the required expertise. In addition, the panel members, the institution, and the secretaries provided written declarations confirming that the panel and secretaries perform their tasks independently. On 23 October 2025, the NVAO approved the panel composition (approval form PA-2492b).

Prior to the assessment process, the chair was trained by Julia Roosenboom MSc and Daniëlle de Koning MSc on the NVAO's *Assessment Framework for the Accreditation System of Higher Education in the Netherlands* (2024). The cluster coordinator reviewed the standards, procedures, and responsibilities

with the chair, in line with the *Profile of the Chair* (NVAO 2016) and the guidelines from the NVAO training *Train the Chair*. The other panel members were instructed and informed during a cluster-wide start meeting by the cluster coordinator and chair about the content and intent of the assessment framework, as well as the procedure, attitude, working methods, and planning within the cluster.

Prior to the site visit, the Faculty of Humanities of Leiden University provided the secretaries with a list of recent graduates per programme. In consultation with the cluster coordinator, the panel chair selected fifteen final projects per programme, taking into account the distribution of grades, assessors, and, where applicable, variants and tracks. The panel studied the selected final projects with their corresponding assessment forms, as well as the programmes' self-evaluation report. The final projects were assessed in accordance with the NVAO guideline for the review of final projects (Implementation Regulations, September 2025). An overview of the reviewed material, including the selected final projects and an explanation of the selection process, is included in Annex 5.

After reviewing the documentation, the panel members formulated their initial impressions and shared them with the secretaries. The secretaries compiled these and distributed the compilation to the panel. During a preparatory meeting prior to the site visit on 4th of December, the panel members discussed their first impressions and identified key topics for discussion.

Staff and students of the programmes within the visitation group *Area Studies 1* at Leiden University were informed in advance by the faculty about the opportunity to speak confidentially with the panel. They could register for this through the secretaries. An *open consultation hour* was scheduled during the preparatory meeting for potential participants. As no registrations were received, this *open consultation hour* was cancelled.

On 8, 9, 10 December 2025, the panel conducted a site visit at Leiden University. The draft programme of the visit, including representative stakeholders, had been submitted in advance by the programmes to the chair and secretaries. Annex 4 contains information about the site visit.

At the conclusion of the site visit, the panel formed an independent judgment of the programmes, based on the four standards of the NVAO's *Assessment Framework for the Accreditation System of Higher Education in the Netherlands* (2024). The chair presented the main conclusions in a public oral feedback session.

This final report provides a systematic account of the panel's findings, considerations, and conclusions. After the site visit, the secretaries 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 Leiden University for a check of factual inaccuracies. After processing any corrections, the report was finalized and approved by the chair.

Institution

Leiden University (LU) was founded in 1575 and is therefore the oldest university in the Netherlands. The institution is publicly funded. Over the past three years, the number of LU students has fluctuated around 36,000, spread across 48 bachelor's programmes and 83 master's programmes¹. The university has seven faculties: Archaeology, Humanities, Medicine (LUMC), Governance & Global Affairs, Law, Social Sciences, and Science. The university's profile is described on its website². In short, Leiden University aims to equip new generations to make a difference in a global society. Its core values are Connecting, Innovative, Responsible, and Free. Leiden University attaches great importance to partnerships. Within the Netherlands, it collaborates extensively with Delft University of Technology and Erasmus University Rotterdam³, and internationally, among others, within the League of European Research Universities⁴.

Programme

The bachelor's programme Japanese Studies is the only academic Area Studies programme in the Netherlands focused specifically on Japan, with comparable programmes offered in Ghent (Belgium) and Oslo (Norway). The programme aims to provide students with a solid understanding of Japanese culture and society, supported by the academic skills needed to study these topics. As language proficiency is essential for engaging with Japanese-language sources, approximately half of the 180 EC curriculum is devoted to acquiring Japanese language skills, with a strong emphasis on reading contemporary and, to a lesser extent, classical Japanese. Students are introduced to multiple disciplinary approaches and apply one of these in depth in their bachelor's thesis. Most graduates continue into master's programmes in Asian Studies, Linguistics, or occasionally Media Studies.

Developments since the last accreditation

Since the previous accreditation in 2020, when the bachelor's programme Japanese Studies received a positive assessment, several developments have taken place. Due to budgetary constraints, the teaching team has decreased in size, as three departing lecturers have not been replaced. As an austerity measure, the faculty is working towards integrating selected modules across the bachelor's programmes in Japanese Studies, China Studies, Korean Studies, and South and Southeast Asia Studies. While this shared curriculum is intended to economize and reduce staff workload, it also limits the Japan-specific character of the programme; this development is further discussed under Standards 1 and 2.

The 2020 panel did not issue strict recommendations but identified points for attention regarding staff workload, the visibility of the four-eyes principle for students, and the guidance provided in academic

¹ See: <https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/over-ons/feiten-en-cijfers>

² See: <https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/over-ons/profiel>

³ See: <https://www.leiden-delft-erasmus.nl/nl/home>

⁴ See: <https://www.leru.org/>

writing. The current panel examined how the programme has addressed these matters during the site visit and concludes that the programme has adequately followed up on the earlier advice. These issues are further elaborated under the relevant 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.

Findings and considerations

Profile of the programme

The bachelor's programme in Japanese Studies is embedded within the Area Studies Asia cluster of the Faculty of Humanities at Leiden University and is unique in the Netherlands as the only academic programme dedicated specifically to Japan. Comparable programmes exist in Belgium (Ghent) and Norway (Oslo), but the Leiden programme distinguishes itself through the specific combination of a required use of Japanese-language sources in the bachelor's thesis, a broader range of disciplinary approaches, and an open admission structure. The programme aims to provide students with a solid understanding of Japanese culture and society and with the academic skills required to study these domains independently. In line with the programme's definition of its object of study, "Japan" refers both to Japan within its current borders and to the historical and contemporary presence of Japanese culture and society beyond those borders. A central principle is that cultures should be studied through "local knowledge", which is reflected in the strong emphasis on developing autonomous proficiency in the Japanese language. This enables students to actively and passively engage with Japanese-language sources relevant to their own areas of interest.

The programme is characterised by a multidisciplinary approach. Students are introduced to a broad range of disciplinary approaches from both the Humanities and the Social Sciences. Throughout the programme, they encounter multiple perspectives on Japan before specialising in one approach for their bachelor's thesis (see Standard 2). In addition to disciplinary and language training, the programme fosters general academic skills such as critical thinking, analytical writing, and research communication. These skills prepare graduates not only for Japan-related fields but also for broader professional contexts that value cultural awareness, intellectual versatility, and the ability to work with diverse perspectives.

The panel appreciates the clear and distinctive profile and academic orientation of the programme. It does, however, note that the relatively small student enrollment combined with faculty-wide financial constraints due to governmental and university budget cuts creates a degree of vulnerability. Recent staff departures (see Standard 2) have not been replaced, which places pressure on the disciplinary breadth that characterises the programme. According to the panel, planned collaboration in joint modules with related programmes—such as Korean Studies, South and Southeast Asian Studies, and

China Studies (see Standard 2)—offers opportunities for thematic enrichment and shared expertise, while also requiring attention to safeguarding the distinct profile of Japanese Studies.

Intended learning outcomes and alignment with the academic and professional field

The programme has translated its intended learning outcomes (as listed in Annex 2) into four overarching characteristics that together capture the full scope of the bachelor's profile. These characteristics reflect the Dublin Descriptors and align with the linguistic, disciplinary and academic foundations of the programme.

1. **Language competencies in Japanese:** Students achieve CEFR level B2 for reading and B1 for speaking. This includes the ability to listen, speak, read and write in modern Japanese, and to locate, understand and use relevant primary and secondary sources. Language proficiency is explicitly integrated into the content-oriented courses in the later stages of the programme.
2. **A broad knowledge base of Japan:** Graduates acquire foundational knowledge of major historical developments as well as contemporary political, societal and cultural issues. This knowledge base enables students to contextualise and analyse Japan from an academic perspective.
3. **Understanding and applying disciplinary approaches:** Students gain insight into the methodological challenges of studying a culture different from their own and acquire knowledge of at least two disciplinary perspectives offered within the programme. They learn to apply these approaches to specific topics, formulate research questions and engage with academic debates.
4. **Academic and professional skills:** The programme trains students in critical analysis, structuring and interpreting acquired knowledge, and communicating insights and research results effectively. These skills prepare graduates for both academic progression and a wide range of professional contexts.

The panel considers the intended learning outcomes appropriate for a bachelor's programme, as they align with the Dublin Descriptors. It also finds the intended learning outcomes and the programme's profile well aligned with the needs of students and with relevant further opportunities — such as the master's programme Asian Studies and professional career paths. The content and orientation of the programme are informed both by the research expertise of the academic staff and by input from the programme's Advisory Board, ensuring that the programme and intended learning outcomes remain attuned to developments in the professional field. The panel further notes that partnerships with universities in Japan, with other European institutions, and with professional stakeholders — such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs — help ensure that the profile and learning outcomes meet international expectations and that the programme remains outward looking and internationally embedded.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the programme has a clear and distinctive profile — characterised by strong language training, a broad multidisciplinary orientation and a coherent academic approach to the study of Japan — and that it prepares students well for relevant further study and professional trajectories. The intended learning outcomes reflect the linguistic, disciplinary and academic foundations of the programme and are well formulated, appropriate for a bachelor's programme and demonstrably aligned with the Dublin Descriptors. Both the programme's profile and its intended learning outcomes show a clear connection to developments in academia and the professional field, for example through collaboration with external partners and input from the Advisory Board. At the same time, the panel notes that maintaining the programme's disciplinary breadth and distinctive profile requires continued attention in light of faculty-wide budget constraints and staff turnover, particularly as the programme seeks synergies through joint modules with adjacent Area Studies programmes.

Based on the interviews and the review of the underlying documentation, the panel concludes that the programme **meets 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.

Findings and considerations

Curriculum restructuring

This report reflects the programme's current situation and its development over the past six years. From 2026–2027, the programme will undergo a phased restructuring prompted by faculty-wide financial constraints, increasing the use of shared courses in BA2 and BA3 with adjacent Asian Studies programmes (China Studies, Korean Studies and South and Southeast Asian Studies). Japanese Studies will incorporate three shared courses (or two in the case of a study-abroad semester), compared to two (or one) in the current situation. As a result, one Japan-specific course will be removed from the curriculum. The panel recognizes that reducing the number of Japan-specific ECs may render the curriculum somewhat less Japan-focused. At the same time, it acknowledges the programme's rationale that broader thematic offerings can help students situate Japan within its regional context and benefit from cross-programme synergies, while also enabling the programme to produce relevant knowledge by addressing regional and global perspectives and comparisons. While the panel sees the potential analytical gains and efficiencies, it also encourages the programme and the faculty to leverage joint offerings selectively where they demonstrably enhance student learning, ensuring that the programme's distinctive profile is safeguarded (see Standard 1).

Content and structure of the curriculum

The first year of the curriculum (see Annex 3) consists of a fully structured programme of 60 EC, of which 30 EC are dedicated to Japanese language acquisition. Given the complexity of the Japanese writing system and the programme's emphasis on enabling students to work with Japanese-language sources, the language curriculum prioritises reading proficiency. In addition, students follow five introductory content courses (25 EC) on the history, culture, society and politics of Japan, as well as a 5 EC faculty-wide course in Area Studies, which introduces comparative approaches and encourages early self-reflection on cultural perspectives.

In the second year, language acquisition again accounts for 30 EC, except for students who do not participate in the study-abroad programme. For students who do not participate in the study-abroad programme, the total amount of language-focused coursework in the first two years amounts to 55 EC instead of 60 EC. Alongside the language courses, students select three Japan-specific electives (20 EC) and two electives (10 EC) from the programmes in Korean Studies, Chinese Studies or South and Southeast Asian Studies if they remain in Leiden, and one such elective (5 EC) if they go to Japan. These electives are organised into two disciplinary clusters—Humanities and Social Sciences—which offer structured pathways into cultural-historical or social-scientific approaches. The Humanities cluster focuses on Japanese cultural production, history, linguistics and textual, visual and material culture, while the Social Sciences cluster addresses behavioural, political, economic and international issues in contemporary Japan. Students also take a 5 EC course in philosophy of science.

A study-abroad semester in Japan (15 EC) is available to a substantial proportion of students (approximately 65%), with a maximum of 40 places per year for those who meet the academic and linguistic requirements. Students spend three or five months at one of three partner universities—Nagasaki, Kanazawa or Toyama—following an intensive language programme tailored to Leiden students, which since 2019 includes a modest research component. Students who remain in Leiden (approximately 35% of the cohort) follow an alternative track that achieves the same intended learning outcomes. The programme observes that study-abroad students tend to develop stronger conversational skills, while students who stay in Leiden often outperform them in reading proficiency; the panel considers this difference understandable. By the end of the second year, students are expected to reach approximately B2 reading and B1 speaking proficiency.

In the third year, students continue within their chosen cluster and take a 10 EC seminar in which they engage with Japanese-language academic literature and prepare for their graduation project. They may also take advanced Classical Japanese or Practising Japanese Studies (5 EC), both of which involve further language-based work with primary sources. Students additionally complete 15 EC of minor or faculty-wide elective space. In the second semester, students complete a 10 EC graduation project—such as a traditional bachelor's thesis, the Journal Project or the BA Conference Project—together with a 5 EC

graduation seminar and an additional 15 EC of minor or elective coursework (30 EC in total). Students may alternatively opt for the External Research Project (25 EC), which combines academic research with professional experience; in this route, they also take Business Japanese 2 (5 EC). This 30 EC ERP trajectory replaces the entire second-semester combination of the graduation project, the graduation seminar and the 15 EC minor space.

Throughout the curriculum, academic skills are developed progressively. Students practise textual analysis and reflection from the first semester onwards, write literature reviews and analytical papers in the second and third year, and receive targeted writing support in the second-year seminars. These academic competencies also function as transferable skills, equipping students with analytical, reflective and information-critical abilities that are essential for a broad and diverse labour market. The panel values this explicit and structured attention to transferable skills and observes that the programme succeeds in embedding them coherently across the curriculum, enabling students to apply these abilities in both academic and professional contexts.

Overall, the panel considers the curriculum demanding yet well structured. The ambitious language-proficiency targets are reflected in the number and progression of language courses (55–60 EC across the first two years), ensuring a solid foundation in Japanese Studies. The panel also appreciates the programme's structured yet flexible design, which offers students meaningful opportunities to tailor their studies through thematic and disciplinary specialisation. In addition, the panel notes a clear and consistent progression from introductory lectures in the first year to advanced, research-oriented seminars and the graduation trajectory in the third year. While the organisational separation between the Humanities and Social Sciences clusters may limit opportunities for more integrated interdisciplinary approaches, the panel nevertheless finds the curriculum coherent, academically robust and well aligned with the intended learning outcomes.

Graduation trajectory: thesis and internship-based alternatives

In the graduation phase, students demonstrate their achievement of the intended learning outcomes through an individual research project. Most students complete a traditional bachelor's thesis under the supervision of an academic staff member assigned to them within their disciplinary cluster. Students select and refine their topic in consultation with their supervisor and are required to work with at least one Japanese-language primary or secondary source, which functions as a knock-out criterion. Supervision takes place both individually and in group-based graduation seminars. Each seminar consists of a language component—taught by a native speaker and focused on thesis-related language tasks—and a content-oriented component in which students develop their research question, theoretical framework, methodology and analysis across six structured sessions, during which they also discuss draft sections of their thesis. Students additionally write the abstract of their thesis in Japanese, which, according to the panel, sets a high but appropriate standard and reflects the ambitious language

proficiency expected at the end of the programme. The panel considers the graduation trajectory well designed and aligned with the intended learning outcomes, valuing the clear structure of the thesis process, the integration of Japanese-language source work and the combination of individual supervision with group-based support.

As mentioned above (see *Content and structure of the curriculum*), the programme has recently introduced alternative graduation formats: the BA Journal Project, the BA Conference Project and the External Research Project. To date, only the ERP has been implemented, and only a small number of students have opted for this route so far. The ERP combines an individual academic research project (4,000–5,000 words) with professional experience gained through an internship, for example at the Dutch pavilion of EXPO Osaka 2025 in collaboration with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The panel welcomes the introduction of alternative graduation formats, as these offer students meaningful opportunities to connect academic research with professional experience. However, the panel also identifies points for attention regarding the assessment of these formats, particularly with respect to the division of assessment responsibilities between internship providers, the Career Services Centre and academic staff, and the need to safeguard academic standards across the combined assessment components (see Standard 3).

Student intake

The programme reports a modest upward trend in enrollment, with the annual intake increasing from approximately 70 to 90 first-year students in recent years. It emphasises the importance of attracting students with appropriate motivation and qualifications, and supports prospective students in making an informed study choice through open days, trial study days and a sample module that introduces the language-intensive nature of the first-year curriculum. At the same time, the programme acknowledges that these outreach and information activities have limited impact on the actual number of admitted students, as long-standing experience shows that such efforts only marginally influence overall enrollment. In the upcoming academic year, the Faculty of Humanities will therefore expand its approach to study matching by introducing a mandatory matching procedure to ensure that prospective students gain a realistic understanding of the programme's content, expectations and study load before enrolling. The panel considers these efforts appropriate and notes that the planned mandatory matching may further support informed study choice.

Study advice and student guidance

The programme offers students guidance and coaching from the first year onwards, including support with study planning, study-abroad preparation and the graduation trajectory. The programme notes a significant increase in the number of students with special needs—approximately one in four first-year students in 2024/25—particularly in relation to neurodiversity. Although the university and faculty provide a wide range of support services, such as the Fenestra Disability Centre, the high proportion of

students requiring additional support combined with limited staff capacity poses challenges for safeguarding study progress. The panel considers it important to acknowledge that the programme is working with a demanding student population with an above-average share of neurodiverse students. In the panel's view, the student guidance offered by the programme rises to this challenge, largely due to the strong commitment of the teaching staff.

Teaching staff

The teaching team consists of 19 lecturers, 17 of whom are appointed for more than 0.5 FTE for over a year and hold a University Teaching Qualification (UTQ). All content-focused lecturers hold a PhD, while the five language instructors have professional qualifications in language teaching. Because many lecturers are employed across multiple programmes within the Faculty of Humanities, the number of hours allocated specifically to Japanese Studies is often limited. The staff collectively cover a broad and accessible research portfolio, with expertise in both modern and premodern Japan; however, the panel notes that academic expertise in areas such as anime—topics that are popular among students—is currently limited.

The teaching staff indicate that safeguarding research time is challenging, as it is often restricted to weeks without teaching or must be carved out of personal time. The programme management and staff also report that the programme is currently understaffed due to budgetary constraints: three lecturers with expertise on economics, culture and religion have left and have not been replaced, and two lecturers who received NWO grants are exempted from thesis supervision without replacement being available. The panel regards the shortage of staff as a matter of concern for both the programme and the faculty. While it acknowledges the strong commitment of lecturers and the benefits of collaboration with other programmes (see also Standard 1), the panel considers the current situation unsustainable in the long term. The panel notes that the programme itself indicates in the self-evaluation that maintaining the intended learning outcomes is challenging under the present staffing conditions, and therefore recommends addressing the staff shortage in an effective and sustainable manner.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the programme offers a coherent and well-structured teaching-learning environment that enables students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The curriculum shows a clear progression from introductory courses to advanced, research-oriented components, supported by a strong language trajectory and consistent attention to academic and transferable skills. The graduation trajectory is generally well designed, with clear supervision structures and a strong integration of Japanese-language source work. The panel also values the introduction of alternative graduation formats, which offer students meaningful opportunities to connect academic research with professional experience. The programme provides solid study guidance, even in the context of a growing number of students with special needs.

At the same time, the panel identifies several issues that require attention. The increased use of shared courses calls for selective implementation to ensure that the programme's distinctive profile is safeguarded. The panel also notes that academic expertise in areas such as anime is currently limited, despite student interest. Finally, the panel observes that the current staffing situation places pressure on the teaching-learning environment and recommends addressing this in a sustainable and forward-looking manner.

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

Standard 3: Student assessment

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

Findings and considerations

Testing principles

The programme's assessment principles are firmly embedded in the faculty-wide assessment policy, as articulated in the Course and Examination Regulations, the faculty assessment framework and the joint rules and regulations of the Board of Examiners. These documents collectively safeguard the core principles of validity, reliability, transparency and usability, and ensure that assessment is systematically aligned with the intended learning outcomes through constructive alignment. This alignment is clearly reflected in the Course and Examination Regulations and in the matrix linking course outcomes to the programme's intended learning outcomes. The panel considers this policy framework coherent and robust, and observes that it is consistently applied in practice.

Within this framework, lecturers—acting as disciplinary experts—are responsible for selecting appropriate assessment formats and determining grading. The programme board and the Board of Examiners monitor whether assessment across the curriculum maintains sufficient variation and adheres to quality standards. The panel finds this division of responsibilities appropriate and effective, noting that lecturers demonstrate ownership of assessment while the programme-level bodies provide meaningful oversight.

Assessment formats evolve across the curriculum. In the first year, content courses are assessed exclusively through written examinations, a format the panel considers appropriate and effective, particularly in the current context of GenAI. From the second year onwards, students encounter a broader range of assessment formats, including essays, presentations and research papers, which foster analytical and academic writing skills. Language courses employ a wide variety of assessment methods,

including written tests (e.g. Kanji and Texts courses) and oral examinations (e.g. conversation and production). During the study abroad period, language assessment is conducted by lecturers at the Japanese partner universities; regular consultation with Leiden-based staff ensures the comparability of assessment standards, and the results obtained in Japan are converted to the Dutch grading system upon return. In line with faculty policy, the programme will introduce a pass/fail assessment for the study-abroad period from 2026–2027 onwards, which the panel considers a sensible step toward harmonisation within the faculty.

The four-eyes principle is applied wherever feasible, particularly in courses taught by multiple lecturers. In highly specialised courses, this is less practical; the panel acknowledges that this is consistent with the principle that the lecturer bears primary responsibility for assessment. To enhance transparency, students can review their graded work with the examiner. First-year students have access to sample questions and practice modules, and Brightspace provides structured feedback and feedforward. The panel considers these measures adequate in supporting students' learning processes and in strengthening their insight into assessment criteria and procedures.

Board of Examiners and quality assurance

The Board of Examiners, consisting of three staff members and an external member with specific assessment expertise, is dedicated exclusively to the BA Japanese Studies programme. Supported by a structurally appointed secretary and working closely with the study advisers, the Board meets approximately 12–15 times per year and maintains regular contact with the programme board. Its responsibilities include safeguarding the quality of examinations and final projects, establishing rules and regulations, granting exemptions, handling fraud cases, approving internships and thesis proposals, issuing binding study advice and awarding diplomas. The Board also aligns its policies with other programmes in the faculty and participates in faculty-wide and university-wide professionalisation activities on topics such as fraud and plagiarism, quality assurance, personal circumstances and AI.

For monitoring assessment quality, the Board of Examiners makes use of a systematic six-year cycle in which each BA semester or set of minor courses is reviewed. For each course, the Board examines whether assessments correspond to the intended learning outcomes and whether students are clearly informed about assessment criteria, for example through answer keys or standardised assessment forms. Validity, reliability, transparency and usability are evaluated using a standardised form. Syllabi and examinations are collected and reviewed on a sampling basis. The panel finds this systematic approach thorough and appropriate for safeguarding assessment quality.

Quality assurance of final projects is conducted annually through a sample of approximately ten theses, selected to ensure diversity in supervisors, topics and grade levels. Theses are checked for validity and reliability, and the Board of Examiners verifies whether the assigned grades reflect the actual quality. The

Board reports that overall assessment quality is good; where improvements are possible—such as in the formulation of feedback—these are communicated to examiners during staff meetings. The panel appreciates the responsiveness of examiners to these recommendations and notes that the Board of Examiners monitors whether these have been implemented in subsequent assessments.

Although the workload is considerable—partly due to the high number of requests related to neurodiverse students and the approval of internships—the panel considers the Board of Examiners to be firmly in control. The Board demonstrates a clear commitment to safeguarding academic standards while accommodating the needs of a diverse student population. The panel values the Board’s proactive stance in refining its procedures and protocols. It also appreciates the frequent dialogue with the programme board and colleagues, as well as its ambition to improve communication with students.

Assessment of final projects

Theses are assessed independently by two examiners using faculty-wide standardised forms based on the Dublin descriptors. A knock-out criterion applies: the use of at least one Japanese-language academic source. Plagiarism checks are conducted through Turnitin. In cases of grade discrepancies of two points or more, a third examiner is appointed, whose judgement is binding. The panel observed that the requirement to use Japanese-language sources can be challenging for some students, though it is consistent with the programme’s intended learning outcomes. It also noted that grades assigned by programme examiners were slightly higher than those assigned by panel members, though differences were minor.

The External Research Project combines an internship component (60%) and a research component (40%). The internship is assessed jointly by the external internship supervisor and the supervising lecturer in Leiden, using the faculty’s standard internship assessment form. Students must pass both the internship and a short internship report (1,000–1,500 words). The research component is assessed using the same faculty-wide criteria as the bachelor’s thesis, including the requirement to use at least one Japanese-language academic source. The panel notes that safeguarding academic standards in alternative graduation formats requires careful attention. Transferable skills developed during the internship are mainly assessed by internship providers and the Career Services Centre of Leiden University, while the (shorter) academic research project is assessed by staff members of the programme. According to the panel, this division of responsibilities makes it essential to ensure that the combined assessment provides sufficiently robust evidence that students achieve the intended learning outcomes. The panel also observes that internship companies often require students to be present several days per week over an extended period, which can make it challenging to meet the academic research requirements. To ensure a coherent and holistic evaluation of students’ achievements, the panel recommends further integration of the assessment components across the internship, the internship report and the academic research project.

Although the panel found no issues with the achieved learning outcomes (see Standard 4), it notes that concerns expressed during the site visit and in the documentation regarding understaffing pose a potential risk to maintaining quality. The panel therefore advises all relevant actors—programme management, examiners and the Board of Examiners—to take proactive measures, such as intensified calibration, to mitigate this risk and ensure continued alignment with the intended learning outcomes.

Generative AI

The programme is well aware of the challenges posed by Generative AI in academic assessment, particularly in courses where written essays constitute the primary assessment format. Lecturers regularly warn students about inappropriate use of GenAI, and the programme is exploring adjustments to assessment formats to mitigate risks. At faculty level, guidelines for lecturers on GenAI and fraud were published in September 2025, accompanied by information for students on the use of GenAI in assessment. These guidelines are embedded in all Brightspace modules, and lecturers actively draw students' attention to the faculty's rules on plagiarism, fraud and AI.

The panel appreciates the programme's clear attention to the challenges posed by AI and the measures already taken to safeguard academic integrity. However, it observes that the programme's current approach is predominantly restrictive, focusing on preventing misuse. While this is understandable in the early stages of AI integration, the panel encourages the programme to work towards a more integrated and strategic perspective on GenAI, in which implications for intended learning outcomes, the teaching-learning environment and assessment are explicitly addressed. Given the rapid development of AI technologies, a more forward-looking strategy may help the programme maintain both academic integrity and pedagogical relevance.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the programme has an adequate and consistently implemented system of student assessment. Assessment principles—validity, reliability, transparency and usability—are firmly embedded in faculty-wide policies, and assessment practices across the curriculum are transparent, varied and aligned with the intended learning outcomes. Students are well supported in understanding assessment criteria and procedures through sample questions, structured feedback and opportunities to review graded work. The Board of Examiners operates systematically and professionally, applying a structured monitoring cycle and clear procedures that effectively safeguard the quality of assessments and final projects. Together, these elements form a coherent and robust assessment system.

At the same time, the panel identifies several points requiring continued attention. Understaffing poses a potential risk to maintaining assessment quality, and the panel therefore advises that programme management, examiners and the Board of Examiners take proactive measures—such as intensified calibration—to safeguard quality and continued alignment with the intended learning outcomes. Within

the alternative graduation project ERP, the panel recommends further integration of assessment components to ensure a coherent and holistic evaluation. Finally, given the rapid development of Generative AI, the panel encourages the development of a more integrated strategy that explicitly links GenAI to learning outcomes, the teaching-learning environment and assessment practices.

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

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings and considerations

Final project

All assessments in the programme contribute to the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. The final project constitutes the key assessment moment in which these outcomes are demonstrably integrated. Positioned at level 400—the highest level within Leiden’s academic framework for a BA programme—it consists of a 10 EC graduation assignment, completed either as a traditional thesis or as part of the 25 EC External Research Project (ERP) track, in which a shorter thesis is combined with an internship assessment.

Based on its review of a representative selection of 15 final projects (13 theses and 2 ERPs), including the accompanying assessment forms, the panel concludes that graduates of the bachelor’s programme Japanese Studies achieve the intended learning outcomes. The thesis topics were found to be relevant and appropriately translated into clear research questions. In some cases, the methodological approach was described somewhat superficially by the students, but the overall academic level of the theses was satisfactory and no thesis was deemed below the expected standard. The ERP projects reviewed by the panel also met the academic threshold. The panel considers the ERP track particularly valuable for students who have a different career plan from enrolling in a subsequent master’s programme, as it provides them with relevant work-field experience alongside Japanese language competencies that enhance their employability.

The panel appreciates that the final projects (both theses and ERP) clearly reflect the breadth of staff expertise, as students typically select and refine their topics in consultation with their supervisor and within the thematic scope of their graduation seminar. The panel also notes that the challenging requirement to demonstrate both active and passive Japanese language competencies is visible in the final projects and encourages the programme to continue safeguarding this requirement.

Performance of graduates

The panel finds that graduates are well prepared for both academic and professional pathways. Approximately 70% continue into a master's programme, either at Leiden University—most commonly the MA Asian Studies—or at other institutions in fields such as Linguistics, International Relations and Media Studies. A small number progress to research master's programmes. Alumni who pursue further study report feeling well equipped for the academic demands of their master's programmes.

Labour market outcomes are positive. Faculty-wide data from 2025 show that 57% of alumni find employment within two months and 89% within six months, with 74% working at higher-education-level⁵. Graduates enter a wide range of sectors, including ICT, government, education and various other fields, and some pursue careers abroad. Examples of positions include regional manager Asia, product developer, PhD candidate in Japan, game software developer, coordinator of international relations and policy officer at the Dutch embassy in Japan. Employers consistently value graduates for their transferable skills and their ability to navigate and appreciate diverse cultural practices—an asset in international and non-Dutch organisational contexts. Alumni themselves confirmed during the site visit that the programme had prepared them well for both further study and professional roles, which the panel views positively.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the programme convincingly demonstrates that graduates achieve the intended learning outcomes. The reviewed final projects show that students are able to integrate and apply the full range of intended learning outcomes at the required master's level, and that they have acquired the expected academic, methodological and language competencies. The panel particularly values that the challenging requirement to demonstrate both active and passive Japanese language competencies is clearly visible in the final projects and encourages the programme to continue safeguarding this important element of the profile. In addition, the strong progression rates into master's programmes and the positive labour-market outcomes provide external confirmation that graduates are well prepared for further study and for a broad range of professional roles.

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

⁵ This faculty survey (2025) combined bachelor and master alumni with a Japanese Studies bachelor.

Final conclusion

The NVAO approved panel has assessed the programme against four standards. The panel concludes that the **bachelor's programme Japanese Studies** meets all standards (intended learning outcomes, teaching-learning environment, student assessment and achieved learning outcomes) and thus rates the overall quality of the programme as positive.

Standard	Judgement
Intended learning outcomes <i>Standard 1: 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.</i>	meets
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
Student assessment <i>Standard 3: The programme has an adequate system of assessment in place.</i>	meets
Achieved learning outcomes <i>Standard 4: The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.</i>	meets
Final conclusion	positive

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

- The panel considers the programme's profile clear and distinctive, characterised by strong Japanese language training, a broad multidisciplinary orientation and a coherent academic approach to the study of Japan.
- The panel values the exceptionally well structured language trajectory, which enables students to engage independently with Japanese-language primary and secondary sources—an ambitious and distinguishing feature of the programme that is further strengthened by the study abroad component in Japan.
- The panel is impressed by the coherent curriculum design, which shows a logical progression from introductory courses to advanced, research-oriented components in the third year.

- The panel appreciates the systematic integration of academic and transferable skills across the curriculum, noting that students are well prepared for both further academic study and diverse professional contexts. This is supported by innovative alternative graduation projects, such as the External Research Project, which combines academic inquiry with professional experience.
- The panel judges the teaching staff to be highly qualified, academically engaged and strongly committed to student learning, offering a broad and accessible range of expertise in both modern and premodern Japan.
- The panel praises the Board of Examiners for its professional and systematic approach, including a structured monitoring cycle that effectively safeguards the validity, reliability and transparency of assessment.
- The panel concludes that graduates demonstrably achieve the intended learning outcomes, with final projects showing solid academic quality and clear evidence of both active and passive Japanese language competencies; strong progression into master's programmes and positive labour-market outcomes further confirm the programme's effectiveness.

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

- The panel advises the programme to safeguard its distinct profile in Japanese Studies within the planned collaboration at faculty level with adjacent programmes such as Korean Studies, South and Southeast Asian Studies, and China Studies.
- The panel advises the programme to leverage joint offerings with adjacent programmes within the faculty selectively, using them only where they demonstrably enhance student learning.
- The panel advises the programme to broaden teaching expertise in areas that are particularly popular among students, such as anime.
- The panel advises all relevant actors – programme management, examiners and the Board of Examiners – to take proactive measures, such as intensified calibration, to safeguard consistency in assessment quality within final projects and ensure continued alignment with the intended learning outcomes.
- The panel advises the programme to consider a more integrated strategy that explicitly links GenAI to intended learning outcomes, the teaching-learning environment and assessment practices.
- The panel advises the programme to continue safeguarding the requirement to demonstrate both active and passive Japanese language in the final projects.

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

- The panel recommends addressing the staff shortage in an effective and sustainable manner.
- The panel recommends further integration of the assessment components across the internship, the internship report and the academic research project in the External Research Project to ensure a coherent and holistic evaluation of students' achievement.

4. Annexes

Annex 1: Administrative data

Institution	
Name in RIO	Universiteit Leiden
Adress	Rapenburg 70, 2311 EZ Leiden
Website	www.universiteitleiden.nl/en
BRIN number	21PB

Programme	
Programme name in RIO	B Japanstudies
International name	Japanese Studies
Location	Leiden
Programme number in RIO	56819
Orientation and level	Wo-bachelor
Research master	No
Language of instruction	Dutch / English
(Legal) professional requirements	No
All study programmes/tracks/specialisations	No
Joint programme	No
Distinctive feature	No
Degree awarded and addition to the degree	B 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 Regiostudies 1/ Area Studies 1
Submission date of accreditation report	1 May 2026
Other (e.g. name change or extension of study duration)	No

Annex 2: Intended learning outcomes

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

Kennis en inzicht:

1. De student heeft een grondige kennis van de belangrijkste historische ontwikkelingen in Japan.
2. De student beschikt over fundamentele kennis ten aanzien van hedendaagse politieke, maatschappelijke en culturele ontwikkelingen in Japan, en is in staat deze te plaatsen in de regionale en mondiale context.
3. De student heeft inzicht in de problematiek van de bestudering van 'vreemde' culturen en de relevante wetenschappelijke discussies, in het bijzonder met betrekking tot Japan en de regio.
4. De student verwerft kennis met betrekking tot de benaderingen (probleemstellingen, theorieën, methoden, analytisch taalgebruik) – toegepast op de Japanse problematiek – van ten minste twee disciplines die binnen het hoofdvakprogramma worden aangeboden (te weten, antropologie, geschiedenis, internationale betrekkingen, kunstgeschiedenis, linguïstiek, literatuurwetenschappen, materiële-cultuurstudies, mediastudies, politieke wetenschappen, en sociologie).

De disciplines worden ingedeeld in 2 clusters:

- Geesteswetenschappen/Humanities (HUM) cluster,
- Sociale Wetenschappen/Social Sciences (SOSCI) cluster.

Toepassen van kennis en inzicht

5. Taalvaardigheid in het modern Japans

- a. Luistervaardigheid. De student begrijpt in essentie langere passages gesproken taal in de standaardtaal, en kan verschillende stijlen (taalniveaus/registers) van gesproken taalgebruik onderscheiden; de student heeft bovendien een adequate receptieve beheersing van de Japanse woordenschat.
- b. Spreekvaardigheid. De student heeft de vaardigheid om talig en intercultureel te communiceren in een Japanse omgeving en deel te nemen aan discussies over algemene onderwerpen; de vaardigheid om tijdens deze gesprekken het taalniveau aan te passen aan de communicatiecontext (bijvoorbeeld door onderscheid te maken tussen beleefd en neutraal taalgebruik, en door de gangbare aanspreekvormen te hanteren); de vaardigheid om mondeling verslag te doen van onderwerpen die verband houden met de eigen interesses; een adequate productieve beheersing van de Japanse woordenschat.
- c. Leesvaardigheid. De student is in staat om, met behulp van de relevante woordenboeken, eenvoudig hedendaags proza, alsmede artikelen, rapporten, essays en dergelijke, mits geschreven in een heldere stijl en handelend over bekende onderwerpen of hedendaagse problematiek, te lezen; de student bereikt een dusdanig niveau van leesvaardigheid dat hij of zij in staat is Japanstalige bronnen te consulteren van belang voor het einddoel van het schrijven van het BA3 eindwerkstuk; de student heeft een adequate receptieve beheersing van de Japanse woordenschat.

d. Schrijfvaardigheid: De student heeft een actieve beheersing van het Japanse schrift en kan elementaire Chinese karakters schrijven; de student is in staat zijn of haar structurele en praktische kennis van de taal toe te passen in eenvoudige schrijfoefeningen (met behulp van nieuwe mediatechnologieën en/of andere referentiemiddelen).

Doelen in termen van het Europees Referentiekader taalvaardigheid:

	Propedeuse	Bachelor
Luisteren (monoloog en conversatie)	A1	B1
Lezen	A1	B2
Spreeken (monoloog en conversatie)	A1	B1
Schrijven (kanji)	A1	B1

6. De student is in staat zijn of haar kennis en inzicht (zie 2 en 3) toe te passen op specifieke onderwerpen, en deze in de juiste historische en cultureel-maatschappelijke kaders te plaatsen.

7. De student heeft toegang tot kennis van uiteenlopende aspecten van de Japanse maatschappij en cultuur in heden en verleden, doordat hij of zij in staat is om relevante secundaire en primaire bronnen te vinden en te bestuderen. Hij of zij beschikt over de vaardigheid om (in beperkte mate) naar Japanstalige bronnen te verwijzen.

Oordeelsvorming

8. De student heeft de vaardigheid om onderzoeksvragen te definiëren binnen één van de twee clusters: Humanities (HUM) en Social Sciences (SOSCI), door primaire bronnen (inclusief Japanstalige) te vinden en kritisch te analyseren; de student heeft het vermogen om de zo verworven kennis te ordenen.

Communicatie

9. De student heeft de vaardigheid om verworven kennis, inzicht en onderzoeksresultaten, binnen één van de twee clusters: Humanities (HUM) en Social Sciences (SOSCI), helder en beargumenteerd uiteen te zetten en aan derden te presenteren in de vorm van een BA-eindwerkstuk/eindwerk van de opleiding.

Voorts leidt elke Leidse geesteswetenschappelijke opleiding op tot facultair geformuleerde algemene academische vaardigheden. Deze hebben betrekking op de Dublindescriptoren oordeelsvorming, communicatie en leervaardigheden.

Annex 3: Curriculum outline

B Japanese Studies

Jaar 1		
Semester 1		
	EC	Niveau
History of Japan to 1868	5	100
Japan in the 21st Century: Sociological Perspectives	5	100
Kerncurriculum: Area Studies	5	100
Taalkundige Structuur (Grammar) Ia	5	100
Actieve Taalbeheersing Ia: Conversatie & Luistervaardigheid	3	100
Actieve Taalbeheersing Ia: Kanji	2	100
Teksten Ia	5	100
Mentoraat BA1 Japanstudies	-	0
Semester 2		
Modern Japanese History	5	100
Arts and Material Culture of Japan	5	100
Contemporary Japanese Politics and International Relations	5	100
Taalkundige Structuur (Grammar) Ib	5	100
Actieve Taalbeheersing Ib: Conversatie & Luistervaardigheid	3	100
Actieve Taalbeheersing Ib: Kanji	2	100
Teksten Ib	5	100

Jaar 2		
Semester 1		
	EC	Niveau
Kerncurriculum: Wetenschapsfilosofie	5	200
Actieve Taalbeheersing IIa: Productie	5	200
Teksten IIa	5	200
Gebonden keuzevakken (10 EC): kies minimaal 5 EC aan seminars:*	10	200
HUM Seminar Body, Health and Disease in Early Modern Japan	(5)	200
HUM Seminar inleiding tot Japanse taalkunde	(5)	200
HUM Seminar Japanese Art and Visual Culture	(5)	200
HUM Seminar Japan's Asian Empire, Images and Realities	(5)	200
HUM Seminar Film, manga, literatuur	(10)	200
SOSCI Seminar Introduction to Japanese Political Economy	(5)	200
SOSCI Seminar Everyday Japan	(10)	200
Schrijftutorials (gekoppeld aan seminar)	-	200
Gedeeld onderwijs: Keuzecursus bij Koreaans, Chinees, Zuid Azië of Zuid-Oost Azië (5 EC)	5	200

Jaar 2		
Semester 2		
Blok III		
Actieve Taalbeheersing IIb: Productie	2	200
Actieve Taalbeheersing IIb: Teksten	3	200
Kies in blok 3 één van de hieronder vermelde lectures of seminars (5 EC):	5	200
HUM Sem Klassiek Japans 1	(5)	200
SOSCI Lecture Japanese Food	(5)	200
Kies daarnaast één van de hieronder vermelde seminars met Japan-project (5 EC). Een onderdeel van deze seminars is veldwerk in Japan of Nederland:	5	200
HUM Seminar Genders and Sexualities, 1600-1945	(5)	200
HUM Seminar Japanese Linguistics	(5)	200
HUM Seminar Media, Memory, and Museums: Japan and Asia's 'History Wars'	(5)	200
SOSCI Seminar Japanese Politics and International Relations	(5)	200
Blok IV		
Een programma in Leiden OF in Japan (15 EC)	15	
Gedeeld onderwijs: keuzevak bij Koreastudies, Chinastudies of South and Southeast Asia Studies (blok III en IV)	(5)	
Actieve Taalbeheersing IIc: Teksten	(5)	200
Actieve Taalbeheersing IIc: Productie	(5)	200
Studieverblijf Japan	(15)	300

Jaar 3		
Semester 1		
	EC	Niveau
Kies één van de volgende twee vakken (5 EC):	5	300
Klassiek Japans 2	(5)	300
Practising Japanese Studies	(5)	300
Kies daarnaast één BA3 seminar (10 EC):	10	300
HUM Seminar History and Arts	(10)	300
HUM Seminar Literature and Visual Media	(10)	300
HUM Seminar Language and Linguistics	(10)	300
SOSCI Seminar Ethnography and Anthropology	(10)	300
SOSCI Seminar Politics, Political Economy and International Relations of Japan	(10)	300
Vrije keuzeruimte (minor)	15	-

Jaar 3		
Semester 2		
Kies een van de volgende afstudeerprojecten:		
BA Eindwerkstuk en Afstudeer Seminar (15 EC) in combinatie met de rest van de keuzeruimte (15 EC)	30	
BA-eindwerkstuk	(10)	400
Afstudeerseminar Japanstudies	(5)	400
Vrije keuzeruimte (minor)	(15)	-
BA Journal Project en Afstudeer Seminar (15 EC) in combinatie met de rest van de keuzeruimte (15 EC)	30	400
BA Journal Project	(10)	400
Afstudeerseminar Japanstudies	(5)	400
Vrije keuzeruimte (minor)	(15)	-
BA Conference Project en Afstudeer Seminar (15 EC) in combinatie met de rest van de keuzeruimte (15 EC)	30	400
BA Conference Project	(10)	400
Afstudeerseminar Japanstudies	(5)	400
Vrije keuzeruimte (minor)	(15)	-
External Research Project (30EC)	30	400
BA External Research Project	(25)	400
Business Japanese 2	(5)	300

Annex 4: Programme site visit

Cluster Area Studies 2 – Site visit

Dag 1: 8 December 2025

8:30	8:35	Reception
8:35	9:15	Internal deliberations panel
9:15	9:45	Session faculty management (voertaal: NL)
9:45	10:00	Break
10:00	10:45	Session programme management BA International Studies and BA China Studies
10:45	11:00	Break
11:00	11:45	Session lecturers BA China Studies -
11:45	12:30	Session students BA China Studies
12:30	13:15	Lunch
13:15	13:45	Session Board of Examiners BA China Studies -
13:45	14:15	Break
14:15	15:00	Session lecturers BA International Studies -
15:00	15:45	Session students BA International Studies -
15:45	16:00	Break
16:00	16:30	Session Board of Examiners BA International Studies
16:30	17:15	Discussing future development BA International Studies
17:15	18:00	Internal deliberations of the panel

Dag 2: 9 December 2025

09.00	10.00	Session programme management BA Korea Studies / MA Asian Studies 60 EC / MA Asian Studies 120 EC / BA SSEAS -
10.00	10.30	Break
10.30	11.15	Session lecturers BA SSEAS -
11.15	12.00	Session students BA SSEAS -
12:00	13:00	Lunch

13:00	13:45	Session lecturers MA Asian Studies 60 EC & 120 EC
13:45	14:30	Session students MA Asian Studies 60 EC & 120 EC -
14:30	15:00	Break
15:00	15:45	Session lecturers BA Korea Studies -
15:45	16:30	Session students BA Korea Studies -
16:30	16:45	Break
16:45	17:30	Session Board of Examiners Asian Studies -
16:15	17:30	Internal deliberations of the panel

Dag 3: 10 December 2025

09.00	09.30	Internal deliberations of the panel
09.30	10.00	Session programme management BA Japanese Studies
10:00	10:15	Break
10.15	11.00	Session lecturers BA Japanese Studies -
11.00	11.45	Session students BA Japanese Studies -
11.45	12:00	Break
12:00	12.30	Session Board of Examiners Japanese Studies -
12.30	13.15	Lunch
13.15	15.00	Internal deliberations of the panel
15.00	15.45	Pending issues programme management all programmes -
15.45	16.15	Internal deliberations of the panel
16.15	17.00	Discussing future development MA Asian Studies 60 & 120 EC -
17.00	18.00	First feedback of the panel

Annex 5: Documents

Self-evaluation report B Japanese Studies

- Self-evaluation report B Japanese Studies
- Appendixes
 - Faculty Appendix SER
 - Prospectus BA Japanese Studies
 - Education Dashboard FGW
 - Bachelor Course and Examination Regulations – Faculty of Humanities
 - Bachelor Course and Examination Regulations – Japanese Studies
 - Staff overview
 - Assessment plan BA Japanese Studies
 - Rules and Regulations Board of Examiners
 - Vision on Teaching and Learning
 - Guide to Teaching Quality Assurance
 - Manual for Board of Examiners
 - Teaching Evaluation Framework
 - Manual for Programme Committees
 - Assessment Framework
 - Grade descriptors for essay and other assessed coursework
 - Teaching academic skills in the BA Japanese Studies curriculum
 - Presentation evaluation form
 - Essay and written work evaluation form
 - Extenuating circumstances form for examination, assessed coursework and missed attendance
 - Thesis assessment at the Faculty of Humanities

Additional documentation

- AI guide for teachers FGW Leiden University
- Implementing AI in your curriculum FGW Leiden University
- Guidelines for GenAI use students FGW Leiden University
- Annual report Board of Examiners
- OLC Meeting notes
- Annual Report BA Japanese Studies

Selection of final products

Prior to the site visit, the panel reviewed fifteen final projects from the bachelor's programme in Japanese Studies. The sample reflected a balanced distribution in terms of grades, topics and supervisors. The programme does not offer formal specialisations but did include external review projects. At the request of the chair, two of these external review projects were included in the sample.

Grade Range	Number of theses	Selected
5,5-6,9 sufficient	13	3
7,0-8,4 good	47	7
8,5-10 very good	22	3
Total	82	13

Grade Range	Number of external review projects	Selected
5,5-6,9 sufficient	0	0
7,0-8,4 good	4	1
8,5-10 very good	3	1
Total	7	2

The details of the reviewed final projects are known to Odion Onderzoek and are available upon request.