

BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME

ARTS AND CULTURE

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY

QANU
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

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

Project number: Q0721

© 2019 QANU

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



CONTENTS

REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME ARTS AND CULTURE OF MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION.....	5
COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	5
WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	6
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	9
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENTS	12
APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES	25
APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM	26
APPENDIX 3: DESCRIPTION OF THE FOUR DOMAINS (MAJORS)	28
APPENDIX 4: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT	29
APPENDIX 5: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL.....	31

This report was finalized on 29 November 2019.



REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME ARTS AND CULTURE OF MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY

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

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

Bachelor's programme Arts and Culture

Name of the programme:	Arts and Culture (Cultuurwetenschappen)
CROHO number:	50004
Level of the programme:	bachelor's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	180 EC
Specializations or tracks:	-
Location:	Maastricht
Mode of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	English, Dutch
Submission deadline NVAO:	01/05/2020

The visit of the assessment panel Arts and Culture to the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences of Maastricht University took place on 13 and 14 June 2019.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

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

COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The NVAO has approved the composition of the panel on 28 January 2019. The panel that assessed the bachelor's programme Arts and Culture consisted of:

- Prof. dr. J. (Jan) Baetens, professor in Literary Theory and Cultural Studies at KU Leuven (Belgium) [chair];
- Dr. J. (Jeroen) Boomgaard, lecturer in Art & Public Space at Gerrit Rietveld Academie and head of the research master Artistic Research at the University of Amsterdam;
- Prof. dr. K. (Karel) Vanhaesebrouck, professor and chair of Theatre Studies at the Université Libre de Bruxelles (Belgium);
- Drs. M. (Marlous) Willemsen, director of Imagine IC, an organisation and project that documents, presents and discusses everyday life in the neighbourhood and in the city and senior researcher and lecturer in Cultural Heritage at the Reinwardt Academie;
- E.M. (Eeke) van der Wal MA, research master's student Cultural Analysis at the University of Amsterdam (student member).

The panel was supported by P. (Petra) van den Hoorn MSc and drs. L. (Lieke) Ravesteyn MBA, who acted as secretaries.



WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The site visit to the bachelor's programme Arts and Culture at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences of Maastricht University was part of the cluster assessment Arts and Culture. Between February and December 2019, the panel assessed 34 programmes at 10 universities. The following universities participated in this cluster assessment: Erasmus University Rotterdam, Leiden University, Open University, University of Groningen, Maastricht University, University of Amsterdam, Tilburg University, Radboud University Nijmegen, Utrecht University, and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.

On behalf of the participating universities, quality assurance agency QANU was responsible for logistical support, panel guidance and the production of the reports. Dr. Fiona Schouten was project manager for QANU. Fiona Schouten and Petra van den Hoorn MSc acted as secretaries in the cluster assessment.

Panel members

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

- Prof. dr. J. (Jan) Baetens (chair)
- Prof. dr. A. (Annick) Schramme (chair)
- Prof. dr. P.B.M. (Paul) van den Akker
- Dr. J. (Jeroen) Boomgaard
- Prof. dr. R.L. (Rosemarie) Buikema
- Prof. dr. A.S. (Ann-Sophie) Lehmann
- Prof. dr. K. (Karel) Vanhaesebrouck
- Prof. dr. H.J.G. (Henri) Beunders
- Em. prof. dr. S.L. (Sible) de Blaauw
- Drs. A.N. (Lex) ter Braak
- Em. prof. dr. C.A. (Claudine) Chavannes-Mazel
- Prof. dr. P.A.J.M. (Peter-Arno) Coppen
- Drs. P.H.G.J. (Patrick) Cramers
- Prof. dr. M. (Mark) Delaere
- Prof. dr. M. (Mark) Deuze
- Prof. dr. A. (Alexander) Dhoest
- Drs. M.J. (Marie-José) Eijkemans
- Em. prof. dr. R.E.O. (Rudi) Ekkart
- Prof. dr. phil. W.D. (Wolf-Dieter) Ernst
- Prof. dr. J.B.H. (Johan) de Haan
- Prof. dr. K. (Koenraad) Jonckheere
- Prof. dr. S. (Susan) Legêne
- Prof. dr. P. (Philippe) Meers
- Drs. Y.H.M. (Yoeri) Meessen
- Prof. dr. J. (Joost) Raessens
- Dr. M. (Margriet) Schavemaker
- Drs. E.A.M. (Liesbeth) Schöningh
- Prof. dr. C.B. (Cas) Smithuijsen
- Dr. M.T.A. (Marie-Thérèse) van Toor
- Prof. dr. E. (Lies) Wesseling
- Drs. M. (Marlous) Willemsen
- M. (Mirjam) Deckers BA (student member)
- S.W.J. (Stef) van Ool BA (student member)
- V.L. (Vivian) van Slooten MA (student member)
- E.M. (Eeke) van der Wal MA (student member)

Preparation

On 10 September 2018, the panel chair was briefed by QANU on his role, the assessment framework, the working method, and the planning of site visits and reports. A preparatory panel meeting was organised on 14 January 2019. During this meeting, the panel members received instruction on the use of the assessment framework. The panel also discussed their working method and the planning of the site visits and reports.

The project manager composed a schedule for the site visit in consultation with the Faculty. Prior to the site visit, the Faculty selected representative partners for the various interviews. See Appendix 4 for the final schedule.

Before the site visit to the Maastricht University, QANU received the self-evaluation reports of the programmes and sent these to the panel. A thesis selection was made by the panel's chair and the project manager. The selection consisted of 16 theses and their assessment forms for each programme, based on a provided list of graduates between June 2016 and September 2018. A variety of topics and tracks and a diversity of examiners were included in the selection. The project manager and panel chair assured that the distribution of grades in the selection matched the distribution of grades of all available theses.

After studying the self-evaluation report, theses and assessment forms, the panel members formulated their preliminary findings. The secretaries collected all initial questions and remarks and distributed these amongst all panel members.

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

Site visit

The site visit to the Maastricht University took place on 13 and 14 June 2019. Before and during the site visit, the panel studied the additional documents provided by the programmes. An overview of these materials can be found in Appendix 5. The panel conducted interviews with representatives of the programmes: students and staff members, the programme management, alumni and representatives of the Board of Examiners. It also offered students and staff members an opportunity for confidential discussion during a consultation hour. No requests for private consultation were received.

The panel used the final part of the site visit to discuss its findings in an internal meeting. Afterwards, the panel chair publicly presented the panel's preliminary findings and general observations.

Consistency and calibration

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

1. The panel composition ensured regular attendance of (key) panel members, including the chair;
2. The project manager was present at the panel discussion leading to the preliminary findings at all site visits.

Report

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

Definition of judgements standards

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



Generic quality

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

Meets the standard

The programme meets the generic quality standard.

Partially meets the standard

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

Does not meet the standard

The programme does not meet the generic quality standard.

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

Positive

The programme meets all the standards.

Conditionally positive

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

Negative

In the following situations:

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

SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

Intended learning outcomes

The panel appreciates the broad and interdisciplinary profile of the programme BA AC that focuses on relevant societal issues and themes in and between the four domains. Attention is paid to 'applying knowledge and understanding' and 'learning skills' within the context of historical milestones, contemporary and international developments, and the professional field. The profile sufficiently covers both an academic and professional orientation; the panel hereby acknowledges the strengthened academic orientation.

The panel values the increased internationalisation of the programme as positive, but the international character is not yet fully addressed in the profile. Moreover, in the Dutch writing trajectory, there is no structural focus on Dutch culture. The panel advises making the profiles of the programme as a whole and of the Dutch writing trajectory more clear in order to make them better recognisable for the students and the labour market. The implementation of elective trajectories as of 2019-2020 will give the students a better opportunity to specialise and strengthen their learning skills, which will also give them a better orientation on their future choices.

The ILOs have recently been reformulated in a joint process by relevant stakeholders, in particular the External Advisory Board. They are in line with the revised profile, on a bachelor level, and they cover an academic, professional and international orientation.

Teaching-learning environment

The panel concludes that the structure, content and coherence of the bachelor's programme Arts & Culture is in line with the broad, interdisciplinary and historical approach and the profile of 'Western culture and society in a globalising world'. The programme is well-designed and socially relevant; the four domains are introduced in the elementary phase and are further deepened in the graduation phase. The learning objectives represent the ILOs well. The design of PBL really fits the profile: students learn from the start to practise with problem-based learning and transversal thinking. The programme challenges them to do research and use different methodical skills that are relevant to both the professional and the academic field. An internship, minor or study abroad makes further orientation in the professional fields possible.

The panel appreciates the on-going revision of the programme: many of the measures for improvement are on track and transparently described. Especially the efforts made in increasing academic skills, applying and embedding current knowledge more strongly, and working towards more specialisation are already yielding positive results. The panel recommends better positioning and promoting the elective internship, further improving the visibility of the professional skills, and upgrading the admission requirements programme concerning English.

The panel agrees with the choice for English as the main language of instruction: it is in line with the broad and global profile and offers plenty of possibilities in PBL for sharing multicultural skills. The possibility to write the thesis and exams in Dutch still attracts Dutch students, which is worthwhile for the programme. The programme has also created facilities to support students with both English and Dutch. Nevertheless, in line with better positioning the programme, the Dutch writing trajectory could include more Dutch-oriented content to be of truly added value.

The panel is positive about the process of intensifying the student guidance through the mentor programme, partly to address the relatively high drop-out percentage and partly to support students better in making their individual choices. The students really appreciate the mentor programme and the other student facilities offered. The panel is very positive about the intensified supervision during writing the thesis, which really helps the students' progress, but recommends considering making more time available for finishing the thesis. It also suggests that the programme build a stronger relationship with the internship organisations.



The panel concludes that the teaching staff is highly qualified. The students are positive about their different roles (as tutor, lecturer, mentor and advisor) and their teaching and research skills. They also consider them to be very involved and dedicated. The panel appreciates the fact that the programme and faculty are handling work pressure among staff members with great care.

Student assessment

According to the panel, the assessment policy fits well with the profile of the programme and the didactic learning concept PBL. Formative as well as summative assessment methods are being used, and the students learn to reflect continuously on their learning process. The assessment methods are generally in line with the ILOs and the learning objectives.

The regulation procedures and working agreements are well described and applied in the programme. The panel concluded from the interviews that there is a broad culture of safeguarding the assessment system and the assessments which is supported by the management, teaching staff and members of the Board of Examiners. It also became clear that the feedback from students on assessments and the assessment system is seriously discussed in regular meetings of the Educational Programme Committee.

The panel concluded that the validity, reliability and transparency of the assessments are positive. Several improvement points are being addressed by the programme and are on track. In addition, the panel advises the programme to introduce more varied assessment methods, as a supplement to the many writing assessments, and more unity and transparency regarding the assessment of the internship. It also recommends making the contribution of both examiners more visible on the thesis assessment form and investing in the streamlining of the thesis process to reduce the pressure on both students and staff.

Achieved learning outcomes

The panel is pleased with the bachelor's level and the content of the bachelor's theses; they represent both the broad profile of the programme and a specific domain within that profile. They use relevant academic methods and are written in adequate English or Dutch. The strengthened academic orientation is reflected in the improved methodical quality of the theses and will improve even more, the panel expects, given the current revision of the graduation phase.

The alumni succeed sufficiently in finding jobs or starting a master's programme and feel well trained for them. The panel applauds the programme's effort in further strengthening the professional orientation, and it advises further involving alumni of the programme in this process.

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

Bachelor's programme Arts and Culture

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

The chair, prof. dr. Jan Baetens, and the secretary, Petra van den Hoorn MSc, of the panel hereby declare that all panel members have studied this report and that they agree with the judgements laid down in the report. They confirm that the assessment has been conducted in accordance with the demands relating to independence.

Date: 29 November 2019.

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

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

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

Findings

Profile

The aim of the bachelor's programme Arts and Culture (BA AC) at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASoS) of Maastricht University (UM) is to educate students to critically analyse current societal challenges in Western culture and society (Europe and North America) from an interdisciplinary perspective. In it, societal issues, themes and problems are constantly related to contemporary and international contexts and explained through historical insights. Culture is approached on the one hand by looking at the processes of cultural texts and artefacts, and on the other hand by focussing on practices, discourses and institutions. In terms of content, the programme is oriented at art & literature, science & technology, media and politics, and at the connections between these four domains.

The panel approves this broad and interdisciplinary profile. The students learn to explore current and relevant matters from a historical point of view. They orient themselves both theoretically and professionally, and they are stimulated to build bridges between different methods and approaches.

Due partly to the previous accreditation and partly as a result of its own internal evaluations, the profile of BA AC has been, and still is, under revision. The first major change over the past few years has been the strengthening of the academic skills so that the total attention paid to research in the programme has increased. The second change is the intensified international orientation, which aims to prepare the students better for a national as well as an international postgraduate study and labour market. The focus lies on 'Western culture in a globalising world'. Since the academic year 2017-2018, the programme no longer offers a separate Dutch track, but still offers the possibility for students to follow a Dutch writing trajectory (to improve their Dutch academic writing skills), as well as the option of taking all exams of English-taught courses in Dutch and writing their thesis in Dutch. The third change, which will become effective in the academic year 2019-2020, is the implementation of related elective trajectories, which will lead to more specialisation.

The panel greatly values the strengthened academic orientation and internationalisation. In its view, the focus of the international profile is not yet completely articulated. From the conversations with the management and teaching staff, the panel deduced that the international (that is, global) character of the profile still needs to be addressed more fully. The general profile focusses mainly on Western Europe, whereas other broader scopes also seem to be relevant for the students and their future labour market. The panel also learned that the Dutch writing trajectory does not provide an additional focus on Dutch culture. In the discussion with the management and staff, it became clear that the advantages for the Dutch writing trajectory at the moment lie mainly in catering to Dutch students (see Standard 2). In terms of content, the panel advises making the own character and profile for the Dutch writing trajectory more explicit and recognisable. Finally, it became clear to the panel that the elective trajectories will give the students a better opportunity to specialise, strengthen their learning skills and prepare themselves for the labour market. They will be provided with two advantages which the panel appreciates: making further 'international contextualisation' during the programme possible and starting a lifelong process of 'individual specialisation'.

Intended learning outcomes

The panel looked carefully at the Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) of the programme (cf. Appendix 1) and noticed that they were fine-tuned in the period 2016-2018. This process took place in close collaboration between the programme managers, Educational Programme Committee, educationalist and course coordinators and in consultation with the External Advisory Board (consisting of alumni of the programme and representatives from the professional field). This process of improvement is described transparently in the education plan. As a result, by strengthening 'applying knowledge and understanding' and 'learning skills', the ILOs have been brought better in line with the Dublin descriptors. The programme formulated revised ILOs such as: 'doing interdisciplinary research under supervision' (B5); 'can act as self-regulated learners who are able to apply their outlook, critical thinking and self-reflective skills to a life-long learning process' (E2); and 'collaborate and work towards common goals within heterogeneous and international groups, making use of interpersonal and intercultural skills' (E3).

According to the panel, the programme's renewed profile is adequately reflected in the ILOs. For instance, the international orientation is reflected in ILOs mentioning interpersonal and intercultural skills and the academic orientation in ILOs mentioning interdisciplinary research and self-regulated learning. The panel appreciates the specific way in which the ILOs are formulated together with relevant stakeholders of the programme, in particular with the External Advisory Board. They are formulated on a bachelor's level, in line with the Dublin descriptors, and include a professional, academic and international orientation. The adjusted ILOs became the start of a process of 'constructive alignment' with the educational objectives (see Standard 2).

Considerations

The panel appreciates the broad and interdisciplinary profile of the programme BA AC that focuses on relevant societal issues and themes in and between the four domains (art & literature, science & technology, media and politics). Attention is paid to 'applying knowledge and understanding' and 'learning skills' within the context of historical milestones, contemporary and international developments, and the professional field. The profile sufficiently covers both an academic and professional orientation; the panel hereby acknowledges the strengthened academic orientation.

The panel values the increased internationalisation of the programme as positive, but the international character is not yet fully addressed in the profile. Moreover, in the Dutch writing trajectory, there is no structural focus on Dutch culture. The panel advises making the profiles of the programme as a whole and of the Dutch writing trajectory more clear in order to make them better recognisable for the students and the labour market. The implementation of elective trajectories as of 2019-2020 will give the students a better opportunity to specialise and strengthen their learning skills, which will also give them a better orientation on their future choices.

The ILOs have recently been reformulated in a joint process by relevant stakeholders, in particular the External Advisory Board. They are in line with the revised profile, on a bachelor level, and they cover an academic, professional and international orientation.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Arts and Culture: the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'Meets the standard'.



Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

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

Findings*Structure and content of the programme*

The programme BA AC (180 EC) is designed to be broad and interdisciplinary: in each of the thematically structured, problem-based courses, different perspectives are offered within the didactic approach of Problem-Based Learning (PBL). PBL is a teaching method with which learning is approached as a constructive, collaborative, self-directed and contextual process (see Didactical form of the programme). The programme is split into an elementary phase of 1.5 years (90 EC) and a graduation phase of another 1.5 years (90 EC). Each academic year consists of five periods following the structure of 8-8-4-8-8 weeks. During most of the periods, the students typically follow one substantive and one skill course, which are designed to complement each other. While the first phase consists of mandatory courses, the second phase is more open to be filled in by the students. The three semesters of the first phase (from year 1, period 1 until year 2, period 3) consists of six thematic courses, the themes of which deal with key moments in Western culture: Apollo and Dionysus covers ancient and medieval world; Knowledge & Criticism covers the discoveries and the impact of science and scientific thinking in the 'new world'; Disenchantment & Ideology covers societal transformations of the 19th century; Art & Modernity covers the role played by the arts in societal developments in the fin de siècle and early 20th century; Network Society covers the societal role of technology, media and digitisation in the mid to late 20th century and Cultural Pluralism covers multicultural societies of the early 21st century. Through a combination of small tutorials and lectures, students are familiarised with these subjects and with the perspectives of the core disciplines upon which the programme draws (history, philosophy, studies of art & literature, qualitative social sciences). Parallel to them are the courses in academic and methodological skills, which support specific research methods in the social sciences and humanities. The second phase starts in year 2, with an elective fourth semester that students can fill with subjects from the four domains: Political Culture, Media Culture, Cultures of Knowledge & Technology and Literature, Art & Culture (see Appendix 3 for a description of the domains). In the elective fifth semester, the students can go abroad, or do a minor or an internship. The final semester of the programme is reserved for the thesis: preparation courses (18 EC) and the thesis itself (12 EC). As of 2019-2020, the thesis will account for 16 EC, the preparation courses account for 14 EC.

In reaction to the last accreditation, the programme has undertaken serious efforts to strengthen the academic orientation, including extra courses for writing skills and research methods, research tutorials and working with writing coaches. A total revision of the curriculum began in 2016-2017, which was aimed at improving its content and coherence. The specific aims were: 1) updating the substantive courses to align them better with the revised ILOs, embed them better in current societal changes, and integrate them better with the skills courses; 2) improving the skills track for academic skills; 3) renewing the learning trajectory in 'Research and writing' that runs throughout the whole curriculum, including an increase of EC for the thesis (from 12 to 16 EC); and 4) implementing new elective trajectories in the fourth semester replacing the former majors/specialisations. The curriculum 2018-2019 consists of an already renewed first year containing the updated substantive courses and the new basic academic skills like Finding Sources and Doing Conceptual Analysis (see Appendix 2 for the curriculum 2018-2019). The revisions to the second and third years will be implemented in 2019-2020, including the new skill trainings (Doing Ethnography, Doing Discourse Analysis, Doing Research in Arts and Culture and Writing a Research Proposal), the thesis of 16 ECTS and the preparation courses of 14 ECTS and the implementation of six interdisciplinary elective courses which focus on intersections between the domains and five elective skills courses through which the students can deepen their understanding of one of the skills introduced in the elementary phase (see Appendix 2 for the curriculum 2019-2020).

The panel studied the structure, content and coherence of the bachelor's programme (BA-EER 2018-2019, course descriptions and coursebooks) and discussed them with the management, teaching staff, students and alumni. It concluded that the programme is well designed, interdisciplinary and socially relevant. The programme has a clear structure (generic versus specific) and coherence (within and between the phases), with an elaborate academic skills track. The chosen subjects of the courses of the elementary phase and the four domains clearly represent the 'Western culture and society in a globalising world' profile and the historical approach; the learning objectives of the courses are in line with the revised ILOs (made transparent in several matrices). From the start, the programme stimulates problem-based learning and transversal thinking and challenges the students to do research and use different methodical skills that are relevant for the professional field. The internship or study abroad makes an introduction to the professional field possible. The panel appreciates the revision of the programme: many of the measures for improvement are on track and are transparently described in the education plan formulated in close collaboration with the Educational Programme Committee. The Mid-term report BA AC, January 2018, also gives a clear overview of the recent and earlier improvements in response to the previous accreditation.

Two points were additionally discussed in the interviews: 1) the increased accent on academic skills and 2) the choice for and use of relevant knowledge. Regarding academic skills, it appeared to the panel that there is a large focus on methodological skills and tools in the programme, e.g. discourse, conceptual and visual analysis, close reading, finding sources, iconology and academic writing. From the staff and students, the panel heard that the programme pays a lot of attention to professional skills, among which communication skills (working together in teams, giving presentations), intercultural skills and reflective skills. It values the attention paid to academic and professional skills and compliments the programme on this. In its opinion, the programme would benefit when it would emphasise the attention paid to professional skills more strongly in their internal and external communication.

Regarding use of relevant knowledge, the panel noticed based on evaluation documents that students have been asking for further application of knowledge and a more practical translation of theories, but at the same time they are satisfied with the (inter)disciplinary basis which is necessary to connect and deepen knowledge. The teaching staff told the panel that the broad profile of the programme is complex and requires making choices. They told the panel that they also bring in parts of current projects or their own research themes. The students and alumni mentioned to the panel that the teaching staff succeed in connecting the courses to the relevant themes.

By studying the content of the programme, it became clear to the panel that a lot of effort has been put into redefining and embedding current developments and connecting them better with the core knowledge and underlying disciplines. The panel compliments the programme on this and finds that this increased attention is already recognisable in the renewed parts of the programme. The panel supports the programme's intention to keep paying attention to actualisation and coherence and adds that special attention is needed for keeping the offered knowledge in line, especially that given in the parallel lectures (to avoid fragmentation). One attention point is that if the profile shifts, the content has to shift equally (see the panel's advice regarding focussing further on the internationalisation of the profile under Standard 1).

Internationalisation, name and language of the programme

The BA AC had a yearly intake of 91 – 115 students over the period 2014-2018, and the international background has become increasingly diverse. While Dutch students make up the biggest group (slightly less than 40%), there are also large groups of German, Belgian and Italian students, and a small but increasing number of students from non-EU and non-EER countries. Only a few Dutch students apply for the Dutch writing trajectory.

The name of the bachelor's programme Arts & Culture represents the English-taught curriculum, which is in line with the broad and internationally oriented profile. In the generic as well as in the elective parts of the curriculum, special attention is paid to the historical background of Western



culture and to relevant, more global and contemporary issues concerning this culture. According to the panel, this sufficiently legitimizes the chosen English name, together with an increasing international population of students and teachers within the learning concept PBL. Although all courses are in English, students who follow the Dutch writing trajectory still have the choice of writing their exams and thesis in Dutch and following the academic writing trajectory in Dutch (to help them improve their Dutch academic writing skills). According to the teaching staff, this is appealing for a specific, small group of Dutch students. The use of academic writing advisors in both languages is strongly appreciated by the panel, but at the same time the panel made a comment concerning the contents of the Dutch writing trajectory lacking a specific identity. The panel suggests connecting the content of the Dutch writing trajectory more to Dutch culture (see Standard 1) by paying more attention to Dutch literature and Dutch casuistry on a structural basis. With regard to the 'Arts' in the name, the students sometimes experienced the title as somewhat one-sided and insufficiently covering the programme's content. The management and staff are aware of this: in information about the programme, they emphasize the inclusive concept of culture that considers not only art, but also science, technology, politics and media.

Didactical form of the programme

The bachelor's programme Arts & Culture follows the didactic learning concept of PBL. According to the management and teaching staff, the method (oriented at constructive, collaborative, self-directed and contextual learning) fully supports the interdisciplinary character of the programme. It lays emphasis on dialogue and collaboration in tutorial groups of 12 to 15 students, on self-study, and is supported by tutors (facilitators of PBL sessions) and separate lectures (by teaching staff). The students are systematically trained to follow the seven-step method of PBL so they get acquainted with the research process: defining problem statements and learning goals, independently finding sources, integrating the knowledge and reporting on it in a coherent way. While the steps and guidance by the tutor are more structured in the elementary phase, in the graduation phase students have more freedom regarding the topics of research, and they are challenged to relate their own experiences more to the academic concepts.

In addition to the tutorial groups and lectures, there are other didactical work methods that vary according to the specific courses and contexts: working in specific groups or more individually, using debates, presentations, working with papers, site visits to relevant professional organisations, etc.

In the conversations with students, alumni and teaching staff, it appeared that all of them were positive about the didactic concept and the way it has been implemented. A majority of the students chose this programme precisely because of the PBL concept. The students told the panel that they learn to practise all sorts of roles, in different groups, do widely applicable exercises, and lead their own learning processes. They feel that they are guided well by the tutors in the dynamic group processes, and they feel supported by them in finding the relevant knowledge sources.

Regarding the participation of international students in the classroom, the panel understood that they sometimes struggle to fully participate from the start in the tutorial groups. To support the students in this respect, the tutors explained to the panel that they offer more guidance on PBL at the beginning and, if necessary, pay more attention to individual students; this is supplemented with separate guidance by a mentor in the mentor programme and by the student advisors. Furthermore, in the Cultural Pluralism course, with its focus on clashing values in contemporary multicultural societies, students are challenged to make their own experiences and perspectives more explicit. The panel appreciates the attention paid to intercultural skills within PBL and the programme.

The students are expected to be present at all group meetings and contribute equally to the group work. According to the tutors, the commitment of the students is discussed regularly; they receive feedback from the tutor and are trained to give each other feedback. The panel appreciates the positive attention to feedback and how to prevent the aspect of freeriding.

Professional orientation

The professional orientation is present in the curriculum as part of the learning concept PBL, in the form of internal and external assignments, research, sharing professional experiences among teachers and students, the skills courses and the internship. Students can do internships (including international) in governmental or non-governmental organisations (e.g. European Parliament), cultural institutions (e.g. museums), private cultural organisations (galleries), business organizations (e.g. design agencies, TV stations) and media organisations (e.g. magazines, literary agents). The panel understood from evaluation documents and from interviews with the teaching staff and students that only a few students decide to do an internship. The students who chose to do one are satisfied, but it appeared to the panel that many more students would like to do an internship. It supports the programme in its plans to boost the internship and improve its position. Strengthening the programme's link with professional life and practice is an ongoing concern, so the programme has started intensifying the mentor programme to guide students better in their choices for their future practical orientation. In the fifth semester, the maximum number of EC for the internship will be increased from 18 to 24 to make it easier to do an internship.

The External Advisory Board is already involved in giving advice about the design of the curriculum. The composition of this Board is going to be renewed with alumni who graduated more recently, including international alumni, and with representatives of relevant working fields, which the panel supports because it is another means to strengthen the professional orientation.

Student-centred learning

The panel was pleased to see that the programme offers ample room for student-centred learning. For example, in the fourth semester the students can choose one of the four domains and, from 2019, create their own elective trajectory by selecting, in consultation with their mentor, two (out of six) of the elective courses on offer. The expected advantages of these trajectories are that they help students to be better prepared for choosing a master's programme through more specialisation. Additionally, students will no longer be forced to choose a single domain, but are invited to compose a mix of domains, fitting their own interests and ambitions. For the new trajectories the programme prepared an overview of relevant electives which are in line with each current domain; e.g. for the Art & Literature domain, the new substantial courses Othering Europe or Art, Literature & Technoscience (year 2, period 4) and Vulnerable Bodies (year 2, period 5) are relevant. The panel believes that the increased flexibility will work out positively and is enthusiastic about this planned change. It stresses the importance of keeping the elective trajectories recognisable. This was also a concern expressed by the students but already acknowledged by the programme management and staff.

Student-centred learning is also promoted in the fifth semester, when students can go abroad, follow a minor or do an internship. FASoS has agreements with over one hundred European and non-European partner universities. A course at the Arts Faculty of Hogeschool Zuyd or various minors at FASoS (including a minor about Dutch culture) are also possible. FASoS has a large teacher and alumni network and a large international staff network, which supports students in their choices for studying abroad. In the BA-EER 2018-2019 and Rules & Regulations 2018-2019, the procedures for exchange programmes and the electives are clearly described.

Finally, the programme offers the best-performing students the opportunity to participate in the honours programme (MaRBLe), which includes a faculty component (20 credits) and a university-wide component (5 credits). The deliverables of the MaRBLe project – which replaces the thesis – are consistent with the criteria for the regular bachelor's thesis.

Feasibility and guidance

The programme organises Open Days, Matching questionnaires and other interactive experience days to ensure that students make the right choice when considering the bachelor's programme Arts & Culture of UM. Despite the help of academic writers who offer special workshops and individual guidance (English and Dutch), it appears that some students still experience difficulties with their



level of speaking and writing in English. The programme's admission requirements specify an IELTS (International English Language Testing System) score of at least 6.0. The panel believes this score should ideally be 6.5 or 7.0, because it expects that entering with the minimum score may cause extra work for the teachers and students.

With a BSA of at least 42 credits in year 1 according to the programme, the drop-out rates can be considered relatively high (around 30 percent in year 1). There is also a large percentage of students who did not obtain a grade (students who do not participate in the exams of the courses). An explanation offered by management and students alike is that students feel pressure caused by the (strict) period system: when they fail one course, they run behind as they already have to start focussing on the next one. In the Educational Programme Committee, all possible reasons for delay are discussed and proposals for improvements are made (as the panel saw in the minutes). The management told the panel that the rate of return is an ongoing concern which has the full attention of the management and teaching staff. The panel is satisfied with the attention paid to feasibility.

In order to support students, the programme management decided to intensify its mentor programme. In year 1, the students have group meetings and individual meetings with their mentor. The focus is on studying skills and self-regulated learning. The mentors also monitor the students' study progress to help reduce the drop-out rates, and they will direct students to the writing advisors and student advisors whenever necessary. As of 2019-2020 the programme will extend the mentor programme to year 2 to help students by guiding them in selecting electives, devising a plan for the fifth semester, and preparing for their graduation trajectory. In year 3, the students voluntarily participate in the mentor programme, which will focus on coaching them to reflect about their future, employability and the choice between a job or a master's programme. During the site visit, the students were enthusiastic about the plans to expand the mentor programme. The panel agrees and thinks expanding it will increase the programme's support with making choices and monitoring study progress.

The sixth semester is devoted to the thesis. Parallel to writing the thesis, the students follow the courses about learning how to prepare and write their thesis proposal and do research, within the specialised four domains. From 2019-2020, the preparation courses (14 EC) are sequentially offered before the thesis (16 EC), and students from the different domains are combined (see Appendix 2). The students sign up for a thesis group by choosing, on a first-come first-served basis, from a list of available themes which is based on the research interests and expertise of the available supervisors (professors). They have to find their own focus and link the themes to their chosen domain or electives and to the intended learning outcomes. In the thesis groups, they (usually 3-6 students) develop a proposal before starting with the thesis itself, under the guidance of their supervisor. It is expected that the planning and design of the new preparation courses will align better with the system of theme groups.

Students told the panel that they are very satisfied with the way supervision is offered during the process of writing a thesis; they are mostly satisfied with the choice of their thesis theme. The panel looked at the list of themes and the procedure for enrolling in a thesis group and being assigned a supervisor, and thinks the programme uses a well-designed procedure. If a student is unhappy with the result, the best solutions are sought. A point of concern is the perceived short time designated for actually writing the thesis. Handing in the final thesis in June (with a possible resit during the summer) may exert a lot of pressure for some students. Therefore, the panel suggests that the programme management give students more flexibility and time (e.g. during the resit period) so that they have the choice to give their thesis a last boost to improve their grade.

A staff member of the programme provides supervision during the internship. There is a signed agreement between the internship organisation, the faculty internship coordinator and the student prior to the start of the internship. The panel understood that some students experience a lack of systematic contact between the staff member (supervisor) and the internship supervisor about how the student is performing. More involvement of the programme supervisor with the professional

supervisor of the internship organization seems desirable, to improve the possible positive effects of the internship for the student, as the panel concluded from the conversation with the students.

Teaching staff

The teaching staff is highly qualified, both educationally, by having obtained a UTQ (University Teaching Qualification), and by possessing relevant expertise in their field of study. The panel studied the research focus and roles of the core staff and other staff and concluded that a large majority either possesses a University Teaching Qualification (UTQ) or is in the process of obtaining it. Full professors and associate professors are well represented on the teaching staff, and most thesis supervisors have a PhD. Almost 40% of the academic teaching staff comes from abroad, with a variety of nationalities (e.g. Europe, China, South Africa). All tutors are staff members of the programme. New staff members receive a mandatory introductory course to PBL, and they are coached in their tutoring activities by an experienced staff member. Attention is also paid to regular staff professionalisation (like workshops about didactic and assessment qualities and intercultural skills). The students are very positive about the teaching and research skills of the teaching staff and the way research and education are intertwined during the programme. In the conversation with the panel, the students especially praised the personal involvement and dedication of their teachers.

To the panel it became clear that the experienced workload among staff members is very high. It understood from the management and teaching staff that this has already been a point of concern for some time. It greatly appreciates the number of measures that the management has undertaken to make things more bearable, like reducing the number of exams, creating synergies through sharing electives, more time for research (and less publication pressure), more steady contracts, tenure tracks, sabbatical possibilities, etc. Within the 8-8-4 period system there are fewer activities planned in the first week of each period, which implies fewer activities for students and more recovery time for the tutors and lecturers. The panel highly appreciates these decisions.

Considerations

The panel concludes that the structure, content and coherence of the bachelor's programme Arts & Culture is in line with the broad, interdisciplinary and historical approach and the profile of 'Western culture and society in a globalising world'. The programme is well-designed and socially relevant; the four domains (art & literature, science & technology, media and politics) are introduced in the elementary phase and are further deepened in the graduation phase. The learning objectives represent the ILOs well. The design of PBL really fits the profile: students learn from the start to practise with problem-based learning and transversal thinking. The programme challenges them to do research and use different methodical skills that are relevant to both the professional and the academic field. An internship (undertaken locally or internationally), minor or study abroad makes further orientation in the professional fields possible.

The panel appreciates the on-going revision of the programme: many of the measures for improvement are on track and transparently described. Especially the efforts made in increasing academic skills, applying and embedding current knowledge more strongly, and working towards more specialisation are already yielding positive results. The panel recommends better positioning and promoting the elective internship, further improving the visibility of the professional skills, and upgrading the admission requirements programme concerning English.

The panel agrees with the choice for English as the main language of instruction: it is in line with the broad and global profile and offers plenty of possibilities in PBL for sharing multicultural skills. The Dutch writing trajectory, which offers students the possibility to write the thesis and exams in Dutch, still attracts Dutch students, which is worthwhile for the programme. The programme has also created facilities to support students with both English and Dutch. Nevertheless, in line with better positioning the programme, the Dutch writing trajectory could include more Dutch-oriented content to be of truly added value.



The panel is positive about the process of intensifying the student guidance through the mentor programme, partly to address the relatively high drop-out percentage and partly to support students better in making their individual choices. The students really appreciate the mentor programme and the other student facilities offered. The panel is very positive about the intensified supervision during writing the thesis, which really helps the students' progress, but recommends considering making more time available for finishing the thesis. It also suggests that the programme build a stronger relationship with the internship organisations.

The panel concludes that the teaching staff is highly qualified. The students are positive about their different roles (as tutor, lecturer, mentor and advisor) and their teaching and research skills. They also consider them to be very involved and dedicated. The panel appreciates the fact that that the programme and faculty are handling work pressure among staff members with great care.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Arts and Culture: the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'Meets the standard'.

Standard 3: Student assessment

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

Findings

Quality of assessment

In 2017-2018 the assessment policy of the faculty was redefined, and attention was paid not only to summative assessment, but also to formative assessment. The panel reviewed the programme's Education Plan, which consists of an overview of assessment methods per course. Each course consists of learning objectives that are aligned with the corresponding assessments. Weighting and grade calculation are specified. All courses are aligned with the ILOs. The panel confirmed that the assessment policy and design of the assessment system tie in with the profile, the ILOs and the learning concept PBL.

At the programme level the management and teaching staff (examiners) ensure the overall quality of assessment. The programme director monitors effective implementation of the assessment programme and the Board of Examiners (BoE) ensures the quality of the assessment programme. The Educational Programme Committee evaluates the assessment performance over the year as part of focussing on the quality of courses. The management and teaching staff are guided by the assessment policy, guidelines from the BoE, and procedures described in the Rules and Regulations, and they are supported by an educationalist and an Assessment Committee, who are responsible for the development of the faculty's assessment policy and supports its implementation. In the Rules and Regulations, adequate regulations for the exams and dispensations for FASoS and non-FASoS courses are formulated.

A range of assessment methods are used, including written exams, take-home exams, research papers, (group) presentations, debates and book reviews. The panel appreciates the gradual build-up of the assessments in terms of difficulty level. While in the beginning there is more emphasis on written and take-home exams, later on in the programme the writing of research papers becomes dominant. Wherever possible, course coordinators and tutors provide feedback on drafts prior to the summative assessments. Furthermore, the commitment of the students during all tutorials is assessed: in addition to the grade, a plus or minus 0.5 can be given to students with extraordinary forms of participation (this is described in the R&R FASoS 2018-2019). Students recognise this regulation but do not completely agree on how consequently this rule is applied: they feel that there is a difference in how it is applied by different tutors. The students generally value the assessment methods, which in their opinion are well tuned to the contents of the courses. They also mentioned some points for improvement, such as implicit or non-existent assessment criteria and a lack of consistency in the way feedback is given. The panel understood from the management and teaching

staff that, from the academic year 2018-2019 onwards, course coordinators have to specify how the assessment and feedback will be communicated to students, in combination with a more frequent use of assessment plans. The programme director discusses these aspects regularly with the course coordinators to ensure that feedback and grades are consistently communicated. It also became clear that the feedback from the students on assessments and the assessment system is seriously discussed in regular meetings of the Educational Programme Committee.

The panel concluded that the validity, reliability, transparency and procedural quality of the assessments are positive. The above-mentioned improvement points are already being addressed by the programme, but still need further implementation. The panel advises the programme to introduce more varied assessment methods, as a supplement to the many writing assessments. It found that the assessment forms of the internship are applied differently with regard to the inclusion of the feedback of the supervisor of the internship as a regular part of the assessment procedure. The panel thinks that a more uniform and transparent use of the assessment procedure for the internship is desirable.

With regard to the assessment of the thesis, the programme fully complies with the faculty-wide Regulation for assessment of final work, accompanied by a separate procedure: two examiners provide a joint assessment, and the assessment form only looks at the merits of the final work; no other circumstances concerning the process of writing are taken into account. The programme director oversees the process of matching the student's interest with a first reader (the supervisor) and then finding a right match with a second reader (the responsible examiner). A designated assessment form which explicitly specifies the grading criteria is used and filled in by both examiners under the responsibility of the responsible examiner. When the examiners cannot come to an agreement, a third examiner is involved. The panel highly appreciates the design of the assessment form and the transparency of the procedure; the programme has really invested in the formalisation and embedding of the procedure within the faculty. The forms of the bachelor's theses the panel studied were filled out in sufficient detail. The panel suggests making the contribution of both examiners more explicit, because this will give students more insight into their final grade.

Examination board

The Board of Examiners has varied tasks, which are all related to safeguarding the assessment quality (e.g. advising to the management concerning the assessment policy and regulations, appointing the responsible examiners, and screening assessment forms for the grading of the final work). It also screens the distribution of the results of all assessments and, in case of discrepancies, seeks contact with the programme director. To monitor the assessment quality of the programme as a whole, it also undertakes more general activities. For instance, it participates in thesis grading calibration workshops. Every year, it organises an internal audit check on the assessment of theses.

The programme is aware that the short period for writing the thesis can exert pressure on the students, and at the same time the teaching staff is trying to assess strictly within the frameworks used. The panel saw this reflected in the sample of theses it studied, as a low percentage of high grades was observed. Probably the new streamlining of the thesis, compared with a higher planned study load (in EC) for students, will provide some relief for both students and teaching staff (see *Feasibility and guidance* under Standard 2).

The panel observed a large number of students who appealed during their studies. During the site visit, it became clear that this causes a high workload for the Board in handling these appeals, which are sometimes simply unfounded or not in proportion to the work that comes with an appeal. The panel thinks better communication to the students could be a solution. At the moment, the students seem unaware of the steps that precede an appeal. Therefore, the panel suggests clearly communicating the several steps the students can take first before they decide to appeal.



The panel concluded that the Board fulfils an active and important independent role in defining, advising and monitoring the quality of the assessments and the assessment system. The Board is aware of the current issues and is working hard on trying to solve them.

Considerations

According to the panel, the assessment policy fits well with the profile of the programme and the didactic learning concept PBL. Formative as well as summative assessment methods are being used, and the students learn to reflect continuously on their learning process. The assessment methods are generally in line with the ILOs and the learning objectives.

The regulation procedures and working agreements are well described and applied in the programme. The panel concluded from the interviews that there is a broad culture of safeguarding the assessment system and the assessments which is supported by the management, teaching staff and members of the Board of Examiners. It also became clear that the feedback from students on assessments and the assessment system is seriously discussed in regular meetings of the Educational Programme Committee.

The panel concluded that the validity, reliability and transparency of the assessments are positive. Several improvement points are being addressed by the programme and are on track. In addition, the panel advises the programme to introduce more varied assessment methods, as a supplement to the many writing assessments, and more unity and transparency regarding the assessment of the internship. It also recommends making the contribution of both examiners more visible on the thesis assessment form and investing in the streamlining of the thesis process to reduce the pressure on both students and staff.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Arts and Culture: the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'Meets the standard'.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.
--

Findings

Thesis quality

The panel read 16 bachelor's theses of the programme, two of which were from the honours programme (MaRBLe). The theses were equally divided over the four domains; 11 were in English and five in Dutch. The panel found that the thesis themes were realistic for the field of art and culture and its current globalising developments. They covered both the underlying broad profile and one of the specific domains, reflected the academic bachelor's level, used relevant academic methods (in line with their domain) and were written in adequate English or Dutch. The programme has put a lot of effort into following up the recommendations of the previous accreditation. The panel could clearly see that the training of academic skills and the thesis guidance have been strengthened, which was evidenced by the solid methodological underpinning of the theses. Moreover, the new research and elective courses will further strengthen the focus on analysing research material, across the domains, which the panel expects will increase the quality of the final works even more.

Alumni success

Most graduates opt for a master's programme in the Netherlands or abroad. Few students (around 10 percent) choose to follow the faculty's follow-on master's programme Arts and Culture. Most graduates, however, choose master's programmes like Communication Studies, Media Studies, History, Philosophy, Sociology, Political Science and European Studies and Law. The graduates are easily accepted into these programmes and do not experience any adjustment problems. After the bachelor's or master's programme, the graduates are employed in a wide range of jobs (e.g. editors,

professors, public historians, museum curators, art coordinators, marketing professionals and project managers).

The students recognise that throughout the programme, they acquire valuable skills, such as critical thinking, collaboration and solving problems and good writing and presentation skills. According to the survey among representatives of internship institutions, the graduates of the bachelor's programme Art & Culture are especially appreciated for their outstanding teamwork skills and high level of motivation. While the survey among recent graduates showed their general satisfaction with the programme, the graduates indicated the programme's orientation towards professional life and practice needs to improve. As stated before (see Standard 2), the programme has acknowledged these aspects by trying to intensify the connection between the domains and improving the professional orientation in several ways. In addition to improvements inserted by the programme, the Faculty has been facilitating the organisation of the annual Career Day since 2017-2018. The panel advises to communicate about this event more regularly towards the students. The panel advises increasing the involvement of alumni, not only through career days, but throughout the programme (internship placements, workshops) so that students are informed about their chances in the labour market and invited to relate their study and themselves to the professional field.

Considerations

The panel is pleased with the bachelor's level and the content of the bachelor's theses; they represent both the broad profile of the programme and a specific domain within that profile. They use relevant academic methods (in line with their domain) and are written in adequate English or Dutch. The strengthened academic orientation is reflected in the improved methodical quality of the theses and will improve even more, the panel expects, given the current revision of the graduation phase.

The alumni succeed sufficiently in finding jobs or starting a master's programme and feel well trained for them. The panel applauds the programme's effort in further strengthening the professional orientation, and it advises further involving alumni of the programme in this process.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Arts and Culture: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'Meets the standard'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

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

Conclusion

The panel assesses the *bachelor's programme Arts and Culture* as 'positive'.



APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

Upon completion of the BA Arts and Culture, graduates are able to:

A. Knowledge and insight (Dublin Descriptor I)

- A1. define current societal issues, developments, problems, challenges and debates in Western culture and society.
- A2. understand core issues and key moments of the intellectual, cultural and social history of modern Western society.
- A3. demonstrate knowledge of the main ideas, concepts, theoretical debates and methods from philosophy, history, art and literary studies, and the qualitative social sciences.
- A4. analyse art, science, technology, media and politics as cultural phenomena, focusing on artefacts and cultural practices.

B. Applying knowledge and insight (Dublin Descriptor II)

- B1. identify differences and similarities in approaches of philosophy, history, literature and art and the qualitative social sciences.
- B2. integrate knowledge of philosophy, history, art and literary studies, and the qualitative social sciences in an advanced understanding of complex societal issues.
- B3. address and formulate a research problem, retrieve and/or elicit the appropriate (digital) sources, compile a bibliography, and give critical, narrative and argumentative form to their findings.
- B4. select and apply methods of humanities and qualitative social science research.
- B5. do interdisciplinary research under supervision.

C. Formation of a judgement (Dublin descriptor III)

- C1. analyse current societal issues, problems, challenges and debates, and connect them to their contemporary and historical contexts.
- C2. develop an argument and take a reasoned position in academic and societal debates.

D. Communication (Dublin Descriptor IV)

- D1. express themselves adequately in academic English/Dutch, in spoken and written forms.
- D2. explain their arguments to relevant audiences.

E. Learning skills (Dublin Descriptor V)

- E1. provide, receive and implement constructive criticism.
- E2. act as self-regulated learners, who are able to apply their outlook, critical thinking and selfreflective skills to a life-long learning process.
- E3. collaborate and work towards common goals within heterogeneous and international groups, making use of interpersonal and intercultural skills.



APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Programme 2018-2019

	Period 1 Sept-Oct	Period 2 Nov-Dec	Period 3 Jan	Period 4 Feb-March	Period 5 April-May	June
Year 1	Apollo and Dionysus 9 ECTS	Knowledge and Criticism 9 ECTS	Research and Writing I	Disenchantment and Ideology 9 ECTS	Art and Modernity 9 ECTS	
	Reading texts and Interdisciplinarity 4 ECTS	Finding sources 4 ECTS	Schrijf- en Onderzoeks-vaardigheden I 7 ECTS	Doing Conceptual Analysis 4 ECTS	Analysing Art I 4 ECTS	
	Mentor Programme 1 ECTS					
	Period 1 Sept-Oct	Period 2 Nov-Dec	Period 3 Jan	Period 4 Feb-March	Period 5 April-May	June
Year 2	Network Society 8,5 ECTS	Cultural Pluralism 9 ECTS	Research and Writing II	Frankenstein's Hope Modernity and the Arts I	The Design of Man Modernity and the Arts II	
	Close to the foreign 3 ECTS	Theory of science and interdisciplinarity 3 ECTS	Schrijf- en Onderzoeks-vaardigheden II 7 ECTS	Observing & representing The European State 12 ECTS	Logo & Imago Power & Democracy 12 ECTS	
				Entering the Field I CKT, LAC, MC, PC 3 ECTS	Entering the field II CKT, LAC, MC, PC 3 ECTS	
	Period 1 Sept-Oct	Period 2 Nov-Dec	Period 3 Jan	Period 4 Feb-March	Period 5 April-May	June
Year 3	5 th semester abroad, minor, internship (30 ECTS)			Doing Research in CKT, LAC, MC, PC + NL (12 ECTS)		
				Vademecum thesis writing CKT, LAC, MC, PC + NL (6 ECTS)		
				BA Thesis (12 ECTS)		

Programme 2019-2020

	Period 1 Sept-Oct	Period 2 Nov-Dec	Period 3 Jan	Period 4 Feb-March	Period 5 April-May	June
Year 1	Apollo and Dionysus 9 ECTS	Knowledge and Criticism 9 ECTS	Research and Writing I 7 ECTS	Disenchantment and Ideology 9 ECTS	Art and Modernity 9 ECTS	
	Reading texts and Interdisciplinarity 4 ECTS	Finding sources 4 ECTS	Onderzoeks- en schrijfvaardigheden I	Doing Conceptual Analysis 4 ECTS	Analysing Art I 4 ECTS	
	Mentor Programme 1 ECTS					
Year 2	Technological Society 9 ECTS	Cultural Pluralism 9 ECTS	Research and Writing II 9 ECTS	Course electives (9 ECTS) Othering Europe Art, Literature and Technoscience Living in a digital age	Course electives (9 ECTS) Power & Democracy Vulnerable bodies Authority, expertise and environmental change	
	Doing Ethnography 4 ECTS	Doing Discourse analysis 4 ECTS	Onderzoeks- en schrijfvaardigheden II	Skills Elective I (3 ECTS) Advanced document analysis* Interviewing* Analysing Art II	Skills Elective II (3 ECTS) Doing Conceptual analysis II Doing Discourse analysis II	
	Mentor Programme 1 ECTS					
Year 3	5 th semester abroad, minor, internship (30 ECTS)			Doing Research in Arts and Culture (7 ECTS)	Writing a Thesis Proposal (7 ECTS)	BA Thesis (16 ECTS)
	Mentor Programme 0 ECTS					



APPENDIX 3: DESCRIPTION OF THE FOUR DOMAINS

From: Rules & Regulations, FASoS 2018-2019

Note: These majors are replaced by electives combining two domains as of 2019-2020.

a. Major Cultures of Knowledge and Technology

The major Cultures of Knowledge and Technology (CKT) offers an interdisciplinary approach to the study of challenges of modern Western society concerning science and technology. The omnipresence of science and technology in contemporary society confronts us with various ethical, political and philosophical issues. The CKT major studies this erratic reality and approaches science and technology as cultural phenomena. The interaction between science, technology and society is studied by zooming in on actual historical and present-day practices. The meanings, motives, doubts and ideas linked up with scientific and technological knowledge and practices are studied, with the aim to clarify the interaction between science and technology on the one hand, and political, economic and ethical values on the other.

b. Major Literature, the Arts, Culture

The major Literature, the Arts and Culture (LAC) trains students interested in literature, art and philosophy to become critical academics with knowledge, skills and insight into the meaning of the arts vis-à-vis technological, secular and post-secular society. The roles of literature, art and philosophy are influenced by great changes and redefined by the development of new media, and by processes such as secularisation, democratisation and individualisation. LAC predominantly focuses on ethical issues concerning secular and post-secular cultural identity and the arts' precarious position. LAC offers an interdisciplinary approach to the study of social-cultural implications and effects in literature, art and philosophy, focusing on historical setting, close reading and philosophical reflection.

c. Major Political Culture

The major Political Culture (PC) studies politics as a historically evolved cultural phenomenon. Political phenomena in their broadest sense are the central study object. Politics is about how governments are organised (forms of state), the relationships between citizens and their governments (forms of government), ideas about what the best state and government form is (ideologies) and people who collectively pursue certain goals (movements). These issues are at the heart of PC and are studied in the context of the great episodes in Western society's political history. Central problems and challenges in our contemporary political systems and societies are: Europeanisation, globalization, migration, post-national identities and a general rethinking of political norms and values.

d. Major Media Culture

The major Media Culture (MC) studies the influence of media on modern culture and society, and the interaction between 'old' and 'new' media, focusing on contemporary and historical practices. This major offers an interdisciplinary approach to the study of the development of and key moments in modern media culture and media technology. MC therefore focuses on cultural and social developments shaped by the introduction of new media (e.g. photography, sound recording technology, television, digital media) and its interaction with 'old' media, its history and its users.

APPENDIX 4: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

Programme site visit Maastricht University, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences BA and MA Arts & Culture 13 and 14 June 2019

DAY 1 Thursday 13 June 2019

9:45 10:00 Arrival of the panel

Dean

Associate Dean of Education

10:00 12:15 Internal panel discussion

12:15 12:45 Lunch

12:45 13:00 Presentation by the management

- Dean
- Associate Dean of Education
- Programme director BA AC
- Assistant programme director BA AC
- Programme director MA AC, specialisation AHE/KCE
- Programme director MA AC, specialisations PSE/PSN, ALS/KLS

13:00 14:00 Interview management

- Programme director BA AC
- Assistant programme director BA AC
- Programme director MA AC, specialisation AHE/KCE
- Programme director MA AC, specialisations PSE/PSN, ALS/KLS

14:00 14:30 Break / internal panel discussion

14:30 15:15 Interview BA students and alumni

- Student 1st year
- Student 2nd year (3 times)
- Student 3rd year (2 times)
- Alumni (2 times)

15:15 16:00 Interview BA staff, incl. Chair Educational Programme Committee

- Academic writing advisor
- Coordinator mentor programme; course coordinator; specialisation coordinator
- Former programme director
- Chair educational programme committee BA AC
- Member educational programme committee BA AC; course coordinator
- Course coordinators (2 times)

16:00 16:30 Break / internal panel discussion

16:30 17:15 Interview MA students and alumni

- ALS student
- PSN student
- AHE students (3 times)
- PSE alumna
- AHE alumna
- ALS alumna



17:15 18:00 Interview MA staff, incl. Chair Educational Programme Committee

- Course coordinators AHE/KCE (3 times)
- Final work coordinator AHE/KCE
- Former director specialisations PSE/PSN and ALS/KLS
- Chair educational programme committee MA AC
- Course coordinator ALS/KLS

DAY 2 Friday 14 June 2019

9:00 10:30 Arrival of the panel, internal panel discussion, consultation of the material on the reading table, open consultation hour (10:00-10:30)

10:30 11:15 Interview Board of Examiners and student advisor [Dutch-speaking group]

- BoE Chair
- BoE Vice-Chair
- BoE member
- BoE external member
- BoE secretary
- Student advisor

11:15 11:45 Break / internal panel discussion

11:45 12:45 Final conversation with the management

- Dean
- Associate Dean of Education
- Programme director BA AC
- Assistant programme director BA AC
- Programme director MA AC, specialisation AHE/KCE
- Programme director MA AC, specialisations PSE/PSN, ALS/KLS

12:45 13:15 Lunch

13:15 15:30 Panel prepares preliminary findings and oral report

15:30 16:00 Oral report of the preliminary judgment (public session)

16:00 16:30 Break

16:30 17:30 Development dialogue

APPENDIX 5: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied 16 theses of the bachelor's programme Arts and Culture. Information on the selected theses is available from QANU upon request.

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

- Education plan 2018-2019
- Course descriptions 2018-2019
- Staff overview 2018-2019
- Overview of findings previous panel and actions undertaken by the programme
- Feedback by internship institutions
- The Education Plan cycle
- Assessment policy FASoS
- Annual reports FASoS Board of Examiners 2016-2017 and 2017-2018
- BA-EER 2018-2019
- Rules and Regulations 2018-2019
- Procedure for the grading and archiving of final works
- Annual reports Educational Programme Committee BA AC 2016-2017 and 2017-2018
- BAACCW Thesis themes 2018-2019
- General information Thesis themes info for students 2018-2019
- List of seminars Honours programme FASoS 2018-2019
- Brochure FASoS BA programmes
- MaRBLe Brochure 2018-2019
- Mid-term BA AC, January 2018
- Minutes EPC BA AC 2018-2019
- For the following courses, the course and examination material were present in hardcopy during the site visit:
 - o Apollo and Dionysus – BA year 1
 - o Research and Writing II – BA year 2
 - o Art, Literature & Technoscience – BA year 3 (elective)