

hbo-master Choreography
(joint degree)
Codarts University of the Arts,
Fontys School of Fine and
Performing Arts

23 December 2016

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Executive summary | 3 |
| 2 | Introduction | 6 |
| 3 | Description of the programme | 7 |
| | 3.1 General | 7 |
| | 3.2 Profile of the institutions | 7 |
| | 3.3 Profile of the programme | 7 |
| 4 | Assessment per standard | 8 |
| | 4.1 Intended learning outcomes | 8 |
| | 4.2 Curriculum | 10 |
| | 4.3 Staff | 15 |
| | 4.4 Services and facilities | 16 |
| | 4.5 Quality assurance | 17 |
| | 4.6 Assessment | 18 |
| | 4.7 Graduation guarantee and financial provisions | 19 |
| | 4.8 Conclusion | 20 |
| | 4.9 Joint degree | 20 |
| | 4.10 Advice on degree and sector in the Central Register of Higher Education | 20 |
| | 4.11 Recommendations | 21 |
| 5 | Overview of the assessments | 22 |
| | Annex 1: Composition of the panel | 23 |
| | Annex 2: Schedule of the site visit | 25 |
| | Annex 3: Documents reviewed | 26 |
| | Annex 4: List of abbreviations | 27 |

1 Executive summary

The joint master Choreography is an international, English-taught two-year part-time programme (45 EC per year) for students who work as a choreographer, artistic leader of a (circus) company, a festival or theatre programme, or ballet master. It is offered by Codarts University of the Arts, Rotterdam and Fontys School of Fine and Performing Arts (FHK), Tilburg.

The programme aims to educate and train choreographers and directors with a personal profile and the ability to create choreographies and establish productions and performances in co-creation with all parties involved. The choreographer possesses a solid craftsmanship, research skills and manifests him/herself as a persuasive leader. The panel has established that the content, level and orientation of the intended learning outcomes are suitable for a post-experience professional master in choreography. The interest and involvement of the work field was visible during the site visit. The panel advises presenting a more explicit vision on choreography to the outside world, in order to best position the programme and thus attract the best match of students, a necessary basis for co-creation, which is presented as the cornerstone of the programme. The intended learning outcomes meet the standard.

The curriculum is divided in six terms of 15 EC, three in each year. Each term consists of a block with a taught programme of two weeks. In between the blocks students work on assignments, a graduation project and artistic research of the graduation project in their own professional practice. The professional orientation of the programme is evident throughout the curriculum, not only through the students' professional contexts but also by the stakeholders' interest to be involved as co-creators. The panel considers the interaction of the artistic and academic skills, 'glued together' by artistic research, a strong point of the curriculum. The detailed elaboration of the first year programme shows a good balance between the various components of the programme and also makes the learning lines in the curriculum visible. The contents of the programme are up to date, relevant and comprehensive. The panel is confident that the two remaining issues regarding the curriculum (a stronger positioning of the leadership competence and explicit presentation of the research learning line) will be taken care of. Learning is inquiry based and student directed. Students, teachers and coaches form a learning community of choreography, where co-creation techniques and methods can be used effectively. The educational concept is very favourable for a stimulating and tailor-made learning environment. The part-time structure of the programme allows for the enrolment of interesting students with a position in the professional field. The enrolment procedure reflects the programme's vision on co-creation: selecting a talented and diverse group of students for whom trajectories will be arranged in order to develop each individual's potential. Given this diversity of students and individual study paths, it is a challenge to guarantee the equivalence of achieved learning outcomes. The examination committee is aware of this and will be involved in calibrating enrolment and assessment criteria. Another challenge is to create and manage a good mix within each cohort of students and to make sure that all students have the necessary network. It will require constant monitoring over the years to coordinate the diversity into a coherent whole. The panel concludes that all aspects related to the curriculum (orientation, content, teaching concept and qualifications of incoming students) meet the standard.

The panel is positive about the quality of staff. The unity, shared ambition and eagerness of the core team were plainly visible during the site visit. The core team is well-qualified and connected to the professorships, and the programme can call on a range of guest teachers with theoretical and practical knowledge and experience. Didactic expertise for all roles (mentor, teacher, coach, lecturer, assessor) is available in the team. The panel notes that it will be a challenge to create a unity of all teachers, due to their diverse backgrounds and the work on two campuses, but the core team has already shown in creating the new curriculum that they can work together. It is difficult to know for certain if the quantity of contact hours will be sufficient. Mature students may be expected to work relatively independently, but the panel advises monitoring closely if the number of hours for coaching is adequate. Nevertheless, the panel concludes that the quality and quantity of staff meet the standard.

Students will be able to use the facilities in Tilburg and Rotterdam. Both campuses provide various studios, circus facilities, a theatre and rooms for lectures, workshops, meetings and tutorials. Wireless internet facilities and access to the media library and (international) databases are available at both Codarts and FHK. These facilities will enable the realisation of the curriculum. The panel is especially satisfied with the digital platform and plans for blended learning, since these can bridge the time between blocks. For part-time students this is an important asset. The panel is positive about the tutoring system: the combination of individual coaches and a mentor with overall responsibility for the group will be able to create unity within the diversity and to respond to the needs of each student. The information supply is expected to meet the needs of the students as well. The panel concludes that the services and facilities (accommodation and facilities; tutoring and student information) meet the standard.

Codarts and Fontys both have a quality system for their courses, based on regular evaluations. For the joint degree the partners have decided to use the accredited Fontys quality assurance system. The quality culture is embedded in the concept of co-creation. A course committee (*opleidingscommissie*) for the master Choreography will be established upon the formal start of the programme. During the site visit the panel could see first-hand that the programme staff is open for discussion and is eager to accept suggestions for improvement. The quality assurance meets the standard.

The assessment system is based on an assessment policy, which contains a vision on the relationship between learning and assessment and provides information on specific assessments within the master programme. Students are assessed continuously throughout the programme. They collect the evidence of their artistic and professional development in a portfolio. The range of different assessment methods is in line with the learning objectives and the concept of co-creation. There is agreement about the different roles for the work field and the formally appointed examiners so that feedback from the professional practice can be used to the advantage of the students, without reducing the school's responsibility for the quality of assessment and the awarding of the degree. The examination committee is already in place and intends to play a proactive role, building on its experience in other programmes. It is aware of the complexity of assessment for the diverse group that will be enrolled in the master Choreography. The assessment system meets the standard.

Codarts and Fontys guarantee students that they can complete the entire curriculum, because sufficient financial provisions are available. The cooperation agreement contains a financial paragraph and the financial reserves secure the availability of sufficient financial

provisions. The budget shows that a break-even point is expected to be reached after two years. The graduation guarantee and financial provisions meet the standard.

The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes are appropriate for a Choreography programme at master's level and that a curriculum has been designed that will enable students to achieve these objectives. The curriculum is innovative, the core team is qualified and motivated to guide each student in his/her individual study path and the facilities are good. The quality assurance system and assessment system are adequate. The required graduation guarantee and financial provisions have been taken care of. On the basis of the outcomes per standard, the quality of the programme is assessed as positive.

Given these considerations, the panel advises NVAO to take a positive decision regarding the quality of the proposed programme hbo-master (joint degree) Choreography at Codarts Rotterdam and Fontys School of Fine and Performing Arts.

The Hague, 23 December 2016

On behalf of the Initial Accreditation panel convened to assess the hbo-master (joint degree) Master Choreography at Codarts University of the Arts, Rotterdam and Fontys School of Fine and Performing Arts, Tilburg,

ir. Pascale De Groote MA
(chair)

dr. Marianne van der Weiden
(secretary)

2 Introduction

NVAO convened a panel of experts. The panel consisted of:

- Pascale De Grootte (*chair*), vice-chancellor AP Artesis Plantijn Hogeschool Antwerpen and Honorary President AEC, Association Européenne des Conservatoires;
- João Cerqueira da Silva Junior, associate professor at ArtEZ;
- Leontien Wiering, director of Het Klooster in Woerden, Ombudsvrouw Hogeschool InHolland, member Board of Governors of theatre De Flint in Amersfoort;
- Myrthe Woddema (*student-member*), bachelor student Nursing, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences.

On behalf of the NVAO, Lineke van Bruggen, policy advisor was responsible for the process coordination and Marianne van der Weiden acted as the panel's secretary.

Details of the panel members' expertise are given in Annex 1 (Composition of the panel). All panel members and the secretary signed a statement of independence and confidentiality.

The panel based its assessment on the standards and criteria described in the NVAO Initial Accreditation Framework (Stcrt. 2014, nr 36791).

The panel members studied the programme documents regarding the proposed programme (see Annex 3: Documents reviewed). The panel discussed the first impressions in a preparatory meeting on 17 May 2016, and formulated the questions and issues to be raised during the site visit. A number of questions was sent to the applicant, to be clarified before the site visit. The site visit was originally planned on 26 May 2016, but, on request of the institutions, was postponed to 23 November 2016. The institutions felt they needed more time for preparation and detailed elaboration. The site visit took place at Codarts, Rotterdam (Annex 2: Schedule of the site visit). The panel formulated its preliminary assessments per standard immediately after the site visit. These are based on the findings of the site visit, and building on the assessment of the programme documents.

Based on the preliminary assessments at the end of the site visit the secretary wrote the panel report. For each standard the panel presents an outline of its findings, considerations and a conclusion. The panel concludes the report with a table containing an overview of its assessments per standard.

The secretary sent a draft version of the report to the panel members for their comments. The chair approved the final version of the report. The programme management received the report for a check on factual inaccuracies on 12 December 2016 and reacted on 22 December 2016. This led to three minor corrections, after which the report was formally finalised by the chair. The panel declares that this advice was drawn up independently. It was submitted to NVAO on 23 December 2016.

3 Description of the programme

3.1 General

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Institutions | : Codarts Rotterdam and Fontys School of Fine and Performing Arts (Fontys Hogeschool voor de Kunsten, FHK) |
| Programme | : Choreography (joint degree) |
| Level | : master |
| Orientation | : professional (hbo) |
| Specialization | : n.a. |
| Modes of study | : part-time |
| Degree | : Master of Arts (MA) |
| Locations | : Rotterdam and Tilburg |
| Study Load (EC) | : 90 EC |
| Field of Study | : Language and Culture |

3.2 Profile of the institutions

Codarts is an international university for the arts with programmes in the field of dance, music and circus arts. Codarts policy agenda aims at the extension of master programmes in the arts, and the enhancement of artistic research within a social context.

Fontys University of Applied Sciences is located on several campuses in the southern Netherlands, with over 40,000 students and 4000 employees. It comprises 28 institutes that offer 85 bachelor programmes, forty master programmes and six Associate degree programmes. Fontys presents itself as a knowledge and innovation partner of regions and professional fields. FHK in Tilburg is responsible for the art degree programmes.

3.3 Profile of the programme

The joint master Choreography is an international, English-taught two-year part-time programme for students who work as a choreographer, artistic leader of a company, a festival or theatre programme, or ballet master. Students enrol in the programme with a professional network and a question or issue he/she wants to explore through development, production and research of a project. Students, teachers and professional field together form a learning community, co-creating the master programme. It differs from other master programmes in Choreography because it is a part-time programme, covers a wider working field and is based on the concept of co-creation.

| year 1 block A | year 1 block B | year 1 block C | year 2 block D | year 2 block E | year 2 block F |
|------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|
| What is my choreographic identity? | How do I develop my prototype/concept? | How does my prototype/concept respond to my research question? | Where am I now and how can I relate my research to a wider discourse? | What other sources and ideas can help to refine my prototype/concept? | How do I present the essential elements of my research process in my choreography and thesis? |

4 Assessment per standard

In this chapter, the panel presents the evaluation of the standards. After reproducing the criteria for each standard, the panel presents (1) a brief outline of its findings based on the programme documents and the site visit, (2) the considerations the panel has taken into account and (3) the conclusion of the panel.

4.1 Intended learning outcomes: Standard 1

The intended learning outcomes of the programme have been concretised with regard to content, level and orientation; they meet international requirements.

Outline of findings

The programme is directed at students who work as a choreographer, artistic leader of a company, a festival or theatre programme, or ballet master. The aim is to educate and train choreographers and directors (a term more often used in the field of circus) with a personal profile which embodies their vision and signature. The choreographer has a broad understanding of the different ways people communicate, see, hear and engage within our technology-centred, information-age society, and of the interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary nature of the forms, languages and structures of dance and circus. He/she creates choreographies and establishes productions and performances in co-creation with all parties involved, using the artistic strategies and potentialities of a wide and diverse range of contexts. The choreographer possesses a solid craftsmanship, research skills and manifests him/herself as a persuasive leader.

The applicant has defined the intended learning outcomes as competences: a combination of knowledge, skills and demeanor that are necessary prerequisites for a professional attitude. On successful completion of the programme students should be able to demonstrate competence in:

1. Craftsmanship;
2. Artistic research;
3. Vision and signature;
4. Innovation;
5. Leadership;
6. Co-creation;
7. Reflection.

In the self-evaluation report these competences have been made concrete and linked to the Dublin descriptors at master level. The panel agrees that they correctly reflect the requirements of the Netherlands qualification framework and clarify in concrete terms what is expected from the graduates.

The ambition of the programme is to educate and train innovative professionals with a wide insight into a variety of professional settings, who contribute to practice-based evidence about choreography in dance and circus by means of artistic research. The panel considers this to be an appropriate expression of the programme's professional orientation. The panel believes that the recently added subtitle C.O.M.M.A. (Co-creation of Movement Master of Arts in Choreography) is a good expression of the post-experience character of the programme: 'a comma both divides and connects the flow of a thought, it offers space for alternatives and what occurs after the comma often enriches what came before it'. The

professional character is further substantiated by the programme's close links with the work field. It was clear from the interviews during the site visit, especially with the representatives from the work field, that the programme meets the needs of the various sectors in the field and that the stakeholders have been involved in shaping the programme.

The programme staff has not yet investigated the needs of international stakeholders, but the panel is convinced that the intended learning outcomes are valid internationally as well. The combination of circus, choreography and community arts is exciting and unique. The panel advises a stronger international positioning and inclusion of the international field in the programme.

The programme's singular understanding of the notion of choreography and its position within the larger context of contemporary practice, in particular how choreography relates to dance, was not quite clear from the documentation. From the interviews it became clear that the core team is reluctant to present a general definition, because 'choreographer' is not in line with the terminology used in the circus world. On the other hand, there is a clear, but left implicit, framework, i.e. that the bodily character of human movement is an essential element in their understanding of choreography, an element without which the notion of choreography would be expanded beyond the scope and signature of the programme. The panel recognises that this interpretation of what choreography is reflects the outlook of the programme's stakeholders in the field and, therefore, recommends making this notion more explicit. The panel believes that a master Choreography should present a well-articulated and positioned notion of choreography, to distinguish itself from other choreography programmes, to present its specific strengths and, on that basis, to attract the group of students and stakeholders that are compatible with the programme's ambition and profile. Fruitful co-creation can only come about on the basis of such a common ground.

Considerations

The panel is convinced by the documentation and the interviews that the content, level and orientation of the intended learning outcomes are suitable for a post-experience professional master in choreography. The applicant has provided concrete descriptions of the competences and the panel confirms that they fit the Dutch qualification framework and international standards. The interest and involvement of the work field was visible during the site visit. The panel advises articulating and presenting a more explicit vision on choreography to the outside world, in order to attract the best match of students, a necessary basis for co-creation, which is presented as the cornerstone of the programme. The panel concludes that the programme fulfils the requirements for this standard.

Conclusion

Meets the standard.

4.2 Curriculum

4.2.1 Orientation: Standard 2

The orientation of the curriculum assures the development of skills in the field of scientific research and/or the professional practice.

Outline of findings

The joint degree is a post-experience programme, focused on the implementation of a dance or circus production, either with professionals or as a form of community art. The concept of the production is inspired by the initial artistic research question of the student, resulting from work in the field. This research question is refined and re-composed during the first year and presented to a combined university/work field panel at the end of the second year. The production takes on its ultimate form having undergone an interactive process of questioning and refinement.

The curriculum is divided in six terms of 15 EC, three in each year. Each term consists of a block with a taught programme of two weeks: intensive events during which the students present their research questions, methods and processes for peer review and feedback. In between the blocks students work on assignments, a graduation project and artistic research of the graduation project in their own professional field. The interviews made it very clear that this set-up allows students not only to combine the study with their work in organisational terms, but also in a manner that is relevant to their research. During the first year students from all fields of activity follow the same programme. In the second year the programme consists of a collective part and a specific part for each working field.

Students are affiliated with three fields of activity: (1) professional dance companies and organisations; (2) organisations in the field of amateur arts, community arts and educational institutions); (3) circus companies, organisations and individual artists. Codarts is responsible for the field of professional dance companies and organisations, FHK for the circuit of amateur arts, community arts and educational institutions, while both are together responsible for the fields of circus companies, organisations and individual artists. Assignments are tasks to be carried out in profession-oriented situations or as preparation for school terms (e.g. preparatory literature assignments, writing an essay or reflection). At the end of the first year, students present their prototype for the graduation project and at the end of the second year, they present their creation. Artistic research is embedded within the overall inquiry approach of the curriculum, stimulating students to generate new knowledge by reflective inquiries into, through and for art practice/choreography. The work field constitutes the object, frames the context, informs the method and methodology and embodies the outcome of the research activities. In the artistic research of the graduation project, students prove their artistic research maturity, critical reflection and expertise. The interview with the work field representatives showed that they are keen to be involved in the programme and to create the necessary space for students.

Considerations

The panel notes that the link with the work field is clearly present throughout the curriculum, not only through the students' professional contexts but also by the stakeholders' interest and willingness to be involved as co-creators of the programme. The general part of the programme stimulates students to look beyond their own field of activity and broaden their scope. The panel considers the interaction of the artistic and academic skills, 'glued

together' by artistic research, a strong point of the curriculum and concludes that the orientation of the curriculum assures the development of skills in the professional practice.

Conclusion

Meets the standard.

4.2.2 Content: Standard 3

The contents of the curriculum enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Outline of findings

The curriculum is constructed to enable students to deepen their artistic vision and signature, to achieve the competences of craftsmanship, research and co-creation, to be innovative and show leadership in communication and art discourse and deepen reflective and learning skills. Students must learn to question possibilities, to have an open mind. Therefore, students from several contexts are put together, to gain insights into new views and possibilities. Each block has a central question to be investigated:

Year 1: internal movement, towards the 'self'

block A What is my choreographic identity?

block B How do I develop my prototype/ concept?

block C How does my prototype/ concept respond to my research question?

Year 2: external movement, presentation and manifestation in the outside world

block D Where am I now and how can I relate my research to a wider discourse?

block E What other sources and ideas can help to refine my prototype/ concept?

block F How do I present the essential elements of my research process in my choreography and thesis?

To ensure that students acquire the intended learning outcomes, the competences and the body of knowledge and skills are connected to the six terms and elaborated in assignments, literature, cases and other study material. Overall, the panel considers the curriculum to be coherent and comprehensive. The competence of leadership, however, plays only a minor role in the blocks. The core team explained that students work on a manifesto over the two years: they are stimulated to think about their position in different fields and articulate how they relate to them. Students are also expected to learn managerial skills by bringing different groups together and leading them towards unity. The panel thinks, however, that this remains rather implicit and that it is not sufficiently clear how the curriculum contributes to the development of leadership, while it is an essential competence. The panel recommends making this more explicit.

It was clear from the interviews that research plays a key role in the curriculum. This was reassuring because the panel had understood from the self-evaluation report (table 5, page 19) that research would be restricted to the second year only. The core team explained that students enter the programme with a research question related to their professional context, that they use the first year to develop and re-phrase this question, practice preparatory skills like writing and documenting and learn the possibilities for and requirements of analyses within artistic research. At the end of the year, they present their research question in addition to their concept. During the second year the students compose a plan, apply the chosen research methods, draw conclusions and deliver the thesis. The panel found this clarifying and recommends presenting this learning line clearly in the curriculum.

Initially, the panel was intrigued by the choice for the design model of research. The core team justified this choice by explaining how design thinking and the processes of iteration and emergence inherent to it fits well with how they envision research within the programme. According to the core team, the design model gives students the chance to fail in the process and make a different choice in a very short cycle, constantly reworking and deepening while moving forward. The iterative cycle was also used by the team itself in designing the curriculum. Thinking about how to create a choreographic prototype for instance is a new perspective. The panel agrees that this is an interesting and singular approach.

The panel has studied the course descriptions and, during the site visit, looked at the study materials. They are up to date, relevant and wide-ranging. In addition, the interviews made it clear that the core team is aware of the relevant trends and developments and knows how to use its network and contacts as substantive resources for the further development of the programme..

Considerations

The panel finds the contents of the curriculum to be well-thought out, which was shown not only in the documentation, but even more so in the interview with the core team. The open discussion during the site visit indicated how the team has further elaborated the course contents over the past months, in close collaboration within the team and with the stakeholders. The core team has well used the extra time that had come available as a consequence of the site visit's postponement from May to November. The panel has seen the detailed elaboration of the first year programme, with a consistent combination of the modules Theory, Creation, Communication and Research in each block. This overview shows a good balance between the various components of the programme and also makes the learning lines in the curriculum visible. The panel is, therefore, confident that the two remaining issues (a stronger positioning of the leadership competence and explicit presentation of the research learning line) will be taken care of. The panel concludes that the contents of the curriculum enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Conclusion

Meets the standard.

4.2.3 Teaching concept: Standard 4

The structure of the curriculum encourages study and enables students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Outline of findings

The applicant describes the educational concept in the self-evaluation report as a combination of internal and external movement, based on self-awareness. In the first year the student starts with exploring 'what I know, what I don't know' (first term), followed by a phase of questioning and stand-still (second term) and interaction of ideas: giving and receiving feedback on concepts (third term). In the second year, the emphasis lies on an active manifestation and presentation in the outside world on the basis of the newly-achieved awareness: gaining specific depth in one working field (fourth term), clarity in the links to theory (fifth term) and the graduation project in which students present their personal

profile which embodies their vision and signature (sixth term). Within the programme, each student can tailor the study path to his/her needs, questions and ambition.

Learning is inquiry based and student directed. A variety of didactic tools will be applied: workshops, lectures, seminars, excursions and field trips, presentations and reflection sessions, case assignments and journals. The student him/herself is responsible for setting in motion and maintaining the individual learning cycle, with the help and support of the mentor and coach (see 4.4.2). Students, teachers and coaches form a learning community of choreography, where co-creation techniques and methods can be used effectively. Groups are small, since the applicant expects a yearly intake of maximum twelve students. The two week blocks are an intensive learning period, with 50-60 face-to-face hours. In between blocks students are coached on the workplace (one hour per week). The core team strives to create an open, creative and safe learning environment that enables students to develop their choreographic potential. Student groups learn together and give each other feedback, teachers and coaches provide materials and examples, introduce experts (e.g. guest lecturers) and connect the activities in the taught programme with the assignments in the students' own professional practice. In cooperation with the Codarts Professorship Blended Learning, possibilities of digital technology are explored in order to provide a flexible learning environment, for teaching and learning that are independent of time and place. The panel considers this educational concept quite suitable for the group of mature professionals who want to pursue their individual study path in co-creation with their peer group, teachers and work field.

Considerations

The panel considers the structure and educational concept to be very favourable for a stimulating learning environment. The curriculum offers a clear backbone, against which the students can co-create their own trajectory. The core team provides the necessary resources, the mentor safeguards the overall cohesion and overview, while the coaches take care of the individual guidance. This combination guarantees a tailor-made learning environment that enables the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The part-time structure of the programme, with its variation of intensive study periods and periods for assignments and study at the workplace, will allow the enrolment of interesting students with a position in the professional field.

Conclusion

Meets the standard.

4.2.4 Qualifications of incoming students: Standard 5

| |
|---|
| <i>The curriculum ties in with the qualifications of incoming students.</i> |
|---|

Outline of findings

The programme aims at graduates with a bachelor of choreography, dance, teacher training in dance, or circus arts and several years of experience as a performing artist, or the equivalent of the education and experience indicated. To be admitted, a student must (1) possess the entrance qualifications and have the potential of a choreography student at master level, and (2) have the opportunity to present a choreography/production at the end of the second year.

The enrolment procedure involves three steps:

1. an application letter, with CV, a sample of the student's work (e.g. video) and (research) proposal;
2. an interview to test the student's disposition to work together and co-create in a multidisciplinary team, to analyse complex issues, to formulate own learning targets and a strategy for implementation and evaluation, to communicate effectively and to reflect systematically;
3. a concluding interview.

In the interview the core team emphasised that for co-creation a good match between programme and students is essential. This implies that the programme selects the students, but also that the programme is selected by the students: they must be sure that the programme will bring them what they need and expect. This confirms the importance of a clear profile and an explicit programme vision on choreography (as mentioned in 4.1).

The maximum annual intake is twelve students. Co-creation demands that this group be diverse, coming from a variety of contexts and backgrounds (dance, circus and community art). The core team confirmed that, as a consequence, a suitable student may not be admitted when the group threatens to become too uniform. A student must be an active professional with a relevant network, but one or two talented young bachelor graduates may be admitted each year. In such cases, the programme's network will be used to provide a suitable workplace for assignments and the graduation project. The interview with the work field representatives showed that the strength and breadth of this network make this feasible. These links may also be used for foreign students without a network in the Netherlands.

Considerations

The enrolment procedure reflects the programme's vision on co-creation: selecting a talented and diverse group of students for whom trajectories will be arranged to develop each individual's potential. The panel notes that, given the diversity of incoming students and the diversity of individual study paths, it is a challenge to guarantee the equivalence of achieved learning outcomes. The examination committee confirmed that they are aware of this and will be involved in calibrating enrolment and assessment criteria, monitoring the quality of assessments and assessors etc. (see 4.6). Another challenge is to create and manage a good mix within each cohort of students, coming from the fields of dance, circus and community art, and to make sure that all students have the necessary network. It will require constant monitoring over the years to coordinate the diversity into a coherent whole. The programme's success will for a large part depend on the combination of students each year. The panel is confident that the programme will be able to meet these challenges because staff is aware of the issues and monitoring procedures are in place.

Conclusion

Meets the standard.

4.3 Staff: Standard 6

The staff is qualified and the size of the staff is sufficient for the realisation of the curriculum in terms of content, educational expertise and organisation.

Outline of findings

For the implementation of the programme a combination of permanent staff, flexible staff and support staff is available. The permanent staff consists of the core team of teachers, including the course convenor, originating from both Codarts and FHK. Their CVs prove they are qualified for their task. Together they are a complementary and compatible group that has worked hard over the previous months to work out this project in detail and, in doing so, has become a cohesive team.

The flexible staff consists of teachers and lecturers from Codarts and FHK with specific knowledge, experts outside Codarts and FHK who come in as guest teachers, and coaches and professionals from the field of dance and circus as co-creators. The course convenor in cooperation with the core team secures the expertise of the flexible staff with regards to the criteria for artistic level, theoretical and methodological baggage and research and co-creation qualities. All teachers are from the professional practice and have connections to an international network. One member of the core team, together with professors of Codarts and FHK, is responsible for artistic research in the programme. They will develop a research policy to connect the learning community of the master's programme to the knowledge circles of the professorships and to explore possibilities for a systematic contribution to the body of knowledge of choreography within the domains of dance and circus. The panel considers this connection with the professorships a strength.

Within the core team didactic expertise for all roles (mentor, teacher, coach, lecturer, assessor) is available. All core and flexible teachers of Codarts and FHK have had a didactical training or, if they are appointed recently, get the opportunity to gain the didactic qualification. The course convenor is responsible for the organisation of the programme and can call upon the support staff to deliver services (personnel, finances, housing, management and student facilities).

The ambition is to realise a staff-student ratio of 1:10. The panel finds it difficult to assess whether the number of contact hours is sufficient. It is evident that the combination of teachers, coaches and support in the work field is meant to ensure that the students are adequately supported, but it is not yet possible to know if this will work out as planned.

Considerations

Based on the documentation and the meetings during the site visit the panel is positive about the quality of the staff. The core team is well-qualified and connected to the professorships, and the programme can call on a range of guest teachers with theoretical and practical knowledge and experience. The core team has already shown that they can work together to create the new curriculum. The panel, however, sees two points of attention. Firstly, it will be a challenge to create a unity of all teachers, with diverse backgrounds and working on two campuses. Secondly, it remains difficult to know for certain if the quantity of staff (hours) will be sufficient. Mature students may be expected to work relatively independently, but the panel advises monitoring closely if the number of hours for coaching (one hour per week) is adequate. It is clear from the interviews that the staff is intent to support each individual student in his/her development. The panel is,

therefore, confident that additional time will be invested if this turns out to be necessary. The panel concludes that the programme meets this standard.

Conclusion

Meets the standard.

4.4 Services and facilities

4.4.1 Accommodation and facilities: Standard 7

The accommodation and the facilities are sufficient for the realisation of the curriculum.

Outline of findings

Students will be able to use the facilities in Tilburg and Rotterdam. The block meetings will be organised alternately in both locations. Both campuses provide various studios, circus facilities, a theatre and rooms for lectures, workshops, meetings and tutorials. Wireless internet facilities and access to the media library and (international) databases are available at both Codarts and FHK. There will be one digital learning environment for each student group, accessible for both Codarts and FHK teachers. This will enable students to contact each other and their teachers in between the block meetings.

Considerations

The panel confirms that the programme's facilities are adequate and will enable the realisation of the curriculum. The panel is especially satisfied with the digital platform and plans for blended learning, since these can bridge the time between blocks. For part-time students this is an important asset.

Conclusion

Meets the standard.

4.4.2 Tutoring and student information: Standard 8

Tutoring and student information provision bolster students' progress and tie in with the needs of students.

Outline of findings

Each student will be guided by a mentor and one or more coaches. The mentor is the general supervisor of the student group and focuses on the continuity of engagement between the student, the programme and the learning community. The mentor is always there for the students and has an overview of the programme and the group. Coaches are assigned to each student individually. They may have an academic or artistic background, be internal or external, depending on the needs of the student. Their role is to follow how things go and if the student is comfortable. The mentor meets with the coaches on a regular basis. Both have access to the part of the (digital) portfolio where the student makes his/her progress evident. In every block the mentor and student discuss whether extra effort is necessary with regard to the study progress. In addition to the mentor and coaches, peer coaching is expected to take place. The block meetings and digital platform will facilitate this.

Students can call upon psychologists and counsellors at Codarts and FHK if they need more specific expertise. Codarts also offers an infrastructure of health care for artists and dancers.

Information will be provided on the digital platform. Students can find an up to date survey of their study results in the Progress system.

Considerations

The panel is positive about the tutoring system: the combination of individual coaches and a mentor with overall responsibility for the group will be able to create unity within the diversity and to respond to the needs of each student. The panel expects that the tutoring system can, through its individual focus, take care of any obstacles that might delay the student. The information supply is expected to meet the needs of the students as well.

Conclusion

Meets the standard.

4.5 Quality assurance: Standard 9

| |
|--|
| <i>The programme is evaluated on a regular basis, partly on the basis of assessable targets.</i> |
|--|

Outline of findings

Codarts and FHK both have a quality system for their courses, based on regular evaluations. Fontys has passed the institutional audit. For the joint degree the partners have decided to use the Fontys internal quality system. Key elements are

- the NVAO audit and internal audit, based on the accreditation standards and followed up by a quality improvement plan to be monitored in the planning & control cycle;
- evaluation of every graduation project and the related artistic research by one or more professionals from the work field;
- participation in the National Student Survey (NSE) to measure student satisfaction;
- student feedback and feedforward at the end of every block;
- a feedback and feedforward meeting of coaches and professionals from the field of dance and circus at the end of the first and second year, if possible in combination with the feedback and feedforward meeting of the students;
- a staff survey to measure satisfaction of teachers and other staff members;
- transparent monitoring of every student by a personal coach;
- sharing the outcomes of the above with the examination committee, programme committee and advisory committee from the field of dance and circus.

The panel considers this a solid system. It is a sensible decision to use the FHK system as the framework for joint quality assurance, since it has been formally accredited in the institutional review. A course committee (*opleidingscommissie*) for the master Choreography will be established upon the formal start of the programme.

The panel agrees with the statement in the self-evaluation report that the educational concept of co-creation and the learning community is essential for the quality of the programme. Stakeholders are already involved in a dialogue about the curriculum and will continue to provide input. In addition to the formal evaluations listed above, the panel expects that the individual coaching will produce valuable feedback in an informal way as

well. It is evident from the interview that the core team is eager to pick up feedback from various sources and use it to improve the programme.

Considerations

The formal quality assurance is arranged on the basis of the accredited evaluation system of FHK. The quality culture is embedded in the concept of co-creation. During the site visit the panel could see for itself that the programme staff is open for discussion and is eager to accept suggestions for improvement. The quality assurance meets the standard.

Conclusion

Meets the standard.

4.6 Assessment: Standard 10

| |
|--|
| <i>The programme has an adequate assessment system in place.</i> |
|--|

Outline of findings

The assessment system is based on an assessment policy, which contains a vision on the relationship between learning and assessment and provides information on specific assessments within the master programme. It also includes assessment procedures, quality assurance and the role of the examination committee. Assessment is learning directed, authentic, integrated and congruent.

Students are assessed continuously throughout the programme. They prove their competencies with reports, essays, performances, feedback and other evidence of the artistic and professional development. The student designs the concrete plan for his/her portfolio with guidance of the mentor and coach. Evidence in the portfolio must be linked to the competencies of the programme and show a rich variety of products, performances and feedback. At the end of each block a student writes a reflection report and has completed a logbook on the assignments. The assessment at the end of each block/term is executed by an independent first examiner (teacher) and the mentor or coach (second examiner). Together with the assessment result, students will get an advice on further development (feedforward information). Because of the importance of co-creation, the core team wants to involve the work field in the assessment of assignments. The representatives whom the panel met during the site visit, were interested and eager to be included in these. They see their role mainly in assessing the students' craftsmanship and the way in which a concept works out in a company or performance. They are aware that the final responsibility rests with the school. The panel considers this an adequate division of roles.

A main component of the programme is the graduation project, co-created in the course of the programme and presented at the end of the second year. The programme aims to facilitate a public presentation of the project. The artistic merit is made accountable through documentation of professional reviews and/or feedback from external experts in the field. The artistic research of the graduation project should demonstrate the student's ability to understand, articulate and defend the specificities and idiosyncracies of artistic research in his/her own artistic practice. In the thesis, students document and communicate about the research and embed it within the existing theoretical discourses. The thesis and defence will be assessed by an independent first lecturer (examiner) and the coach or guiding teacher.

The examination committee for the master's programme Choreography will be part of the executive chamber Dance of the general examination committee of the FHK School of Performing Arts. It will comprise one member from Codarts and one from FHK. The panel notes that the formal agreement of cooperation between Codarts and FHK is not clear about the Codarts member in the examination committee and recommends adjusting the text to correct this. It has been agreed that the policy and systems of FHK will be leading, but that in case of discussion both examination committees will come together to sort it out. The examination committee intends to play an active role in the quality assurance of assessment. Equivalent to its role in other programmes, the examination committee will appoint the examiners, check a representative sample of assessments (including preparation, contents, model answers, assessed work and the grade awarded), stimulate the development of rubrics and assessment criteria and the organisation of calibration sessions among staff. The panel feels that this is a comprehensive approach and expects that the proposed calibration sessions can be a useful instrument to ensure the equivalence of achieved learning outcomes and assessment criteria among examiners. This will be an important issue because of the diversity of the students and their study trajectories.

Considerations

The assessment system is well-designed. The range of different assessment methods is in line with the learning objectives and the concept of co-creation. There is agreement about the different roles for the work field and the formally appointed examiners so that feedback from the professional practice can be used to the advantage of the students, without reducing the school's responsibility for the quality of assessment and the awarding of the degree. The examination committee is already in place and intends to play a proactive role, building on its experience in other programmes. It is aware of the complexity of assessment for the diverse group that will be enrolled in the master Choreography. The panel is convinced that the assessment system is adequate.

Conclusion

Meets the standard.

4.7 Graduation guarantee and financial provisions: Standard 11

| |
|---|
| <p><i>The institution guarantees students that they can complete the entire curriculum and makes sufficient financial provisions available.</i></p> |
|---|

Outline of findings

Codarts and FHK guarantee students that they can complete the entire curriculum, because sufficient financial provision are available. The cooperation agreement contains a financial paragraph and the financial reserves secure the availability of sufficient financial provisions. The budget shows that a break-even point is expected to be reached after two years.

Considerations

The panel concludes that sufficient guarantees are laid down in the formal documents.

Conclusion

Meets the standard.

4.8 Conclusion

The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes are appropriate for a Choreography programme at master's level and that a curriculum has been designed that will enable students to achieve these objectives. The curriculum is innovative, the staff is qualified and motivated to guide each student in his/her individual study path, the facilities are good. The quality assurance system and assessment system are adequate. The required graduation guarantee and financial provisions have been provided.

On the basis of the outcomes per standard, the quality of the programme is assessed as positive.

4.9 Joint degree

Outline of findings

The panel has received the required formal cooperation agreement between Codarts University of the Arts and Fontys School of Fine and Performing Arts (FHK) for this joint hbo-master's programme, stating how responsibilities and rights are regulated.

Considerations

The panel has taken note of the formal agreement. During the site visit, the panel was able to confirm the practical implementation of the programme as a robust joint undertaking, as could be seen from the common responsibilities, the input of staff members from both institutions and the commitment of all involved. The panel regards this to be a sound foundation for this joint degree programme and a major factor for the continuity of the programme.

Conclusion

The programme meets all joint degree requirements. The panel advises NVAO to grant the programme the status of a joint degree programme.

4.10 Advice on degree and sector in the Central Register of Higher Education

Findings

Codarts and FHK propose that the joint master programme Choreography be registered in the sector Language and Culture and that the degree of Master of Arts (MA) is awarded upon graduation.

Considerations

The panel confirms that the joint master programme Choreography, as part of the fine and performing arts, fits best in the sector Language and Culture. The panel confirms that the intended learning outcomes reflect the (professional) master level. The degree of Master of Arts (MA) fits with the level and disciplinary background of the programme.

Conclusion

The panel confirms the allocation of sector as suggested by the applicant: Language and Culture. The panel confirms the title of the degree as suggested by the applicant: Master of Arts (MA).

4.11 Recommendations

1. Present a well-articulated, positioned and consistent notion of choreography, in order to attract the group of students and stakeholders who are compatible with the programme's profile and ambition;
2. Present the programme stronger internationally and include the international field in the programme;
3. Clarify how the competence of leadership and the research study path are situated in the curriculum;
4. Ensure that each cohort consists of students from the three fields (dance, circus, community art);
5. Calibrate the enrolment and assessment criteria in order to guarantee the equivalence of achieved learning outcomes for all students;
6. Monitor closely if the number of hours for coaching is adequate;
7. Adjust the text of the formal agreement of cooperation between Codarts and FHK so that the position of the Codarts member in the examination committee is made explicit.

5 Overview of the assessments

| Subject | Standard | Assessment |
|--|--|--------------------|
| 1 Intended learning outcomes | 1. The intended learning outcomes of the programme have been made concrete with regard to content, level and orientation; they meet international requirements. | Meets the standard |
| 2 Curriculum | 2. The orientation of the curriculum assures the development of skills in the field of scientific research and/or the professional practice. | Meets the standard |
| | 3. The contents of the curriculum enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. | Meets the standard |
| | 4. The structure of the curriculum encourages study and enables students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. | Meets the standard |
| | 5. The curriculum ties in with the qualifications of incoming students. | Meets the standard |
| 3 Staff | 6. The staff is qualified and the size of the staff is sufficient for the realisation of the curriculum in terms of content, educational expertise and organisation. | Meets the standard |
| 4 Services and facilities | 7. The accommodation and the facilities are sufficient for the realisation of the curriculum. | Meets the standard |
| | 8. Tutoring and student information provision bolster students' progress and tie in with the needs of students. | Meets the standard |
| 5 Quality assurance | 9. The programme is evaluated on a regular basis, partly on the basis of assessable targets. | Meets the standard |
| 6 Assessment | 10. The programme has an adequate assessment system in place. | Meets the standard |
| 7 Graduation guarantee and financial provisions | 11. The institution guarantees students that they can complete the entire curriculum and makes sufficient financial provisions available. | Meets the standard |
| | | |
| Conclusion | | Positive |

Annex 1: Composition of the panel

Ir. Pascale De Groot, MA (chair) is currently principal of the Artesis Plantijn University College. From 2001 to 2013 she was Dean of the Royal Conservatoire of Antwerp (Artesis University College of Antwerp). She has been president of the Association Européenne des Conservatoires from 2010 to 2016, having been on the board of this association since 2006. After studies in Civil Engineering and Dance Pedagogics, Pascale De Groot, started a career as dancer (later soloist) in Compagnie Aimé de Lignière. From the start she combined this with activities as teacher and as balletmaster and in 1997 she became co-ordinator of the Higher Institute for Dance. Meanwhile, she obtained the degrees of Bachelor in Dance and Master in Theatre Sciences. Pascale De Groot is member or chair of the board of directors of numerous institutions active in arts, artistic research or art education (Research Centre for Flemish Music, Royal Flemish Philharmonic Orchestra, Antwerpen Open, Orpheusinstitute, docARTES – international doctoral programme, Flanders Operastudio, Ballet Institute Flanders ...) and committees concerning educational matters in all levels of the art education in Flanders. She has been active in the field of Quality Assurance since 1999, first as co-ordinator Quality Assurance of the Royal Conservatoire of Antwerp (until 2002), as inspector for 'Dance' in secondary education (2003-2010) and since 2004 as chairman or member of expert committees for review visits for bachelor and master programmes in dance, drama, music and related subjects (28 programmes in Belgium, the Netherlands, Estonia, Austria and Switzerland). Pascale De Groot was professor at the Higher Institute for Dance from 1988 to 2012 and was lecturer Dance History in the University of Antwerp from 1999 to 2012. She is frequently asked as speaker on international congresses and symposia on topics related to institutional management, quality assurance, art education and artistic research.

João Cerqueira da Silva Junior, PhD studied choreography at the European Dance Development Center in Arnhem. In 2004 he became a master NLP practitioner, being certified by the Neuro Linguistic Programming Center in New York City. In 2010 he obtained his Master Degree (cum laude) in Theater Science at the University of Utrecht, where he finished his PhD research (Risk-Taking and Large-Group Dance Improvisation) in October 2016. He has over the years choreographed a number of small-scale works, also for theater. He has taught improvisation and composition all over the world and since 1995 he has been a lecturer at ArtEZ Academy for Theatre and Dance, Arnhem. Between 2002 and 2014 he directed the ArtEZ Master of Choreography Program. He is now senior lecturer. For his publications refer to: <http://artez.academia.edu/JoãoDaSilva>

Leontien Wiering studied dance at Codarts. After dancing with a contemporary dance company in Antwerp for a few years, she decided to change her focus and studied arts management at the HKU. After finishing this study, she worked as production manager at Korzo theatre and production house for dance in The Hague for several years. She then became director of the festival Nederlandse Dansdagen. Her next position was manager of the dance department of the Amsterdam School for the Arts, including the national ballet academy, programme for contemporary dance and choreography. At the moment she is director of Het Klooster, theatre and centre for the arts in Woerden.

Myrthe Woddema BA (student member) completed the bachelor programme Applied Psychology and now studies the fast track of the bachelor programme Nursing. Before this, she attended the premaster programme at the University of Humanistic Studies. Myrthe

Woddema is an experienced member of student panels, programme committees and student councils. She often participates as a student-member in NVAO panels.

Assisting staff:

- Dr. Marianne van der Weiden, secretary to the panel
- Ir. Lineke van Bruggen, policy advisor NVAO and process coordinator

All panel members and the secretary signed a declaration of independence and confidentiality prior to the assessment process.

Annex 2: Schedule of the site visit

Date: Wednesday 23 November 2016

Location: Codarts, Veerlaan 19F, 3072 AN Rotterdam

Agenda:

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| 08.30 | reception |
| 08.30u – 09.00u | preparatory meeting panel |
| 09.00u - 09.30u | short tour of the facilities |
| 09.45u – 10.30u | Session 1 meeting with management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karen Neervoort. General Director Fontys School of Fine and Performing Arts • Samuel Wuersten. Member executive board Codarts, University of the arts • Caroline Harder. Head of Academics dance department Codarts, University of the arts • Herma Tuunter. Head of Dance Academy, Fontys School of Fine and Performing Arts |
| 10.45u - 11.45u | Session 2 meeting with core team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dirk Dumon. Teacher Fontys School of Fine and Performing Arts • Soosan Gilson. Teacher Fontys School of Fine and Performing Arts • Keith Randolph. Teacher Codarts, University of the arts • Katherine Stimson. Teacher Codarts, University of the arts |
| 12.00u - 12.30u | Session 3 – meeting with examination/course committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anton Negggers. Chairman Examination committee Fontys School of Fine and Performing Arts • Hans van Dijk. Member Examination committee Fontys School of Fine and Performing Arts • Arienne Zwijnenburg. Member Examination committee Codarts, University of the arts • Annemieke Wijers. Member Course committee performing arts Codarts, University of the arts |
| 12.30u - 13.30u | panel meeting, lunch (confidential) |
| 13.45u - 14.30u | Session 4 – meeting with work field committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rosa Boon. Partner TENT circustheatre productions • Martine van Dijk, Managing Director & Education Holland Dance festival • Pia Meuthen. Artistic director Panama Pictures • Leo Spreksel. Artistic director Korzo • Suzan Tunca. Researcher & Dance teacher ICK Amsterdam • Ed Wubbe. Artistic director / choreographer Scapino Ballet Rotterdam |
| 14.30u – 16.00u | panel meeting (confidential) |
| 16.15u – 16.30u | Session 5 – Presentation of initial findings |
| 16.30 | Drinks |

Annex 3: Documents reviewed

Self-evaluation

Self-evaluation report
Subject-specific reference framework and the learning outcomes of the programme
Overview of the curriculum in diagram form
Description of the curriculum components, specifying the objectives, teaching method, teaching concept, workload, assessment format and the relation to research or the professional field
Teaching and examination regulations
Overview of staff to be allocated with names, positions, scope of appointment, level and expertise
The macro-efficiency decision
Overview of the work field committee
Intended staff-student ratio
Intended number of face-to-face hours for each course year
Cooperation agreement joint degree

Additional information sent in preparation of the site visit

Het gekozen profiel
De co-creatie
Artistic research in de Master
Glossary master Choreography

Documents available during the site visit

Policy plan "Kiezen voor Codarts"
Report Codarts Staff Satisfaction Survey
Management information 2016. Comparison with other Universities of Applied Science
Memo discontinuation of study
Concept didactic model 2016
Update didactic concept May 2016
Format Institutional Plan
Codarts Research. Promotion Policy
Human Resources. Sustainable employability
Human Resources. Recruitment policy
Human Resources. Professionalization plan
Human Resources. Education policy
Human Resources. Regulation cycle of assessment meetings and evaluation of progress
Annual report 2015
Survey users Student Life 2015
Quality Assurance. Module and teacher evaluations
Quality Assurance. Testing and assessing
Protocol for studying with a functional disability
National Student Survey 2016
Memo Quality Assurance
Strategic plan Health Care. Prevention and Maximising Performance

Annex 4: List of abbreviations

| | |
|------|---|
| Ba | bachelor |
| EC | European Credits |
| FHK | Fontys Hogeschool voor de Kunsten (Fontys School of Fine and Performing Arts) |
| hbo | hoger beroepsonderwijs |
| Ma | master |
| NVAO | Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatieorganisatie |
| wo | wetenschappelijk onderwijs |

The panel report has been ordered by NVAO for the initial accreditation of the programme hbo-master Master Choreography (joint degree) of Codarts University of the Arts and Fontys School of Fine and Performing Arts.

Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO)
Parkstraat 28
P.O Box 85498 | 2508 CD DEN HAAG
T 31 70 312 23 00
E info@nvaio.net
W www.nvaio.net

Aanvraagnummer 004420