



ASSESSMENT REPORT

Extensive programme assessment

hbo-master course Design
fulltime

Design Academy Eindhoven – DAE

ASSESSMENT REPORT

Extensive programme assessment

hbo-master course Design
fulltime

CROHO registration 44759

Design Academy Eindhoven – DAE

Hobéon Certificering BV

Date

29 June 2012

Audit panel

drs. Jeroen van den Eijnde – chair
Glenn Adamson, PhD – expert member
Ivar Björkman, PhD – expert member
ir. Herman Kossmann – expert member
Alike van der Kruijs – student member

Co-ordinator

drs. Robert Stapert

INHOUDSOPGAVE

1.	BASIC DATA	1
2.	SUMMARY JUDGEMENT	3
3.	CHARACTERISTIC OF THE MASTER PROGRAMME	7
4.	JUDGEMENT PER STANDARD	9
5.	OVERALLL CONCLUSION	34
6.	RECOMMENDATIONS	36
APPENDIX I	Results table	38
APPENDIX II	Subject-specific framework and the learning outcomes of the programme	40
APPENDIX III	Overview of the programme	42
APPENDIX IV	Site-visit	44
APPENDIX V	Documents examined	50
BIJLAGE VI	Composition of the audit panel	52

1. BASIC DATA

NAME of the INSTITUTION	Design Academy Eindhoven – DAE					
Status of the institution	publicly funded					
Outcome of the institutional quality assurance assessment:	not applicable					
Nomenclature of the course according CROHO	Design – Vormgeving					
Croho registration number	44759					
Croho domain/sector	Arts – Kunstvakonderwijs					
Orientation of the course	Professional					
Level of the course	Master					
Number of credits (ecs)	120 (2-years)					
Specialisations	Not applicable					
Location	Eindhoven					
Mode of study	Fulltime					
Relevant lectorships	Design Theory					
Date assessment ¹	13-14-15 March 2012					
Data on intake, transfers and graduates pertaining to – if possible – the last 6 cohorts						
cohort	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
▪ intake	32	40	30	39	35	39
▪ success rate after 2 years	60%	63%	60%	50%		
staff – student ratio achieved	1 : 20					
contact hours / face-to-face instructions	year 1		year 2			
▪ average number per week	28		28			

¹ During the site-visit the panel assessed both the master and the bachelor course. The findings from the assessment of the bachelor course are laid down in a separate report. Since both the master course and the bachelor course are devised and implemented starting from one all-embracing DAE-vision on the required nature of education, on the quality of the educators involved, on the provisions needed and on quality assurance, the Assessment Report on the bachelor course is in that respect quite similar to the report presented here.

2. SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

Introduction

Design Academy Eindhoven (DAE) is part of the professional arts education indeed, but DAE's very specific profile makes DAE to a so-called 'monosectorial' school within the Dutch Higher Vocational Education system. The main distinctive feature of DAE is the openness and responsiveness of their education programmes to the occupational field, partially also reflected in the school's organisation and in the background of the education staff. DAE brings 'design' and 'designer' explicitly into a creative, socio-economic and socio-cultural context. All this is about artistic and conceptual creativeness, about having an open eye for the needs of individuals and /or of society and about being aware of the implications of designs. The education goals, the curriculum and the assessments mirror this contextual approach as well as this broad perspective that surpasses the mere design of objects.

1. Intended learning outcomes

The intended learning outcomes are covering all aspects of an autonomous, creative, highly skilled, context-sensitive and professional designer who can perform independently and in a guiding & leading position and in co-operation with colleagues within different (and changing) settings. The pivot of the learning outcomes is focused on 'conceptualizing and contextualisation'. This focus and the strong emphasis on context-sensitivity, autonomy and on innovative & guiding capacity make the intended learning outcomes revealing and demanding. In that respect the intended learning outcomes of the master course also reflect DAE's high ambitions.

In the intended learning outcomes all elements such as knowledge & understanding, skills, attitude, creativity and critical self-reflection are further elaborated into assessment criteria: a clear cue indeed for arranging the master course programme.

DAE determined the intended learning outcomes in close co-operation with and through consultations of a great number of professionals from the Netherlands and in particular from abroad. By doing so, DAE explicitly has placed the master learning outcomes in a national and international perspective. From that the intended learning outcomes meet the international professional design requirements. The set of intended learning outcomes also encompasses a well-defined 'design-research' component. All this implies that the intended learning outcomes *fully* meet the quality requirements as set out in standard 1. Therefore the panel's judgement on Intended learning outcomes reads 'good'.

2. Curriculum

Fully in line with the far-reaching and demanding intended learning outcomes, the driving force behind the curriculum are clearly the requirements of the design world: the very open and flexible programme puts a strong focus on conceptual design in context and on autonomous thinking and it presents to students a well-balanced variety of theoretical knowledge, the application of acquired knowledge and the practising of conceptual, operational and guiding skills. This all is done in an apt and very challenging learning and teaching environment, for both the students and the education staff. The programme is coherent in its 'vertical' interaction between the respective programme components and the learning activities, since the distinctive education pathways are focused on learning goals that gradually are growing in complexity and scope. In the panel's view, this really evokes a step-by-step progression in the student's command of the profession, eventually leading to the mastery of all final master qualifications, laid down in the intended learning outcomes. Therefore the panel's judgement on Curriculum reads 'good'.

As far as the 'research-track' is concerned, DAE is aiming at demand-driven research themes: themes that regard general socio-economic and/ or cultural issues the students have to deal with in their future design-practise. However, the panel noticed that the nature of the research conducted by the master students, mainly depends on the individual (nationally oriented) choices made by these students. In that respect the panel's suggestion to DAE is to bring the master research topics round to a limited number of (broad) issues relevant to the positioning and the development of the design-domain, national *and* international.

3. Staff

The teaching staff is deeply rooted in the occupational field: *all* teachers are mainly active in the design-world either as renowned and experienced professionals who already have won their spurs or as young professionals generally recognised as very promising designers – a combination DAE deliberately wants to be represented in their teaching staff. From that the teaching staff is, as it were, the occupational field itself. To put it into other words: the occupation field is not only next to DAE, but it is an integral part of DAE: in the Dutch education sector a unique feature indeed. In this respect the panel considers the quality of the teaching staff as 'excellent'. From a teaching point of view, the panel considers all members of the teaching staff, above-average. Those interviewed made a strong, positive impression on the panel. The teaching staff are quality-driven and strongly focused on the development of students' learning capacities. In their role as teacher they are properly-equipped, as a result from both the regularly organised compulsory workshops on (e.g.) 'teaching and didactics', 'coaching students' and 'assessments' and the 'Introduction meetings for starters' in which incoming lecturers will take part from September 2012. Many students testify they are inspired by their lecturers thanks to their teaching approach and their instructive assessments. The number of staff and the student-lecturer ratios throughout the programme are quite sufficient. The execution of the HR performance cycle is done properly. The panel has seen good examples of how performance interviews have led to individual training of staff members. Weighing carefully the exceptionally strong links the teaching staff have with the occupational field on the one hand and their proper education capacities on the other, the panel's judgement on Staff reads 'good'.

4. Services and facilities

The housing and availability and quality of the facilities DAE are in keeping with the rather open and challenging educational and didactical approach of the programme: classrooms, ateliers, exhibition room, auditorium, media and resources centre, all of these accommodate competency learning and contribute to the adoption by the students of DAE's quality standards. The panel has observed an open door policy amongst lecturers and an effective system of individual tutoring of students. Therefore the panel's judgement on Services and facilities reads 'good'.

5. Quality assurance

Although quality awareness and quality care are firmly embedded in DAE's nature, a solid and more formal quality assurance system has not fully come into place yet. The panel considers the choice of DAE to give priority to a substantial education reform a legitimate one, hence the next step for DAE is to close the PDCA cycle. In view of the strong focus on quality, the panel's judgement on Quality assurance reads 'good', even though the quality assurance *system* as such is not fully recorded yet.

6. Assessment and learning outcomes achieved

DAE has a solid and all-embracing system of assessments in place which enables DAE to measure the achievement of curriculum outcomes. It renders valid and reliable assessments. The comprehensive assessment criteria/requirements are clear to the students and are properly applied. The work field is involved in the assessment of students' professional skills.

The achieved learning outcomes, in terms of the final assignment reports and products / objects definitely reflect or more than that, they even exceed the master level, but the lack of solid research by the students is a point for improvement. Therefore the panel's judgement on Assessment and learning outcomes achieved reads 'good'.

Overall conclusion: good

According to the audit panel, it is first-and-foremost the achievements that count. And these are quite convincing: at DAE the panel has seen (i) a clear integrated range of qualifications directing appropriate standards for the entire programme; (ii) an open, flexible, and challenging curriculum that offers ample opportunities for individual students to bring out the best in themselves and to grow to autonomous and guiding designers; (iii) professional, motivated and inspiring lecturers; (iv) a stimulating teaching and learning environment and distinct facilities; and (v) a proper assessment system that renders fine results and, at the time of the audit, is partly under reconstruction. Although the grades reflect the right levels achieved, students' final assessment needs a few improvements, especially in the field of transparency of the assessors' judgements and with regard to the research component in the programme. But on the whole the achieved level is good.

Taking into account all of the findings as they are, the auditors have concluded that the master course Design shows a quality that is without any doubt high and good, both from a Dutch and from an international perspective.

Date: 29 June 2012

drs. J.N.M. van den Eijnde

drs. R.F.H.M. Stapert



chair



co-ordinator

3. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROGRAMME-STRUCTURE

As far as the bachelor course is concerned the core of the DAE's educational organization up till now consists of 8 Design departments and four so-called Compass departments, representing an attitude and interest of the designer: (i) craft and personal style, (ii) culture and reflection, (iii) presentation and entrepreneurship and (iv) research and experiment. The master course consists of three Research Departments:

Contextual Design

Contextual Design departs from the relationship between people and their physical and non-physical (digital) context / environment and in the role designers can play. Based on abstract themes, the department is focused on the essence of design, art and architecture and their interconnectedness; on cultural, social and historical meanings that are associated with those things, on the meaning of industrial and traditional production; on the changing meaning of functionality and on the importance of the geographic, architectural and socio-economical context in which design will function.

Social Design

Social Design departs from social developments and human needs and drives. The changing way in which people, objects and social phenomena are connected and affect each other is a central theme. Such new socio-economic ecologies form the object of study. Social Design is more process-oriented and system-oriented than object-oriented.

Information Design

Information Design focuses on the changing role of the designer in a world where information is available in abundance, where information is accessible to everyone. and where the role of the reader has evolved to that of user and co-designer of ubiquitous information. The role of a designer changes from creator of an end product to the creator of a filter, a tool which the user can use to filter information. Digital technology and tools have become indispensable.

The research departments are self-managing organizations under the supervision of the Executive Board. The head of a research department determines the themes and strategy of the department and manages the evaluations, final exams and department meetings. Together with the permanent co-ordinator, the head determines the programme and established the education team. Together with the co-ordinating lecturers the head of the research department translates the themes into content and into concrete and operational activities.

4. JUDGEMENT PER STANDARD

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.

Explanation: As for level (bachelor or master) and orientation (professional or academic), the intended learning outcomes fit into the Dutch qualifications framework. In addition, they tie in with the international perspective of the requirements currently set by the professional field and the discipline with regard to the contents of the programme.

Findings

Basically Design Academy Eindhoven (DAE) has derived the intended learning outcomes of the master programme Design from the "National Education Profile Design" formally set up in the context of the so-called "Overleg Beeldende Kunstonderwijs" (OBK), being the Dutch consultative body for education in visual arts within which all Dutch Academies of Arts are represented. This education profile corresponds to the professional profile 'designer' the occupational field concerned agreed on in the context of the national "Advisory Body Design", in Dutch: the "Advies Commissie Vormgeving". This is (in a nutshell) the basic process through which the Academies that offer education programmes in 'Design', established their common education goals to be considered as the overall standard the Academies should meet.

The goal of master education Design

In DAE's vision the level 'master' will not be reached through following the path alongside the 'traditional' design disciplines only, but is established through an integrated conceptual and contextual approach. After all, DAE expects from a master to be engaged and culturally informed and to be able to address relevant themes in a conceptual manner. To achieve that DAE's master programme is aimed at educating students in such a way that their designs can be guiding from a cultural, economic, political and social perspective. From that according to DAE the master-designer is

- an autonomous and independent designer with broad intellectual baggage
- a leading specialist within the design-field
- a leading specialist in multidisciplinary teams of designers, researchers, technicians and producers
- a guide in national and international social debates about design, albeit from a theoretical or from the design practice
- a design-researcher who is able to substantiate his research by means of personal insights and the outcomes of analytic research

These five briefly presented characteristics of a DAE master designer are transformed into the following intended learning outcomes:

Intended learning outcomes

1. As leading designer, the student is able to guide complex design processes in such a way that different groups of stakeholders (principal, other disciplines, users etc), feel recognized and acknowledged in the design result.
2. The student is able to conduct systematic and intuitive research into complex issues and to make well-informed, tactic, strategic and creative choices so that he is also able to clearly express and justify when facing a critical audience.
3. The student knows the ins and outs of different types of research and applies the appropriate research methodology in the development and elaboration of his own innovative concepts.
4. The student is able to acknowledge and to analyze complex issues in the practice of the design trade and to resolve them in a strategic, tactical and creative manner, while observing social, professional and ethical opinions of his own and of others.
5. Being aware that his social and ethical responsibilities and his cultural background will affect his design proposals, the student is able to put his own specialist knowledge and opinions at the service of the developments of the design trade in relation to adjacent fields of knowledge, both from the context, background and perspective of others and from a 'global' perspective.
6. The student has a critical understanding and he has detailed knowledge of several topical discussions within the design field and he is able to justify his own position in this.
7. Taking into account the often global context, the student is able to integrate his own intuition as driving force behind his concept development and he is able to use his cultural background as valuable source of inspiration.
8. From a global perspective, the student is able to autonomously deepen his own development as designer and to broaden it in view of further development of the trade and the associated fields of knowledge.
9. The student is able to compose design proposals that demonstrate (i) advanced knowledge of and insight into the topical international work field and social reality (ii) a well-informed opinion about the results of his systematic and (iii) intuitive research and an original way to convey those results.

In the audit panel's opinion the above competences reflect the very specific –at least in the Dutch context – view of DAE on the meaning and function of 'design' and designers, and in particular the 'master'- designer. DAE's vision can be summarized as follows: DAE is focused on the humanitarian perspective that looks for meaning, relevance and value, in the cultural, social and economic field. DAE wants to meet the demand of society for designers in the broadest sense. After all, the present role of designers transcends the mere product design. Designers think about the usefulness and meaning of services, information strategies and scenarios for change processes. Their designs are often characterized by unexpected combinations of knowledge fields and solutions that transcend traditional professional disciplines. DAE approaches design as a part of general human needs. This requires from the students a fully developed contextual awareness and a strong ability to conceptualize, based on advanced insight in the socio-economic and socio-cultural environment. This insight is also based on the analytical research carried out by the 'master'-designer. Furthermore the 'master'-designer is expected to play a leading and guiding role. To the panel DAE has properly embedded these components in the intended learning outcomes.

Since the heads of departments and the (co-ordinating) lecturers are also working in the professional field they all together can be considered as the continuous linkage to the outside 'design world'. Actually the heads of the departments and the co-ordinating lecturers function not only as educators but also as advisors from the professional field. Through biannual consultations among the heads of Design departments, the three Research departments and the co-ordinating lecturers new developments relevant to the master programme are identified and they are judged to what extent they should affect the goals of the programme. One of the issues DAE has incorporated in the programme goals as a result of these consultations, is strengthening the methodological training in the research dimension of the programme.

Moreover DAE operates actively in an extended international network: (e.g.) Royal College of Art in London, Rhode Island School of design (ISD) in New York, University of Art and Design (UIAH) in Helsinki (currently Aalto University School of Art and Design), École Cantonale d'Art (ECAL) in Lausanne, International Council of Societies of Industrial design (ICSID) in Montreal, Salone del Mobile in Milan, exhibitions in New York and Tokyo, International Association of Universities and Colleges of Arts, design and Media (CUMULUS) together with Danmarks Designskole, Gerrit Rietveld Academy in Amsterdam, Universität Gesamthochschule Essen and Hochschule für Angewandte Kunst in Vienna. Furthermore DAE is one of the partners in the Creative Industry Scientific Programme – CRISP. The main focus of CRISP is the development of knowledge, methods and supporting tools that together form a knowledge infrastructure. The results of the projects in the programme will be disseminated to all the players involved in the project as well as to Dutch design related industries, the knowledge institutes and the public sector outside of the consortium.

All these contacts are maintained by Board, Heads of departments and, last but not least, the (co-ordinating) lecturers. Thanks to this international environment DAE is fully informed about the current developments abroad and the design professionals from abroad can bring-in their experiences in DAE.

Considerations and Judgement

The nature of the intended learning outcomes shows that these outcomes are focused on highly skilled, *innovative and leading* designers who are not only able to practise and to innovate their profession in a creative and well-considered way (like the 'bachelor'-designer) but who are also able to guide the thinking about 'design' and to influence the further development of the design-world. What in particular is an asset, is the way DAE has transformed their conceptual and contextual approach into the learning outcomes. Hence the audit panel is of the opinion, that the professional orientation of the intended learning outcomes is fully secured. Moreover, since DAE converted the outcomes into specific indicators, the learning outcomes can be handled as an appropriate tool to define the successive learning goals in the course programme. The international designer-requirements are incorporated in the learning outcomes, which is not surprising, since DAE operates very actively in an international network and due to the international scope of DAE's staff. The (practice oriented / applied) research component is sufficiently exposed too.

The audit panel's conclusion is that the intended learning outcomes of the master course 'Design' fully meet the quality requirements standard 1 refers to, including the international aspect and the applied research dimension of this standard. The audit panel's judgement, therefore, is 'good'.

4.2 Curriculum

Standard 2: The orientation of the curriculum assures the development of skills in the field of scientific research and/or the professional practice.

Explanation: The curriculum has demonstrable links with current developments in the professional field and with the discipline.

Introduction

DAE has a flexible master curriculum, based on three pillars, three research departments: 'Contextual Design', 'Social Design' and Information Design. These departments, as described in section 3, form the substantive areas in which students graduate.

The three departments do not have a definite and specific curricula. The master curriculum is determined by current social and related research themes, emerging from the frequent dialogue between the research department heads, Creative Board and the Executive Board. Furthermore, the master students bring in their issues they would further specify, elaborate and investigate in the framework of the master course.

The continuity of the education is guaranteed by the composition of each team. It consists of a permanent core of specialized lecturers, who bring a certain expertise of the design trade to the table, with, in addition, an annually alternating group of lecturers who provide knowledge around these themes. This flexible way of curriculum development is possible, since the lecturers are able to fully devote to their teaching task, since all indirect/supporting tasks are provided by the Education Bureau of the academy. A fairly unique situation in the world of education, indeed.

Findings

The professional context of the master course

After having analysed the particular programme components of the master curriculum and through discussions with the DAE management, the heads of the departments and lecturers, the audit panel noticed the following:

DAE's basic vision is that the pivot of the programme should be the concept of learning by doing. Accordingly the study master programme is strongly oriented towards the profession and its practice. This is not surprising, since the staff is deeply rooted in the occupational practice and they maintain close contacts with a great number of professionals from the 'design-world'. More than that, one could say that all lecturers themselves comprise the occupational field. So, the occupational field is not (only) next to DAE but within DAE.

The 'learning by doing'- concept, being the leading principle of the education model, becomes apparent in the great number of projects the master programme is focused on throughout the entire course. During the audit the panel established, that actually the projects are the nucleus of the master course'.

After having analysed the master programme and through examination of a great number of project-designs &-results, the panel established the following:

In the first three trimesters, students implemented projects to learn about new work methods. During the first year it turned out, that students gradually obtained more individuality and skills. In the second year they worked -in close consultation with their mentors- on their own thesis design project. Each third trimester, students implemented a project in collaboration with either the business community, the government or non-profit agencies. The results of those projects have found their way into the world through official publications and exhibits. For example the projects: Machine, Apocalyptopia, Atlas of Limburg, Time restaurant, (In)visible Membrane, Hydro Morphosis, New Ways to Embrace the Cycle of Life and Death, Spider Farm.

The panel's conclusion is, that the projects are in direct connection to realistic and complex issues and dilemma's in the design-world as well as in the specific professional practice. They also require an active and involved attitude and they call on strong capacities, like (e.g.) 'acting autonomously', 'having insight in the context' and 'conceptual thinking'. These far-reaching and realistic design projects together with businesses, governments and non-profit organizations, provide an authentic and challenging learning environment, in which the reality check occurs and together they reflect all intended learning outcomes.

In this respect it is worth to mention that the lay-out of the programme is not based on subjects, but they are grafted into (i) 'detecting social phenomena that are affecting industry, art, culture, mobility, social and economic values and design' and (ii) autonomous thinking.

The openness of the course programme

Not only the learning outcomes (see under standard 1) but also the curriculum as such is the result of the intensive biannual consultations among the heads of departments and the co-ordinating lecturers through which new developments relevant to the master programme are identified and they are judged to what extent they should affect the programme as such.

As already stated under standard 1, thanks to DAE's international network DAE is fully informed about the current developments abroad and the design professionals from abroad bring-in their experiences in DAE, for example through the annual so-called "White Lady"-programme, consisting of 10 lectures by internationally renowned thinkers from within and outside the design trade. The programme, being a compulsory part of the bachelor programme, is strongly recommended for Master students. Speakers are asked to combine their introduction with a workshop session or specific lecture for a bachelor or master department prior to or after their lecture.

The research component of the programme

DAE is aiming at demand-driven research themes: themes that regard general socio-economic and/ or cultural issues the students have to deal with in their future design-practise. However, the panel noticed that the nature of the research conducted by the master students, mainly depends on the individual choices made by these students. In that respect the panel's suggestion to DAE is to bring the master research topics round to a limited number of (broad) issues relevant to the positioning and the development of the design-domain, national *and* international. All this should be one of the main issues to be handled by the lectorship Design Theory. Concerning the actual research track as such, the methodological schooling is still a point for improvement.

Finally, the audit panel learned from the discussions with the master students, that the lecturers constantly bring-in their experience and expertise in their education, which the students highly appreciate.

Considerations and judgement

To the audit panel it is quite evident that DAE has substantial and effective links with the national and international professional field the master course is focused on. The professional background and the (inter)national network of the staff are effectively applied in the actual education and training of students and it has resulted into an open lay-out of the programme in which out-school projects are incorporated. From that students are educated and trained through realistic interactions with the professional field. All this is fully in line with the intended learning outcomes. The audit panel's conclusion is that the orientation of the curriculum of the master course 'Design' fully meets the quality requirements standard 2 refers to. The judgement is: good.

Standard 3: The contents of the curriculum enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Explanation: The learning outcomes have been adequately translated into attainment targets for (components of) the curriculum. Students follow a study curriculum which is coherent in terms of content.

Findings

Introduction

The master course programme is a very open programme. Students entering DAE will not find a well made bed, they will not find a course to graduation, mapped in detail. What they will find is a challenging and rather demanding environment in which education and the professional field are strongly tied together. In this respect even the lay-out of the programme reflects the nature of the intended learning outcomes. Nevertheless the programme consists of a variety of well-determined and properly scheduled components as described below.

Structure and contents: outline

Basically the programme structure consists of two main components: projects and supporting lectures, scheduled in the programme component 'Source'.

Projects

During the first three trimesters, students implement projects to discover new work methods which they are not used to, in a continuously recurring process of research and design. During the first year, the products are partially specified. Based on the assignments, students work on their project. Gradually, students obtain more individuality and skills, and they will -in close consultation with their mentors- start working on their own thesis design project during the second year. They will determine the research question. Each third trimester, students implement a project in collaboration with the business community, the government or non-profit agencies.

Integral part of all projects is the requirement that students have to present themselves verbally and in writing. Each trimester, a student presents and defends himself based on the project results. During the final graduation, the student has to present the results of his thesis design project in front of research heads, mentors, delegates, design professionals from outside, interested parties and critical colleagues. Projects require students to provide integrated deployment of their knowledge and skills when working on a design issue.

Source

Source, the in-depth lecture and workshop programme, is mainly intended as a support programme for the student to deepen his knowledge and to develop his own perspective, his own methods of designing, his positioning in and autonomic vision on design in a global context. The goal is to provide the student the knowledge and the awareness of the global context of the trade. In addition, the programme supports personal development of the student with regard to skills such as empathy, autonomy, intuition and collaboration.

The knowledge oriented lectures cover subjects or topics related to (e.g) 'ethics & aesthetics', 'ecology & social changes', 'buildings & constructions', 'culture & style', 'graphic design', 'new media', 'craftsmanship & technology', 'social movements'.

Moreover, students will get trained in design-research through which they learn to use various sources materials, including scientific research and insights from other cultural fields such as fine arts and architecture. The academy aims to create a form of research where intuition may be used in the interpretation of solid scientifically obtained data. Design–Research is not the same as fully relying on artistic talents, personal fascinations and intuitively obtained insights, but incorporates all of these qualities when analysing and interpreting phenomena.

Learning goals

DAE made the relation between the intended learning outcomes and the attainment targets visible not in the traditional way through so-called learning goals, but directly in the assessment criteria themselves. The panel fully agrees with this approach. Given the very specific nature of the DAE master course with a curriculum that is not mapped in full detail and that is arranged around individual projects, defining learning goals as a separate aspect is a redundant in-between step after all.

Thanks to the fact that DAE specified the intended learning outcomes directly into clear-cut assessment criteria, the linkage between the learning outcomes and the way how DAE will measure them is rather transparent – also to the students, so learned the audit panel from the discussions with them.

The audit panel examined the project assignments. Every assignment comprises a definition of the specific assessment criteria, set up in such a way, that they imply the required knowledge & understanding, general & specific skills & competences and attitude. In that respect the learning goals evidently reflect the intended learning outcomes, qua scope, nature and content.

Since the project assignments recur in the two successive years, in an even more complex, extensive and comprehensive way, the assessment criteria are applied accordingly.

Considerations and Judgement

Although DAE has described the master course programme in a comprehensive way, which enabled the audit panel to get grip of the course and which also clarifies to the students what DAE is offering to them and what DAE is expecting from them, the programme gives the lecturers and the students very much room to for an individual ‘colouring’, an individual filling-in of the education path. This is fully in line with DAE’s vision to educate ‘open-minded’ designers who even at conceptual level are able to provide for professional answers on social changes and insecurities. Actually DAE creates through the very open programme an educational environment which fully reflects the characteristics of the ‘real world’. This in particular is the main asset of the course programme. The audit panel is very positive about that.

Apart from that, the basic structure and the contents of the particular programme components are arranged in such a way that they indeed enable the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. In particular the relation between the intended learning outcomes and the respective assessment criteria are well established, since they are specified in a proper way so that they indeed function as the backbone of the programme.

The audit panel’s conclusion is that the curriculum of the master course ‘Design’ fully meets the quality requirements standard 3 refers to. More than that, the panel appreciates very much the openness of the programme and the pivotal role of the projects. That is the reason that the judgement is ‘good’.

Standard 4: The structure of the curriculum encourages study and enables students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Explanation: The teaching concept is in line with the intended learning outcomes and the teaching formats tie in with the teaching concept.

Findings

Structure

Under standard 3 the structure of the master course programme already has been described. To the panel the main asset of the structure is the openness in the lay-out, which forces the students to find their own way, which is just what they have to do in their future profession and which is exactly what DAE has laid down in the intended learning outcomes. From that the audit panel thinks the structure of the programme encourages the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes, which are demanding, indeed.

The teaching concept

Not 'being taught', but 'to learn' is the basic concept of DAE's education approach. From that learning by doing (and reflecting) is the leading principle in all education provided by DAE. From the discussions with lecturers and students during the audit, the panel learned that this didactic approach is consistently implemented in the education. In fact, in the panel's opinion, this learning-by-doing-principle fits in the nature and scope of the intended learning outcomes. After all, by undergoing the design process in a different scale and complexity, by shaping it, by reflecting on it and then by refining it, students develop their own design methodology. Moreover, the panel fully endorses DAE's didactical approach, since learning is mainly doing indeed. Expanding or deepening knowledge through intense experiences. DAE offers the students the opportunity to experiment throughout the entire programme.

The central teaching models are those that enable the student to gain knowledge and skills by trial and error: realistic practical exercises, projects with external parties, active assignments, creating assignments instead of reproductive assignments. All this will constantly challenge the student to go through the creative process.

Conceptualization and contextualisation are characteristic to the study. Through targeted research, a student learns to turn an idea into a concept, a supportive thought that forms the basis for the actual design result. By aiming the focus on the user and the context within which the design will have a place, the student learns to involve social, professional and ethical considerations of others and himself in his design proposals.

To summarize: the master course is offered in a project driven learning environment where the occupational practice has a central position, for instance with the help of lecturers who have proven experience in occupational practice, supported by occupational practice-led projects both inside and outside the school.

Considerations and Judgement

The audit panel noticed, that in the course programme the correspondence among the intended learning outcomes, the assessment criteria, the didactic approach and teaching methods is apparent. Moreover, the teaching methods will indeed challenge the students to actively participate in the learning process. This regards in particular the projects, the backbone of the course after all.

The audit panel's conclusion is that the structure of the curriculum of the master course 'Design' fully meets the quality requirements standard 4 refers to. As already stated under standard 3 the audit panel values the openness of the programme structure highly. From that the judgement is 'good'.

Standard 5: The curriculum ties in with the qualifications of the incoming students.

Explanation: The admission requirements are realistic with a view to the intended learning outcomes.

Findings

Acceptance / entry procedure

The previous education of the Master students at DAE varies from design studies and architecture studies to art academies. By far, most students followed a design study at bachelor level. Many of the bachelor studies are focused on problem solving design, an approach that contradicts the vision of DAE, as elaborated above. Design students, architects and visual artists or interior architects are admissible to the DAE as soon as their *portfolio* demonstrates that they have the talent and the ability to train themselves in conceptual design, an important feature of DAE.

The heads of the departments decide about admission, based on the below admission criteria:

- quality of performance
- ambition, personal goals and motivation of the candidate
- (self-) critical research attitude
- expressive ability
- capacity to grow and develop
- potential quality of ideas, concepts and thoughts, that can be furthered, refined, deepened and enriched by following the master course
- good proficiency of the English language
- references

Given the large amount of applications² DAE decided to adjust the admission procedure to be implemented from 2012. The main changes concern the following points:

- responsibility for the assessment of portfolios is distributed among *all* research heads of the department organizing the intake interviews
- establishing an admission committee per research department
- maintaining a stable admission standards
- separation of the substantive and organizational side of the admission

Foreign students

About 90% of the applicants come from abroad. The instruction language is English.

Considerations and Judgement

To the audit panel DAE is handling the admission carefully. The additional admission criteria are relevant to the Design educational requirements at master level, because they reflect the necessary skills, the motivation and dedication, the artistic sensitivity and visual ability. In fact the scope and nature of the admission requirements are derived from the set of intended learning outcomes.

The audit panel's conclusion is that the admission to the master course 'Design' fully meets the quality requirements standard 5 refers to. So, the judgement is 'good'.

² 2011: 208 applicants and 2012: 162 applicants (23 for Information, 75 for Social en 64 for Contextual Design).

Standard 6: The programme is feasible.

Explanation: Factors pertaining to the programme and hindering students' progress are removed as far as possible. In addition, students with functional disabilities receive additional career tutoring.

Findings

After examining the admission procedure &-criteria (see under standard 5), the nature of the programme and after the discussions with lecturers and students during the audit, the audit panel noticed, that DAE makes high demand to the students. From the very beginning, the master student faces a heavy program. The bar is raised high, the requirements are intense and so are the working methods; motivation and deployment are required to the extreme. After one or two trimesters, each student knows whether Eindhoven is the place for him.

In contrast with the semester structure of the bachelor programme, the master course has a trimester system. This system guarantees the student 6 evaluation and assessment occasions instead of 4. This is, given the duration of the master course, no luxury. In addition, it helps DAE to evenly spread the pressure on the workplaces and exhibit areas. Inherent to the artistic process, the planning of students does not always keep pace with the well-dosed offering of the curriculum. Of course, the periods just before the assessment are peak periods for students in several respects. Still, the evaluations from students show that the distribution of the study load is adequate in general. The interim Midterm and green light interviews about the progress of the projects play an important moderating role in that. If a student fails to pass a trimester of the first year, he or she has to repeat a similar project and present it in the Midterms of the next trimester. Such a retake may only occur once. If a student fails two trimesters during the first year, he is strongly advised to quit. If he chooses to proceed, the entire first year has to be redone. If a student fails to pass the third trimester, he / she works on the retake during the summer holiday and presents the project at the start of the second year. He or she can only start the second year if the retake project is completed successfully.

The individual development of the students shows sometimes a rather irregular route by fits and starts. Students consider the study as to be heavy and severe and in their view the study load is high. However, the panel noticed during the audit, that the students have strong ambitions and an inner urge to achieve.

The guidance in the 1st year is meant to manage the study process in such a way that the main obstacles (demanding project assignments, the need for structure whilst the lay-out of the programme is open) can be surpassed. Moreover, from 2012 each student will be given tailored assignments based on a theme or topic they choose.

In fact DAE is trying to establish a well-considered balance between a relatively stable structure and a floating filling-in by the students and lecturers. According to DAE's vision and in view of the intended learning outcomes the master programme must be to some extent 'chaotic'. On the other hand master students need some guidance. In the discussions during the audit the panel addressed this looking for a balance as a task for DAE to find a proper way to 'manage their madness'.

Students with functional disabilities

Because of the nature of the programme itself, students with a disability are relatively scarce at DAE. Still, DAE has formulated a policy on disabled students consisting of five steps.

(1) Specific information to incoming students, (2) Accessibility of the building: from 2013 the building will be wheelchair-accessible, (3) One overall DAE-protocol 'studying with a functional disability', (4) Focusing the coaching and expanding the expertise with the help of 'Expertise Centrum Handicap + Studie', (5) Annual evaluation of the implementation and effects of the policy concerned. The Examination Committee responsible for implementing this policy assesses requests from students on an individual basis and ensures that the student is able to sit examinations.

Considerations and Judgement

Actually the audit panel thinks the 'study load' of the master course Design is to some extent inevitably high for students and students are fully aware of this. Moreover, the audit panel noticed that the students expect (and that they want) a high work load. However, DAE has taken initiatives to improve the support and guidance of the students and to reshape the nature of project assignments towards tailor-made assignments. So, the workload will be a burden and will remain a burden. That is all in the game of this demanding course.

The audit panel's conclusion is that the feasibility of the master course 'Design' fully meets the quality requirements standard 6 refers. The judgement is: good. The fact that (due to the demanding programme) the study load is high, does not alter the panel's opinion, because DAE only can fulfill their ambitions and the students only can achieve the intended learning outcomes through a very demanding programme.

Standard 7: The programme meets statutory requirements regarding the scope and duration of the curriculum.

Explanation: Scope and duration of a master programme (professional orientation) equal at least 60 ecs.

Findings

The programme description of the master course Design shows, that all components together equal 120 ecs.

Considerations and judgement

The master programme Design meets the statutory requirements regarding the scope and duration of the curriculum. Judgement: in compliance.

4.3 Staff

Standard 8: The school has an effective staff policy in place.

Explanation: The staff policy provides for the qualifications, training, assessment and size of the staff required for the realisation of the programme.

Findings

The staff policy of the master course Design is attuned to the staff policy of DAE as a whole. The basic concept of DAE's staff policy is to establish through the staff a structural interwovenness between education and the occupational field. In recruiting and selecting lecturers, proven professional quality as a designer in the (international) occupational practice plays therefore a decisive role. Through this, the programme has very strong links indeed with the occupational practice.

As already has been stated, the heads of the departments decide on the direction and the themes of the respective programmes. Dependent on the themes chosen, the heads of departments together with the co-ordinating lecturers look for the expertise needed. The expertise needed determines the recruitment process. Actually the education team will be established every year, since DAE every year reconsiders what the main themes will be in education. In that way DAE secures an almost perfect match between the education themes and the expertise of the lecturers. Within the framework of the given themes it is to the lecturers to determine the contents and the nature and range of the assignments to students. This freedom of the lecturers to model the way they teach according to their own insights, to their own accents and angles is relatively big. Within the substantive and educational vision of DAE and under supervision of the department heads, they are the ones who for the most part determine the curriculum of the course.

DAE has an annual performance and assessment cycle in operation. Once a year interviews with all staff members are held as standard. The heads of departments are provided with all policy information and the relevant forms, which are used to prepare and conduct the interviews, by the HR Department. The outcome of these interviews is stored centrally and possible follow-up actions are started. HR also plays an initiating role (policy) and a coordinating role (implementation) with regard to performance and assessment. The panel has inspected a few performance and assessment reports of staff members. These showed a clear focus on lecturers' performance on the basis of student evaluations and, if need be, measures for improvement in terms of training and further schooling.

DAE also puts emphasis on safeguarding the basic knowhow of the didactical concept among its staff, and deepening and broadening its implementation. This all is the responsibility of the heads of departments and the co-ordinators who all together form the core staff of DAE.

Considerations and Judgement

DAE's staff policy, explicitly focused on the recruitment and involvement of staff strongly rooted in the professional field, is fully implemented in the master course Design. Performance & assessment interviews are held periodically and, according to the staff, in an effective way. Further didactic schooling of lecturers is now one of the main issues. The audit panel examined all CV's as well as a comprehensive overview of the professional network of the staff. From that the audit panel noticed that the links with the professional field (national and international) are very strong and extensive. To put it into other words: the staff policy turns out to be effective.

The audit panel's conclusion is that the staff policy of the master course 'Design' fully meets the quality requirements standard 8 refers to. Thus, the panel rates standard 8 a 'good'.

Standard 9: The staff are qualified for the realisation of the curriculum in terms of content, educational expertise and organisation.

Explanation: The actual expertise available among the staff ties in with the requirements set for professional or academic higher education programmes.

Findings

From the curricula vitae of the lecturers who are working in the master programme, it is apparent that they are emphatically rooted in the occupational practice. In addition, these CVs also offer insight into the diversity of professional disciplines, which comes from the diversity of required subject disciplines in the different teaching modules.

The majority of the lecturers is teaching one day a week at DAE. When they are not active at the academy, they are running their own design agency or they work as designer, artist, writer, journalist, art historian, etc. Originating from work areas such as applied and autonomous fine arts, architecture, theatre, music, industrial design, autonomous and traditional design and large and small design agencies, they jointly reflect the colourful palette of the national design field. This makes the inspiration from the concrete design and related art practice a constantly returning incentive for both lecturers and students, as well as a tangible focal point for growing ambitions.

Since the majority of the lecturers only have a small appointment, fragmentation of focus and approaches lie in wait. Therefore DAE deserve special attention to secure the consistency within the entire master course. The audit panel observed that the core-staff (heads of the research departments and the co-ordinating lecturers) succeed in safeguarding the required consistency in the Design programme. Not only through formal tools (contracts, thematic framework and the like) but also and in particular through effective communication and through the frequent consultative meetings with individual lecturers. Furthermore, the core-staff regularly organise workshops about (e.g.) 'teaching and didactics' and 'coaching students'. New lecturers will take part in so-called "Introduction meetings for starters" from September 2012.

Considerations and Judgement

Staff members are well-equipped to teach 'Design'. Both from their CVs, the classroom visits and the audit interviews the panel has concluded that lecturers possess the actual expertise to execute the programme. Many members of the teaching staff have qualifications and bring in up-to-date expert knowledge and skills of high standing. Students are very pleased with the way lecturers demonstrate their expertise and working knowledge of the Design World. Also students appreciate lecturers' didactical approaches and skills. Therefore the panel rates Standard 9 a 'good'.

Standard 10: The size of the staff is sufficient for the realisation of the curriculum.

Findings

DAE works with a teacher-student ratio of 1:20. Based on the current number of students (70), the number of staff is sufficient to provide the teaching. This regards: implementation of the curriculum, guidance of the students, further development of the course programme.

Since most of the lecturers mainly have a limited part-time appointment DAE can quite easily absorb a growth in the number of students through a (temporary) increase in the size of their contract. In addition to the teaching staff, capacity has been provided within the whole staff body of DAE for educationally supportive processes, finances, personnel management, innovative processes and contract activities.

Considerations and judgement

DAE applies sufficient staff to execute the programme. This includes both educational and support staff. Lecturer/student ratios facilitate a smooth execution of the programme and ties in nicely with the didactical concept. Both students and lecturers are satisfied about the size of the staff. Therefore the panel rates Standard 10 a 'good'.

4.4 Services and facilities

Standard 11: The accommodation and the facilities (infrastructure) are sufficient for the realisation of the curriculum.

Findings

Design Academy Eindhoven is situated in a monumental modernistic factory building, de Witte Dame, in the heart of Eindhoven, symbol of history, industry, culture, openness, transparency and accessibility. The interior of the building encourages a direct and open interaction between students, tutors, employees and management. Open areas and flexible workplaces are an invitation to casual contact, regardless of status or position. The nature of the interior could be characterized as person-oriented, innovative, practice-oriented and informal. To the panel the venue really reflects the vision of DAE.

The venue accommodates also a sufficient number of studyplaces, reading rooms, engineering-textile-, ceramic- ateliers and digital workplaces as well as a big exhibition room and an auditorium which is equipped with up-to-date facilities for light, sound and projection. Furthermore the panel noticed that DAE has a 'well-stocked' library with a broad and deep collection of professional literature.

The panel has established that there are more than enough work areas and classrooms. Students on the discussion panel did not complain about the capaciousness, although some found the availability of the ateliers as a problem, in particular in the periods before assessment.

The most frequently used classrooms are equipped with a multimedia projector which is connected to a PC with sound. This means that students and lecturers always have access to the Internet and other multimedia applications. For rooms not equipped with a multimedia projector the lecturer can reserve a (mobile) multimedia projector plus PC. For larger meetings the school has an auditorium available. (The staff and students of the master course have their own space at the 2nd floor of the academy.)

Considerations and Judgement

Both the DAE's accommodation and infrastructure blend in very well with DAE's educational concept. DAE has all the facilities available for students to come to grips with their hospitality management skills within the school. The panel is impressed by the way the DAE has implemented vocational practice into its curriculum and facilities accordingly. The panel thinks they both are really challenging.

Classrooms offer enough space and are well-equipped with modern audio-visual facilities. A wide variety of applicable resources is available. Students' access to information networks is most competently and enthusiastically supported.

Overall the panel considers the services and facilities of DAE of a high quality. This holds especially for the total lay-out of the interior, which in the eyes of the panel members tie in very well with the competency based curriculum of design course. It therefore rates Standard 11 good.

Standard 12: Tutoring and student information provision further students' progress and tie in with the needs of students.

Findings

In addition to the guidance on subject-related content and design skills training by the lecturers, DAE also offers the students guidance in the more process-related and organizational sides of the education and in their personal development (career orientation). Important areas of attention for DAE are a good information provision in the area of study-related and non-study-related matters and adequate tutorage.

Tutorage

Every student has a mentor who at least once a year meets the student for an individual discussion about (among others) personal circumstances, study-style, motivation, expectations. The purpose of these discussions is to identify possible impediments which may hinder the study progress. Apart from that the mentor also takes care of student groups for discussions about contents, organisation and study load of the course programme. The mentor takes the initiative for these scheduled discussions, but the student can always approach him or her, if needed. The mentor informs the executive board, the student council and the lecturers about his findings, in particular if it regards bottlenecks in the lay-out of the programme and/or problems in the implementation.

In the 2nd (graduation) year the students are followed intensively in order to avoid that they, being under great pressure, withdraw or that they detach themselves from the school environment and their study mates. Every week graduating students can make an appeal to one of his lecturers for advice and reflection.

In fact, the panel noticed, that the lecturers are very committed to the students and to their progress in the study. From the discussions during the audit the panel learned, that students and lecturers appreciate very much the open ambiance in which they can discuss the study progress and the study results. In that respect students are very positive about the personal coaching by the lecturers.

Information supply

The IT infrastructure for communicating with students and staff has been much improved over the past few years through implementing the digital Student Information System – SiS, and through putting the DAE Intranet and the DAE email account into operation. With the account and the desktop service, staff and students can reach their own digital DAE environment from anywhere in the world. Besides, a broad range of communication means have been instituted: the electronic newsletter, the information counters, the digital information screens and the renewed DAE website.

Considerations and Judgement

DAE has an elaborate and effective system of tutoring in place. Not just individual counselling is available, but also scheduled tutoring groups are used to detect and overcome students' deficiencies. Tutoring does not only focus on remedial measurements but also incorporates activities that aim at facilitating student's personal growth. The panel is particularly impressed by the extensive coaching during the final stage of the study. Furthermore students are well-provided with all necessary information to follow their study. In this field the school has a digital platform as well as a support centre in place. On the basis of these considerations the panel rates this Standard a 'good'.

4.5 Quality Assurance

Standard 13: The programme is evaluated on a regular basis, partly on the basis of measurable targets.

Explanation: The school ensures the quality of the intended learning outcomes, the curriculum, the staff, the services and facilities, the assessments and the learning outcomes achieved through regular evaluations. The school also collects management information regarding the success rates and the staff-student ratio.

Findings

Thanks to their organisational structure DAE is able to react quickly and properly on signals from the occupational field and (broader) from society. Information from the 'design-world' is recognised, understood and (almost) immediately translated into adaptation in the course.

A great part of quality care takes place in 'the corridor', during informal encounters or open consultations. The panel agrees with DAE that this informal and continuous way of evaluating can be very effective. Actually, this approach turns out to be really effective, due the fact that it is a structural part of DAE's procedure to reconsider *every year* the lay-out of the programme and the education themes.

Still a sound quality assurance system should encompass formal feedback mechanisms. DAE has the following instruments in place:

- Yearly evaluation of the White Lady programme
- Six-monthly evaluative meetings: the core-staff and the lecturers
- Evaluative meetings with the student council: two times a year
- Evaluative meetings with the representative advisory board: three times a year
- Evaluative meetings with external commissioners: every year
- Periodical monitoring by the examining board of the (technical) quality of the student assessment: this regard both the lay-out and the actual execution of the assessments.

The outcomes of the evaluations by master students are laid down in the SiS-system.

The DAE QA-system now is under revision, since DAE is not fully satisfied with the current practice. The procedure does not provide yet in the Check and Act segment of the PDCA-cycle. In that respect DAE will start the following actions, to be completed in June 2013.

- Analysis of the current evaluation tools
- A detailed design of the PDCA process and the role of the immediate QA-stakeholders
- Reshaping the measuring of the satisfaction of education staff and supporting staff.
- Designing a monitoring tool to follow the implementation of improvement actions, resulting from the evaluations.
- Strengthening the authority and clarifying the position of the examining board.

Considerations and Judgement

DAE exploits very effectively -and the audit panel strongly advocates this approach- one feedback tool in particular: well-structured evaluative discussions with students, lecturers and (other) representatives from the professional field. It is the audit panel's strong opinion that evaluative meetings, provided that they are sharply focused, are a much more effective feedback tool than standardised questionnaires. In that respect the audit panel fully supports the way DAE is dealing with evaluative consultations of the stakeholders.

The feedback tools are evidently effective which is shown by the continuous improvement process. DAE uses the feedback tools intensively in a rather natural, but still goal-oriented way, which enhances the effectiveness considerably. A qualification 'good' seems to be justified. However, from a quality assurance *system* point of view, the objectives on the basis of which evaluations are carried out, are not sufficiently measurable. Moreover the QA-system up till now is not sufficiently recorded. The panel's judgement therefore is: satisfactory.

Standard 14: The outcomes of these evaluations constitute evidently the basis for measures for improvement that contribute to the attainment of the targets.

Findings

One of the main and far-reaching results from the evaluations is laid down in the Education Reform Plan. As far as education is concerned, this plan is focused on:

- To enhance the internal coherence between the source programme and the projects and the feasibility of the study programme
- To integrate the Design- and the Compass departments of the bachelor course and to make the integrated bachelor programme more adjacent to the Research departments of the master course.
- To reshape and to rearrange the education of DAE in such a way that there will be one 6-year education curriculum leading to a master degree in which after 4 years a clear-cut caesura leading to a bachelor degree.

Apart from that the periodic evaluations resulted in some specific measurements for improvement, such as:

- Strengthening the research dimension in the programme
- Reshaping the QA-system (see under standard 13)

Considerations and Judgement

The audit panel presented in the above paragraph some measures for improvement in order to make it clear that (i) DAE is fully aware of the weaknesses in its performance and (ii) DAE's evaluations evidently lead to actions for improvement. A qualification 'good' seems to be justified. However, the objectives of the improvement actions not always are defined in measurable targets, which makes the monitoring less transparent than it should be from a quality assurance *system* point of view. The judgement, therefore, is: satisfactory.

Standard 15: Programme committees, examining boards, staff, students, alumni and the relevant professional field are actively involved in the school's internal quality assurance.

Findings

In accordance with the panel's findings presented under standard 13, the panel has established that the Quality Assurance approach of DAE provides for an active involvement in the school's internal quality assurance of all parties involved. Programme committees, examining board, core-staff, lecturers, supporting staff, students, graduates and the relevant professional field are actively involved in the programme evaluations.

Since the QA-system is not properly recorded yet, the impact of the stakeholders' involvement is not always transparently reducible to the specific feedback given by the stakeholders. Furthermore the QA-tasks and QA-authority of the examining board are not crystallized out yet. DAE has scheduled a plan to improve the current set up of the examining board. In particular focused on clarifying and determining (i) the scope of the board's field of activity, (ii) the position within DAE, (iii) the tasks and the authority, (iv) the composition, (v) the specific expertise needed (vi) the QA-assurance methods to be used and the way of reporting. According to this plan the re-established examining board will be in force from 2013.

Considerations and Judgement

The QA-approach incorporates all relevant stakeholders. However, so far the school has carried out evaluations in a more informal way and due to the imperfect recording the panel has not been able to judge on the full implementation of the QA system, the results of all evaluations being transferred into measures for improvement, and the formal involvement of all stakeholders. On the other hand, the panel has observed that all relevant stakeholders have contributed to the development of the curriculum.

As far as the involvement of the examining board is concerned, the audit panel observed that the board's tasks in safeguarding the quality of the assessment system and the actual assessments is not fully elaborated yet.

Conclusion: all stakeholders are involved but the actual involvement of the examining board still has to be implemented in a systematic way. The panel's judgement, therefore, is: satisfactory.

4.6 Assessment and learning outcomes achieved

Standard 16: The school has an adequate assessment system in place and demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Explanation: The level achieved is demonstrated by interim and final tests, final projects and the performance of graduates in actual practice or in subsequent programmes. The tests and assessments are valid, reliable and transparent to the students.

Findings

In the audit panel's opinion DAE's assessment system is really all-embracing. The system covers not only all intended learning outcomes, but also students' individual professional development and growth. The panel will found this positive statement by describing the outline of the system.

Assessment system

The system provides for six assessment period, each time at the end of a trimester. The object of the assessment is the design/research and the output of the projects carried out by the students. The assessments, thus, are focused on the projects. The learning outcomes from the training and education in the framework of the Source programme are not separately assessed. The panel considers this fully justifiable, since the learning outcomes from the Source programme are only relevant if the student is able to apply them in comprehensive projects. To put it into other words: if a student based on a proper assignment is able to design and complete a project and the output meets the assessment criteria, the student implicitly has proven that he has acquired the knowledge, insights, skills and attitude needed. In this sense DAE's assessment approach is integral and not fragmented into small parts of isolated tests. In fact the panel established that the assessments are competence based, indeed.

Apart from the above summative assessments, the system also provides for so-called interim midterm interviews about the progress of the projects. These assessments are formative and according to the students very helpful in identifying possible impediments in their progress and supporting their learning path.

Under standard 6 the panel already gave some additional information to be repeated here. If a student fails to pass a trimester of the first year, he has to repeat a similar project and present it in the Midterms of the next trimester. Such a retake may only occur once. If a student fails two trimesters during the first year, he is strongly advised to quit. If he chooses to proceed, the entire first year has to be redone. If a student fails to pass the third trimester, he / she works on the retake during the summer holiday and presents the project at the start of the second year. He or she can only start the second year if the retake project is completed successfully.

Under supervision of the head, the team of lecturers the students jointly assesses the work, so they get a chance to see the results of each other's projects. Not only the quality of the (design) result is assessed, but also the process the student has gone through. In this way, students learn how to present in a brief manner and to distinguish main issues from side issues. Such an assessment is the dynamic place where the confrontation during which the results achieved are the subject of discussion and reflection. It is not just the student who is being assessed, tutors also assess and discuss each other's assignments and address each other on quality.

Students always receive immediately feedback that addresses the competencies and how they have been achieved. If students fail an assignment, they get written feedback about what is missing and what needs to be done to demonstrate the stipulated competences. Such structured, specific feedback is a key feature of a competency based curriculum because it demonstrates progression towards achieving the intended learning outcomes.

Assessments are always carried out by the whole research department team of mentors/assessors. The final assessment is carried out by an exam panel in which at least five DAE experts are represented. The professional field also is represented in the exam panel. The rules and criteria of the final assessment by the panel are laid down in the Education and Examination Regulation and fully elaborated in the assessment forms. The criteria cover the following steps in the design process: the analytical phase, the conceptual & creative phase, the production phase and finally the product / object itself and oral and physical presentation.

Panel assessment of the level achieved

The school provided a complete list of graduates over the last two academic years. This list contained the names of the students, the student numbers, the graduation dates, the names of the examiners and the results achieved in the final study phase. To assess the level achieved two components are crucial: the (physical) product and the underlying conceptual design/research-thesis.

Prior to the audit the expert panel members selected and assessed 20 final assignment reports. During the audit the panel examined also the 20 corresponding theses in combination with products / objects. Selections were made randomly and differentiated by grades achieved. Also completed and signed assessment forms were included to give panel members insight into the standards used by the examiners. A list of the final projects as evaluated by the panel members is included in annex V of this report. In addition the panel members also looked into the final theses that were on display during the audit.

Judgement of the panel

The panel members are unanimously not that positive about the content level of the underlying assignment reports they have evaluated. Not all of them appeared to be well-structured and well-considered. It was not always clear which research methods and instruments are substantiated. In other words: from a methodological point of view the reports turned to be rather weak, although in general the consulted literature is substantial and exceeds the regular literature list.

As far as the (physical) final products / object are concerned, the panel considers their quality as amazingly meaningful and uncommonly powerful. Consequently the panel was very impressed by these designs made by the graduates. In that respect the master students achieved the intended learning outcomes in an exemplary way and in compliance with the high standards of DAE.

Students are very much aware of the standards by which they are judged. DAE has a clear instruction manual in place to guide students through their final study phase. However, the assessment forms hardly give any information on *how* the assessors have come to their final judgements and also some more detailed information on student's individual performance is required. The panel considers these points as distinct measures for improvement.

The school is aware of these points of improvements and intends to redesign the assessment forms for the final phase of the course. The panel would gladly have evaluated these, but to materialize this, the audit came too early.

Considerations and Judgement

DAE has a solid system of integral summative and formative assessments in place, rendering a valid measuring of students' achievements and a reliable assessment and rating. Testing criteria/requirements are clear to the students. The professional field is involved in the assessment of students' final achievement.

The achieved learning outcomes, in terms of the final reports and the products / objects are definitely of master level, although the underlying student-research should be strengthened.

However, the assessment forms lack transparency. DAE is aware of these and has taken measures to improve these aspects in the framework of the planned 'Education Reform'.

Given the fact that the products resulting from the final projects that the panel has evaluated, is quite excellent, the panel – in weighing up the lack of transparency in the assessment forms and the lack of solid research by the students on the one hand and the excellent quality of the course outcomes on the other, rates Standard 16 as good.

5. OVERALL CONCLUSION

The panel was foremost impressed by the academy as a community in which social life, realistic design practice and scholarly learning are combined and offered in such a well-structured manner. The curriculum clearly serves as a backbone to guide students through an interesting and challenging programme that has all the features needed to cater for proficiency, creativity and craftsmanship.

- A set of demanding and inspiring final qualifications, that have a clear international focus;
- A programme that fully ties in with competency based learning in an international setting, as adhered by the school;
- An experienced and encouraging staff that safeguards the presence of international high-end professional craftsmanship;
- High-quality services and facilities.
- An output that undoubtedly reflects the master level.

Both DAE's internalised quality drive and culture show ambition and, in the eyes of the panel members, could eventually lead to an 'excellent' rating. This could definitely have been the case now, had the panel been able to see the full results of the installed QA system and the results of the Education Reform, including the strengthening of the research component in the master programme. However, the audit came too early to measure these outcomes.

Therefore, in tune with the NVAO assessment rules, the panel's judgement on the entire programme reads 'good'. It recommends the NVAO to extend the programme's accreditation for another six years.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Main challenges

The main challenges DAE has to deal with, are: (1) Establishing a well-balanced and well-considered equilibrium between the current context-sensitive, mainly conceptual oriented education approach on the one hand and the –still context-sensitive– technology oriented education approach also encompassing technical craftsmanship. (2) Establishing a well-balanced and well-considered equilibrium between the current flexible, open and floating course programme on the one hand and a settled course programme, conveniently arranged. (3) Strengthening the methodological training in both the object oriented (bachelor) design-research and in the context oriented (master) design-research.

Recommendations

1. In order to decrease the number of drop-outs in the 1st year of the bachelor course, DAE should
 - seriously consider to introduce a preparatory course offered to prospective applicants
 - channel the expectations of applicants by focusing the information to them on the very particular demands arising from the nature of the education programme and on the de facto career- & job opportunities.
2. DAE should reshape the outline of the programme arrangements to secure that the education path is manageable for the students. Though, the panel does not argue in favour of easily smoothening the education path. That would be in full contradiction with DAE's vision and ambition, after all.
3. In view of the panel's plea for a more technology-oriented education, DAE should pay more attention in the bachelor curriculum to the development of technical craftsmanship / -skills and accordingly to the specific infrastructure and expertise needed.
4. DAE and in particular the Lectorship 'Design Theory', being fully aware of the necessity to strengthen the research abilities of both the bachelor- and master students, should accelerate their efforts to devise and implement a well-targeted research track in the bachelor and in in particular the master programme.
 - In general: the lectorship's role should be more explicitly defined not only with regard to the devise and implementation of the research-track but also with regard to the quality assurance and assessment of all research done by both bachelor and master students.
 - As far as the master course is concerned: DAE is aiming at demand-driven research themes. Themes that regard general socio-economic and/ or cultural issues the students have to deal with in their future design-practise. However, the nature of the research conducted by the master students, mainly depends on the individual choices made by these students. In that respect the panel's suggestion to DAE is to bring the master research topics round to a limited number of (broad) issues relevant to the positioning and the development of the design-domain. This all to be handled by the lectorship Design Theory.
5. In view of the intended learning outcomes the scope of DAE's assessment system as well as the assessment criteria are appropriate and valid. Still, the actual process of assessment is not fully transparent yet. In that respect DAE should urge the assessors to explicitly record in a standardized way their underlying reasoning and considerations. This will further the transparency to both the education staff and to the students. Moreover it will serve to the accountability.

6. DAE should accelerate the re-arrangement of the examining board in order to enable them as soon as possible to play the required pivotal role in the quality assurance of DAE's assessments. In that respect DAE should unequivocally determine: (a) the range of the sphere of activity, (b) the tasks, (c) the responsibilities, (d) the authority, (e) position within DAE's organisation, (f) the composition, (g) the expertise needed, (h) the working methods, (i) the reporting.
7. Quality assurance (QA) as such turns out to be embedded in the culture of DAE. However, from a managerial point of view and from an accountability point of view, the current quality assurance is not fully traceable, because the entire QA-process is not streamlined through formal (evaluation, monitoring and reporting) procedures. DAE should accelerate the establishment and implementation of effective and transparent procedures to be incorporated in an overall QA-system.

APPENDIX I Results table

Results table	
master course Design	
Standards	Judgement
Intended learning outcomes	
Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	Good
Curriculum	
Standard 2: Orientation of the curriculum	Good
Standard 3: Contents of the curriculum	Good
Standard 4: The structure of the curriculum	Good
Standard 5: Incoming students	Good
Standard 6: Feasibility of the programme	Good
Standard 7: Scope and duration of the curriculum	In compliance
Staff	
Standard 8: Staff policy	Good
Standard 9: Quality of the staff	Good
Standard 10: Size of the staff	Good
Services and facilities	
Standard 11: Housing and infrastructure	Good
Standard 12: Tutoring and information	Good
Quality assurance	
Standard 13: Evaluations	Satisfactory
Standard 14: Measures for improvement	Satisfactory
Standard 15: Involvement of stakeholders	Satisfactory
Assessment and learning outcomes achieved	
Standard 16: Assessment system and learning outcomes achieved	Good
Overall judgement	Good

APPENDIX II Subject-specific framework and the learning outcomes of the master programme

Dublin descriptor □ Masters competenties□	Kennissen en inzicht	toepassen kennis en inzicht	oordeelsvorming	communicatie	Leervaardigheden
vermogen tot research en analyse	De student kent de ins en outs van verschillende soorten onderzoek en past de geëigende onderzoeksmethodiek toe bij de ontwikkeling en uitwerking van de eigen, vernieuwende concepten		De student doet systematisch en intuïtief onderzoek naar complexe problemen en maakt gefundeerde, tactische, strategische en creatieve keuzes die hij helder kan verwoorden en verantwoorden ten overstaan kritische toehoorders		
conceptueel vermogen in context	De student bezit een kritisch begrip en gedetailleerde kennis van enkele actuele discussies binnen het ontwerpdomen en kan daarin de eigen positie verantwoorden		Rekening houdend met de vaak globale context integreert de student de eigen intuïtie als drijvende kracht achter zijn conceptontwikkeling en benut zijn culturele achtergrond als waardevolle inspiratiebron		Vanuit een mondiaal perspectief zijn studenten in staat hun eigen ontwikkeling als ontwerper autonoom te verdiepen en te verbreden gericht op verdere ontwikkeling van het vak en daarmee samenhangende kennisdomeinen
ontwerpend vermogen	Designvoorstellen van de student geven blijk van geavanceerde kennis van en inzicht in het actuele internationale werkveld en maatschappelijke realiteit, van een gefundeerd oordeel over de resultaten van zijn systematisch en intuïtief onderzoek en van originele manier om de resultaten uit te dragen				
vermogen tot mondelinge en visuele presentatie	Designvoorstellen van de student geven blijk van geavanceerde kennis van en inzicht in het actuele internationale werkveld en maatschappelijke realiteit, van een gefundeerd oordeel over de resultaten van zijn systematisch en intuïtief onderzoek en van originele manier om de resultaten uit te dragen			Vanuit een mondiaal perspectief zijn studenten in staat hun eigen ontwikkeling als ontwerper autonoom te verdiepen en te verbreden gericht op verdere ontwikkeling van het vak en daarmee samenhangende kennisdomeinen	
Communicatief leidinggevend vermogen	De student kan zijn presentatievaardigheden doelgericht inzetten ten dienste van zijn ontwerpproces en weet door woorden en beelden anderen te winnen voor zijn designconcept. Daarbij weet creatief gebruik te maken van de eigen sterke en zwakke kanten			Vanuit een mondiaal perspectief zijn studenten in staat hun eigen ontwikkeling als ontwerper autonoom te verdiepen en te verbreden gericht op verdere ontwikkeling van het vak en daarmee samenhangende kennisdomeinen	
vermogen tot groei en vernieuwing	Als leading designer kan de student complexe designprocessen zo aansturen dat verschillende groepen belanghebbenden (opdrachtgever, andere disciplines, gebruikers e.d.) zich herkend en erkend weten in het ontwerpresultaat			Vanuit een mondiaal perspectief zijn studenten in staat hun eigen ontwikkeling als ontwerper autonoom te verdiepen en te verbreden gericht op verdere ontwikkeling van het vak en daarmee samenhangende kennisdomeinen	
vermogen tot groei en vernieuwing	Studenten zijn zich bewust van zichzelf, van eigen sociaal-maatschappelijke en ethische verantwoordelijkheden en van zijn culturele achtergrond als authentieke invloed op zijn designvoorstellen en kan zowel vanuit de context, achtergrond en perspectieven van anderen als vanuit een 'global' perspectief zijn eigen specialistische kennis en oordelen ten dienste stellen voor de ontwikkeling van het ontwerpvak in relatie tot aangrenzende kennisdomeinen				

APPENDIX III Overview of the course programme: an example

Contextual design: Living as a Physical being in a Digitalized world

Social design: Me, Myself & I

Information design: Tools

Week 37 – SOURCE 01

Monday 12 September 15.30- 17.00

Timo de Rijk - Design Challenges – On design, Culture and Unchangingness

Lecture and Q&A

Week 38 – SOURCE 02

Monday 19 September 15.30- 17.00***

Martijn de Waal – The Influence of New Media on our (urban) Culture - Historical overview, approaches of digital media and public spheres

Lecture, Q&A and one on one talks

***** Wednesday 28 September 14.00 - 15.00**

Martijn de Waal will do one on one talks on your project with 4 students (approx 15 minutes each), please email Kim at kimbouv@gmail.com before Monday 19th to subscribe, first come, first serve!

Week 39 – SOURCE 03

Thursday 29 September 10.30 – 15.30

LUST (graphic design studio)– How tools become form/strategy

Lecture and Q&A, workshop

Week 40 – SOURCE 04

Tuesday 4 October 15.30 – 17.00

Robin Brouwer On Contemporary hedonism: the culture of Me, Myself and I

Lecture and Q&A

Week 41 – SOURCE 05

Thursday 13 October 10.00 - 18.00

**Excursion – New Craft and Old technology (and vice versa)
to Audax textielmuseum Tilburg / EKWC Den Bosch**

Visit to the Textile Lab and the Europees Keramisch Werkcentrum

<http://www.textielmuseum.nl/>

Week 42 – SOURCE 06

Wednesday 19 October 10.30 – 14.30

Partisan Publik Analyzing and building on the social & empowering the community

Lecture and Q&A, workshop

Week 43 – SOURCE 07 Dutch Design Week

Public lecture in collaboration with White Lady (date, time and place will be communicated)

Week 44 – SOURCE 08

Tuesday 1 November 15.30 – 17.00

Bik van der Pol - How can (artistic) research be translated into representation and/or a projects?

Lecture, Q&A and workshop

Week 44 – SOURCE 09

Thursday 3 November 10.30 – 15.30

Inga Cholmogorova – ‘GO!’ by tandem (Giorgio and Giorgina)

Lecture, performance and Q&A

Week 45 – Week 44 – SOURCE 10

Tuesday 8 November 15.30 – 17.00

Nanna Verhoeff – Mobile Media Screens (interface for new communities)

Lecture and Q&A

Week 46 – Midterms (no Source)

Week 47 – SOURCE 11

Thursday 22 November 10.30-17.00

Studio Joris Laarman (Joris Laarman)

How research and idea translates into form and craft (beyond portfolio+design attitude)

Lecture, Q&A and workshop

Week 48 – SOURCE 12

Tuesday 29, Wednesday 30 November or Thursday 1 December

Lecture organized by the students (4 pax)

Lecture and Q&A or..?

Dates to be confirmed

Keynote lecture Ethics& Aesthetics

Konstantin Grcic

Skype lecture by Paola Antonelli

On the MOMA exhibition Talk to Me: Design and the Communication between People and Objects

APPENDIX IV Site-visit

Lay-out of the programme: 1st day 13 March 2012

Time schedule	Auditees	Auditors	Topics
08.15 – 09.00		audit panel	preparatory discussion within the panel
09.00 – 10.15	Board of the School: Anne Mieke Eggenkamp Igor van Hooff Advisory Board: Ilse Crawford (curator) Walter Amerika (connector)	audit panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mission & strategy - developments in professional field - market position / competitive position - education performance / success rate - interaction with professional field / customer relationship management - international focus - (applied) research & development - personnel management / staff policy - quality assurance
10.15 – 10.30			- retrospective
10.30 – 11.30	Heads of the particular Bachelors departments Bernardine Walrecht (Atelier) Nicoline Dorsman (Forum) Irene Drooglever (Leisure) Axel Enthoven (Mobility) Declan and Garech Stone (Communication) Hilde Blank (Public Space)	audit panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - involvement professional field - intrinsic backbone of the programme's contents - distinctive features of the programme - practical components - learning assessment (methods, standards, parties involved, scoring & feedback) - tutoring - (applied) research & development - education performance / success rate
11.30 – 12.00			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - retrospective - examining additional documents
12.00 – 13.00	Heads of the research departments of the Masters Gijs Bakker (head of the master course) Louise Schouwenberg (head of research Contextual Design) Jan Boelen (head of research Social Design) Joost Grootens (head of research Information Design)	audit panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - involvement professional field - intrinsic backbone of the programme's contents - distinctive features of the programme - practical components - learning assessment (methods, standards, parties involved, scoring & feedback) - tutoring - (applied) research & development - education performance / success rate
13.00 – 13.45	Lunch	audit panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - retrospective - examining additional documents
13.45 – 14.45	Exhibition / Guided tour Henri Beelen and Peter van Nugteren	audit panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - accommodation and provisions (e.g. multi-media centre / library, it-provisions, student tracking system)
14.45 – 15.45 Parallel session	Open consultation	audit panel	Open Consultation must be published widely within the academy, everyone should know that they have the opportunity to speak with the audit panel
14.45 – 15.45 Parallel session	Examination board Yolande van Kessel (chair) Tessa Blokland (teacher/member) Arjo de Vries (staff member)	audit panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - quality assurance learning assessment - authority of the examination board - relation to the management - assessment: involvement of the professional field - assessment expertise

15.45 – 16.45	Bachelor Students Nils CHudy (Activity 1) Maartje Slijpen (Communication 2) Victoria Ledig (Identity 3) Laura Ferriere (Leisure 4) Marcis Ziemins (Living 4) Anke Verstappen (Mobility 3) Maarten Scherpenisse (Public S. 2) Jason Page (Well Being 1) Shay Raviv (1 st year) Jens Rasmussen (1 st year)	audit panel	- quality teachers - information provision - learning assessment / feedback - tutoring (incl. practical periods) - feasibility and workload - provisions - final projects
16.45 – 17.00	Project 'Appeltoer' (Leisure)	audit panel	
17.00 – 17.30			Retrospective – determining pending issues

Lay-out of the programme: 2nd day 14 March 2012

Time schedule	Auditees	Auditors	Topics
08.15 – 09.00		audit panel	preparatory discussion within the panel
09.00 – 10.15	Bachelor Teachers Rien Derks (Atelier) Marietta de Vries (Atelier) Robert Adolfsson (Forum) Vincent van Baar (Communication) Allard Roeterink (Lab) Wytse Rodenburg (Activity) Maya Skujeniece (Living) Jan Melis (Leisure)	audit panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - relation with / input from professional field - developments in professional field - international focus - curriculum development - contents - learning assessment - tutoring - enhancing professionalism - work load
10.15 – 10.30			- retrospective
10.30 – 11.30	Coordinators Masters and Bachelors Anna Crosetti (co-ordinator Master) Mona Smits (co-ordinator Bachelor) Saskia van Gelder (Identity) Hans van der Markt (Public Space) Natassia Jacobs (Activity) Liesbeth Fit (Atelier and Lab) Catalijne van Middelkoop (Communication)	audit panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> involvement professional field - intrinsic backbone of the programme's contents - distinctive features of the programme - practical components - learning assessment (methods, standards, parties involved, scoring & feedback) - tutoring - (applied) research & development - education performance / success rate
11.30 – 12.00			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - retrospective - examining additional documents
12.00 – 13.00	Master teachers Dick van Hoff (Social Design) Aldo Bakker (Social Design) Koen Kleijn (Contextual Design) Gijs Assman (Contextual Design) Gert Staal (Information Design) Ted Noten (Contextual Design) Simon Davies (Information Design)	audit panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - relation with / input from professional field - developments in professional field - international focus - curriculum development - contents - learning assessment - tutoring - enhancing professionalism - work load
13.00 – 13.45	Lunch	audit panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - retrospective - examining additional documents
13.45 – 14.45	Master Students <i>1st year students:</i> Pablo Calderon Salazer (Social D.) Jeanette Petrik (Contextual D.) Antonio Samaniego (Information D.) Jin Hee Kwon (Information D.) <i>2nd year students:</i> Irma Földényi (SD) Aleksandra Szymanska (SD) Alicia Ongay Perez (CD) Tamar Shafrir (CD)	audit panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - quality teachers - information provision - learning assessment / feedback - feasibility and workload - provisions - final projects / thesis
14.45 – 15.45	Quality assurance staff Jochem Otten (Head of Education) Yolande van Kessel (Staff) Arjo de Vries (Staff) Wieke Martens (Head HRM) Olga Pullens (student counselor, student affairs)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - evaluation results - measures for improvement - involvement stakeholders - internal monitoring and reporting
15.45 – 16.30		audit panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - retrospective - determining pending issues
16.30 – 17.30	Exhibition and visit at the Design House: Focus on Crafts by students (Forum)	audit panel	

Lay-out of the programme: 3rd day 15 March 2012

08.30 – 09.00			- retrospective 2nd day
09.00 – 10.15	Lectorships Louise Schouwenberg (Design R.) Gert Staal (Design Research) Bas Raaijmakers (CRISP) Danielle Arets (CRISP) David Hamers (City and Countryside)	audit panel	- research - impact on the programme - involvement teachers and professional field - results
10.15 – 11.00 Parallel session	Works Council (<i>Ondernemingsraad</i>) Piet Hein Clijisen (Chairman) Margret Wiersma (Secretary) Ingrid Swinkels Anita Pauwels Lo Hielema Anna Crosetti	audit panel	- interaction with the management - role in quality assurance - the extent of student participation in the school's decision making
10.15 – 11.00 Parallel session	Student Council (<i>Studenten Raad</i>) Anne Ligtenberg Well Being (ex juni) Coen de Koning Public Space (ex juni) Marit vd Gevel Communication mod 3 Ron Krielen Leisure module 4 Sarah Linde Forrer Identity module 3 Zeno Koenigs Communication mod 4 Katja van Heugte Communication mod 3 Carri Harwig Leisure module 4 Samuel Bazeley Master CD year 1	audit panel	- interaction with the management - role in quality assurance - the extent of student participation in the school's decision making
11.00 – 11.15		audit panel	- retrospective
11.15–12.15		audit panel	- attending teaching – learning situations
12.15 – 13.15	Lunch		- retrospective
13.15 – 14.15	<i>Representatives of the design field</i> Piet Hein Eek Jeroen van Erp Koert van Mensvoort Mary Hessing <i>Alumni</i> Maurizio Montalti (Masters) Tineke Beunders (Bachelors) Maarten Kolk (Bachelors) Heather Daam (Masters) Dennis van Melick (Bachelors)	audit panel	- overall quality of the programme & the graduates - involvement in quality assurance
14.15 – 15.15		audit panel	- retrospective
15.15 – 15.45	Performance of students during the lesson of Ton de Gouw in the Witte Dame Zaal 5 th floor (12 min maximum)	audit panel	
15.30 – 15.45	To whom it may concern		- (if applicable) pending issues
15.45 – 16.30		audit panel	- determining overall judgement
16.30 – 17.15		audit panel	- brief feedback to the school

Selection of the delegation / the auditees

In compliance with the NVAO regulations the audit panel decided on the composition of the delegations (auditees) in consultation with the course management and on the basis of the points of focus that had arisen from the panel's analysis of the school's documents prior to the audit. An 'open consultation session' was scheduled as part of the site-visit programme. The panel verified that the scheduled times of the consultation session had been made public correctly and timely to all parties involved in the school community. No master students attended the open consultation session. During the site-visit the members of the audit panel attended a comprehensive exhibition of (bachelor and) master final projects.

APPENDIX V Documents examined

- A Critical Self-reflection: Organisation Design Academy Eindhoven (2012)
 - Mission and Policy
 - Facilities
 - Quality Care and Quality Assurance
 - Statistics on total number of students, intake, drop-out, number of graduates
 - Time table Education reform
- Masterplan Renewed Education (2012) en onderliggende documenten zoals:
 - Verslagen (Stand van zaken) van de vier betrokken werkgroepen
 - Doelstellingen Onderwijsvernieuwing
 - Blueprint Renewed DAE (2011)
 - Onderwijs als Onderzoek – Onderzoek als Onderwijs (2011)
- A Critical Dialogue Master Course Design (2012)
 - Three research departments
 - Mission and position – education model
 - Curriculum overview
 - Results and assessment
 - Quality care
 - Master competences in relation to Dublin Descriptors
 - Source lectures 2011 – 2012
 - Literature lists
- Programme outline of the three research departments: Contextual Design
- Onderwijs- en Examenregeling DAE (OER – 2011)
- Landelijk Opleidingsprofiel Vormgeving (2002)
- Examencommissie Minutes (2012)
- Overview of Education staff (2012)
 - education background – function – occupational background
- Projectplan Kwaliteitszorg
- Verslagen Studentevaluatie 2011-2012
- Beleidsplan Studenten met een Functiebeperking (2012)
- Graduation Book Masters 2010
- Graduation Book Masters 2011

List of final projects examined³

- Final projects (2010) of the following students: 582182 – 582183 – 582191 – 582179
582193 – 58196 – 582207 – 582197 – 582176 – 582181 – 582205 – 582203.
- Final projects (2011) of the following students: 592168 – 592199 – 592153 – 592155
592181 – 592146 – 592169 – 592158.

³ Following NVAO regulations student enrolment numbers have been denoted here. For reasons of privacy names of students and projects are known to the panel members and panel secretary only.

APPENDIX VI Composition of the audit panel

Panel members	Expertise					
	auditing and quality assurance	education	work field	discipline	international	student-related
<i>chair</i> J. van den Eijnde	X	X		X		
<i>expert</i> G. Adamson	X	X	X	X	X	
<i>expert</i> I. Björkman	X	X	X	X	X	
<i>expert</i> H. Kossmann	X		X	X		
<i>student</i> A. van der Kruijs		X				X
Scope of expertise	Origin of expertise					
Developments in the discipline	<i>Jeroen van den Eijnde</i> doet momenteel promotie onderzoek naar theorie in het toegepast kunstonderwijs, initiator/programmameider 'Open minds, Open sources' (stimulering samenwerking ontwerpers en producenten in de regio Gelderland), docent vaktheorie/designgeschiedenis opleiding Product Design, ArtEZ, hogeschool voor de kunsten te Arnhem. <i>Glenn Adamson</i> is Head of the History of Design graduate course, administrated by the V&A Museum together with Royal College of Art in London. He was assistant professor at the University of Wisconsin at Madison USA, he is co-editor of a journal on the history, criticism and theory of applied arts in the modern period, and he is curator of an independent foundation that promotes and collects decorative arts. <i>Ivar Björkman</i> , has an interdisciplinary background. He has done research in different fields within social sciences and the humanities in design, art, anthropology and organizational theory and he has been involved in the practice of arts and design through curating and running a project based design company called Pyra. He is now President of Konstfack, University College of Arts, Crafts and Design, Stockholm, Sweden.					
International	<i>Glenn Adamson</i> is Head of the History of Design graduate course, administrated by the V&A Museum together with Royal College of Art in London and was Assistant Professor at the University of Wisconsin at Madison USA. <i>Ivar Björkman</i> , is now President of Konstfack, University College of Arts, Crafts and Design.					
Occupational field	<i>Ivar Björkman</i> , has done research in design, art, anthropology and organizational theory and has been involved in the practice of art and design through curating and running a project based design company called Pyra. <i>Herman Kossmann</i> designed and managed a large number of exhibitions. In 1998 he set up "Kossmann.dejong" design office. Kossmann.dejong has grown into an agency with over 20 employees. Alongside temporary and permanent museum interiors, the studio also designs interiors for visitors' centers, clubs, hotels and large-scale events.					
Education management / Curriculum design	<i>Jeroen van den Eijnde</i> in zijn rol als docent vaktheorie/designgeschiedenis opleiding Product Design, ArtEZ hogeschool voor de kunsten Arnhem. <i>Glenn Adamson</i> was Assistant Professor at the University of Wisconsin at Madison USA. <i>Ivar Björkman</i> , as President of Konstfack, University College of Arts, Crafts and Design.					
Auditing and quality assurance	<i>Glenn Adamson</i> in his role as Head of the History of Design graduate course, administrated by the V&A Museum together with Royal College of Art in London and as Assistant Professor at the University of Wisconsin at Madison USA. <i>Ivar Björkman</i> , in his role as President of Konstfack. <i>Herman Kossmann</i> was member of the audit panel for HKU Utrecht.					
student-related issues	<i>Aliki van der Kruijs</i> is Masterstudent Applied Arts, Sandberg Institute Amsterdam, the Netherlands.					

The panel composition was validated by the NVAO on 15 November 2011 – # 5489

Declarations of independence



DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND CONFIDENTIALITY

TO BE SUBMITTED PRIOR TO THE ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRAMME

THE UNDERSIGNED

NAME:

Alieke van der Kruijs

HOME ADDRESS:

Domselaerstraat 66 G
1093 MA AMSTERDAM

HAS BEEN ASKED TO ASSESS THE FOLLOWING PROGRAMME AS AN EXPERT / SECRETARY:

Bachelor Design
Master Design

APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE FOLLOWING INSTITUTION:

Design Academy Eindhoven

HEREBY CERTIFIES TO NOT MAINTAINING ANY (FAMILY) CONNECTIONS OR TIES OF A PERSONAL NATURE OR AS A RESEARCHER / TEACHER, PROFESSIONAL OR CONSULTANT WITH THE ABOVE INSTITUTION, WHICH COULD AFFECT A FULLY INDEPENDENT JUDGEMENT REGARDING THE QUALITY OF THE PROGRAMME IN EITHER A POSITIVE OR A NEGATIVE SENSE;



HEREBY CERTIFIES TO NOT HAVING MAINTAINED SUCH CONNECTIONS OR TIES WITH THE INSTITUTION DURING THE PAST FIVE YEARS;

CERTIFIES TO OBSERVING STRICT CONFIDENTIALITY WITH REGARD TO ALL THAT HAS COME AND WILL COME TO HIS/HER NOTICE IN CONNECTION WITH THE ASSESSMENT, INSOFAR AS SUCH CONFIDENTIALITY CAN REASONABLY BE CLAIMED BY THE PROGRAMME, THE INSTITUTION OR NVAO;

HEREBY CERTIFIES TO BEING ACQUAINTED WITH THE NVAO CODE OF CONDUCT.

PLACE: *Amsterdam*

DATE: *29/00/2011*

SIGNATURE:

006345

ONTVANGEN 07 SEP 2011

AdU



DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND CONFIDENTIALITY

TO BE SUBMITTED PRIOR TO THE ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRAMME

THE UNDERSIGNED

NAME: GLENN ADAMSON

HOME ADDRESS: FLAT 13
208 LONG LANE
LONDON SE1 4QJ

HAS BEEN ASKED TO ASSESS THE FOLLOWING PROGRAMME AS AN EXPERT / SECRETARY:

EINDHOVEN DESIGN ACADEMY

APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE FOLLOWING INSTITUTION:

EINDHOVEN DESIGN ACADEMY

HEREBY CERTIFIES TO NOT MAINTAINING ANY (FAMILY) CONNECTIONS OR TIES OF A PERSONAL NATURE OR AS A RESEARCHER / TEACHER, PROFESSIONAL OR CONSULTANT WITH THE ABOVE INSTITUTION, WHICH COULD AFFECT A FULLY INDEPENDENT JUDGEMENT REGARDING THE QUALITY OF THE PROGRAMME IN EITHER A POSITIVE OR A NEGATIVE SENSE;



HEREBY CERTIFIES TO NOT HAVING MAINTAINED SUCH CONNECTIONS OR TIES WITH THE INSTITUTION DURING THE PAST FIVE YEARS;

CERTIFIES TO OBSERVING STRICT CONFIDENTIALITY WITH REGARD TO ALL THAT HAS COME AND WILL COME TO HIS/HER NOTICE IN CONNECTION WITH THE ASSESSMENT, INsofar AS SUCH CONFIDENTIALITY CAN REASONABLY BE CLAIMED BY THE PROGRAMME, THE INSTITUTION OR NVAO;

HEREBY CERTIFIES TO BEING ACQUAINTED WITH THE NVAO CODE OF CONDUCT.

PLACE: *LONDON*

DATE: *1 SEPTEMBER 2011*

SIGNATURE: *[Handwritten Signature]*



DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND CONFIDENTIALITY

TO BE SUBMITTED PRIOR TO THE ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRAMME

THE UNDERSIGNED

NAME:

HERTIAN KOSSMANN

HOME ADDRESS:

Gijsbrecht van AETSTELSTRAAT 7
109-1 TA AMSTERDAM

HAS BEEN ASKED TO ASSESS THE FOLLOWING PROGRAMME AS AN EXPERT / SECRETARY:

Vormgeving Bachelor / Master

APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE FOLLOWING INSTITUTION:

Design Academy Eindhoven

HEREBY CERTIFIES TO NOT MAINTAINING ANY (FAMILY) CONNECTIONS OR TIES OF A PERSONAL NATURE OR AS A RESEARCHER / TEACHER, PROFESSIONAL OR CONSULTANT WITH THE ABOVE INSTITUTION, WHICH COULD AFFECT A FULLY INDEPENDENT JUDGEMENT REGARDING THE QUALITY OF THE PROGRAMME IN EITHER A POSITIVE OR A NEGATIVE SENSE;



HEREBY CERTIFIES TO NOT HAVING MAINTAINED SUCH CONNECTIONS OR TIES WITH THE INSTITUTION DURING THE PAST FIVE YEARS;

CERTIFIES TO OBSERVING STRICT CONFIDENTIALITY WITH REGARD TO ALL THAT HAS COME AND WILL COME TO HIS/HER NOTICE IN CONNECTION WITH THE ASSESSMENT, INSOFAR AS SUCH CONFIDENTIALITY CAN REASONABLY BE CLAIMED BY THE PROGRAMME, THE INSTITUTION OR NVAO;

HEREBY CERTIFIES TO BEING ACQUAINTED WITH THE NVAO CODE OF CONDUCT.

PLACE: Amsterdam

DATE: 08/11/2011

SIGNATURE:



DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND CONFIDENTIALITY

TO BE SUBMITTED PRIOR TO THE ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRAMME

THE UNDERSIGNED

NAME: Ivar Björkman, President Konstfack

HOME ADDRESS: Götgatan 13
116 46 Stockholm
Sweden

HAS BEEN ASKED TO ASSESS THE FOLLOWING PROGRAMME AS AN EXPERT / SECRETARY:

Bachelor- and Masterprogramme

APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE FOLLOWING INSTITUTION:

Design Academy Eindhoven

HEREBY CERTIFIES TO NOT MAINTAINING ANY (FAMILY) CONNECTIONS OR TIES OF A PERSONAL NATURE OR AS A RESEARCHER / TEACHER, PROFESSIONAL OR CONSULTANT WITH THE ABOVE INSTITUTION, WHICH COULD AFFECT A FULLY INDEPENDENT JUDGEMENT REGARDING THE QUALITY OF THE PROGRAMME IN EITHER A POSITIVE OR A NEGATIVE SENSE;



HEREBY CERTIFIES TO NOT HAVING MAINTAINED SUCH CONNECTIONS OR TIES WITH THE INSTITUTION DURING THE PAST FIVE YEARS;

CERTIFIES TO OBSERVING STRICT CONFIDENTIALITY WITH REGARD TO ALL THAT HAS COME AND WILL COME TO HIS/HER NOTICE IN CONNECTION WITH THE ASSESSMENT, INSOFAR AS SUCH CONFIDENTIALITY CAN REASONABLY BE CLAIMED BY THE PROGRAMME, THE INSTITUTION OR NVAO;

HEREBY CERTIFIES TO BEING ACQUAINTED WITH THE NVAO CODE OF CONDUCT.

PLACE: *Brunsvik
Gottnell
Sweden*

DATE: *14/7 - 11*

SIGNATURE:



DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND CONFIDENTIALITY

TO BE SUBMITTED PRIOR TO THE ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRAMME

THE UNDERSIGNED

NAME:

Jeroen van den Ende

HOME ADDRESS:

Kerkstraat 45B
6823 HS Velp

HAS BEEN ASKED TO ASSESS THE FOLLOWING PROGRAMME AS AN EXPERT / SECRETARY:

Credit Panel NVAO

APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE FOLLOWING INSTITUTION:

Design Academy Eindhoven

HEREBY CERTIFIES TO NOT MAINTAINING ANY (FAMILY) CONNECTIONS OR TIES OF A PERSONAL NATURE OR AS A RESEARCHER / TEACHER, PROFESSIONAL OR CONSULTANT WITH THE ABOVE INSTITUTION, WHICH COULD AFFECT A FULLY INDEPENDENT JUDGEMENT REGARDING THE QUALITY OF THE PROGRAMME IN EITHER A POSITIVE OR A NEGATIVE SENSE;



HEREBY CERTIFIES TO NOT HAVING MAINTAINED SUCH CONNECTIONS OR TIES WITH THE INSTITUTION DURING THE PAST FIVE YEARS;

CERTIFIES TO OBSERVING STRICT CONFIDENTIALITY WITH REGARD TO ALL THAT HAS COME AND WILL COME TO HIS/HER NOTICE IN CONNECTION WITH THE ASSESSMENT, INSOFAR AS SUCH CONFIDENTIALITY CAN REASONABLY BE CLAIMED BY THE PROGRAMME, THE INSTITUTION OR NVAO;

HEREBY CERTIFIES TO BEING ACQUAINTED WITH THE NVAO CODE OF CONDUCT.

PLACE: *Amheim*

DATE: *28 september 2011*

SIGNATURE:

Declaration of Independence and confidentiality to be submitted prior to the assessment of the programme

The undersigned (name and home address):

Drs. Robert F. Stapert
Hobéon – Lange Voorhout 14
2514 ED The Hague

Has been asked to co-ordinate the assessment of the following two programmes as secretary:

-
- (1) Professional Bachelor Course Design – Design Academy Eindhoven
(2) Professional Master Course design – Design Academy Eindhoven
-

Application submitted by the following institution:

Design Academy Eindhoven – Eindhoven

- Hereby certifies to not maintaining any (family) connections or ties of a personal nature or as a researcher / teacher, professional or consultant with the above institution, which could affect a fully independent judgement regarding the quality of the programme in either a positive or negative sense;
- Hereby certifies to not having maintained such connections or ties with the institution during the past five years;
- Certifies to observing strict confidentiality with regard to all that has come and will come to his/her notice in connection with the assessment, insofar as such confidentiality can reasonably be claimed by the programme, institution of NVAO;
- Herby certifies to being acquainted with the NVAO code of conduct.

Place:
The Hague

Date:
08 November 2011

Signature:

