

BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME

ART HISTORY

FACULTY OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN

QANU
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

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

Project number: Q0721

© 2020 QANU

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



CONTENTS

REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME ART HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME.....	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION.....	5
COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	5
WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	5
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	9
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENTS.....	11
APPENDICES	23
APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES	25
APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM	27
APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT	28
APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL	29

This report was finalized on 2 March 2020.



REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME ART HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN

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

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

Bachelor's programme Art History

Name of the programme:	Art History
CROHO number:	56824
Level of the programme:	bachelor's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	180 EC
Location:	Groningen
Mode of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	English
Submission deadline NVAO:	01/05/2020

The visit of the assessment panel Arts and Culture to the Faculty of Arts of the University of Groningen took place on 4 and 5 April 2019.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

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

COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

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

- Prof. dr. A. (Annick) Schramme, professor in Cultural Management at the University of Antwerp (Belgium) [chair];
- Prof. dr. P.B.M. (Paul) van den Akker, professor in Art History at the Open University;
- Prof. dr. P. (Philippe) Meers, professor in Film and Media Studies at the University of Antwerp (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. C.B. (Cas) Smithuijsen, professor by special appointment in Arts and Culture at the Radboud University;
- V.L. (Vivian) van Slooten MA, alumna (2018) from the master's programme Arts and Heritage: Policy, Management and Education of Maastricht University [student member].

The panel was supported by dr. J. (Jesseka) Batteau, who acted as secretary.

WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The site visit to the bachelor's programme Art History at the Faculty of Arts of the University of Groningen was part of the cluster assessment Arts and Culture. Between February and December 2019, the panel assessed 34 programmes at 10 universities. The following universities participated



in this cluster assessment: Erasmus University Rotterdam, Leiden University, Open University, University of Groningen, Maastricht University, University of Amsterdam, Tilburg University, Radboud University Nijmegen, Utrecht University, and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.

On behalf of the participating universities, quality assurance agency QANU was responsible for logistical support, panel guidance and the production of the reports. Dr. Fiona Schouten was project manager for QANU. Fiona Schouten, Schouten, Petra van den Hoorn MSc, drs. Lieke Ravestein MBA, drs. Erik van der Spek. Drs. Renate Prenen and dr. Jesseka Batteau acted as secretaries in the cluster assessment.

Panel members

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

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

Preparation

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

The project manager composed a schedule for the site visit in consultation with the Faculty. Prior to the site visit, the Faculty selected representative partners for the various interviews. See Appendix 3 for the final schedule.

Before the site visit to the University of Groningen, QANU received the self-evaluation reports of the programmes and sent these to the panel. A thesis selection was made by the panel's chair and the project manager. The selection consisted of 15 theses and their assessment forms for each programme, based on a provided list of graduates between June 2016 and June 2018. A variety of topics and tracks and a diversity of examiners were included in the selection. The project manager and panel chair assured that the distribution of grades in the selection matched the distribution of grades of all available theses.

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

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

Site visit

The site visit to the University of Groningen took place on 4 and 5 April 2019. Before and during the site visit, the panel studied the additional documents provided by the programmes. An overview of these materials can be found in Appendix 4. The panel conducted interviews with representatives of the programmes: students and staff members, the programme management, alumni and representatives of the Board of Examiners. It also offered students and staff members an opportunity for confidential discussion during a consultation hour. No requests for private consultation were received.

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

Consistency and calibration

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

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

The panel chair of the Groningen assessment, Annick Schramme, and the chair of the other assessments in the cluster, Jan Baetens, also ensured consistency of assessment through a phone meeting on 15 April 2019, immediately after the RUG site visit on 4-5 April 2019.

Report

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



Definition of judgements standards

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

Generic quality

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

Meets the standard

The programme meets the generic quality standard.

Partially meets the standard

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

Does not meet the standard

The programme does not meet the generic quality standard.

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

Positive

The programme meets all the standards.

Conditionally positive

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

Negative

In the following situations:

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

SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

The panel believes that the chosen profile of the programme is clear, distinctive, and relevant to the ongoing developments in the contemporary field, given its focus on three art domains, the emphasis on the art object itself and the human-artefact relationship, and its interdisciplinary orientation. It appreciates the wide range of perspectives students are offered and the attention paid to the interdisciplinary context and situatedness of the artwork. According to the panel, the profile has been translated adequately into the intended learning outcomes, which convey the goals of the programme in a concise and precise manner. The outcomes are aligned with the professional and research field and match national and international requirements, thus reflecting the academic level of the bachelor's programme. The panel encourages the programme to emphasise its interdisciplinary focus more and make the dynamic relationships between the different art domains and other disciplines more explicit in the formulation of its intended learning outcomes.

The panel concludes that the curriculum and the teaching-learning environment of the bachelor's programme are designed and implemented in such a way that students are able to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The design of the programme is conducive to its feasibility, and students clearly receive the support and guidance they need. Though the programme has a fixed structure, students have the opportunity to shape their own educational experience via the minor, the elective and by choosing a specialisation (art, architecture or landscape) in the third year. The programme makes use of a wide range of teaching methods – which include various activating and innovative approaches – suited to the goals of the courses and the learning trajectory of the students. The panel is positive about the quality of the teaching and support staff. It praises their commitment to students and the efforts the team has put into the implementation and fine tuning of the new programme. It is confident that the programme will deal appropriately with the challenges of an English-taught curriculum and a growing student body, while at the same time profiting from the advantages a varied, international student population brings. The panel appreciates the programme's strong orientation on the professional field through its focus on practical skills, the many excursions and field trips, and the Practice Lab in year three. Though the interdisciplinary focus of the programme is visible in the curriculum and a shared ambition of all staff members, the panel thinks the programme could do more to highlight its interdisciplinary approaches so that these are also clear to students. This way, students will be further encouraged to engage productively with the interrelations between disciplines and domains and be able to translate these insights into interdisciplinary research projects in the bachelor's thesis trajectory.

The panel is positive about the assessment system of the programme, which complies with Faculty and university-wide assessment policies. It appreciates the improvements made by the Faculty and programme following the previous accreditation visit, not only investing in professional development of its staff members and Examination Board, but also embarking on a thorough review of its course and thesis assessments. New protocols and formats have been developed to streamline assessment procedures in each programme and further enhance the transparency, validity and objectivity of the assessments deployed. The panel underwrites the current organisation of the Examination Board with one central board at Faculty level, supported by Expertise Teams per cluster of programmes, but also urges the programme to continue to be aware of the potential risks of too many bureaucratic levels. It appreciates the proactive, reflective and knowledgeable role of the board members in the monitoring of the assessment quality.

The panel approves of the form, variation and build-up of the assessments throughout the three years of the programme, which are aligned with the goals of the courses per year and which involve more knowledge, insight, conceptual thinking and practical skills as the student progresses. The programme adheres to the four-eyes principle in the design of its assessments as well as in the assessment of the end product, the thesis. Though the programme explicitly spells out the roles of the first and second assessor in its syllabus and assessment form, the role of the second assessor is not always as clear-cut in the case of interdisciplinary research projects. The panel therefore recommends that the programme ensures that the role of the second supervisor is clear in the case



of interdisciplinary research projects and that there is always an independent assessor (a person who is not involved in the process) involved in the thesis assessment. Furthermore, the panel urges the programme to make the weighing of the process versus the end product in the final grade more transparent, and suggests including interdisciplinarity in the assessment criteria of the thesis in case a thesis is interdisciplinary. Finally, the panel would encourage the programme to think about how it instrumentalises the assessment form and to be consistent in its approach of the evaluation process and procedure.

The panel is positive about the general quality of the theses: many give evidence of good, sometimes even excellent, research and writing skills. Theses that were of lesser quality, in writing, structure, use of literature or analytical rigour, were graded as such. The panel is of the opinion that, overall, the level of graduates of the programme is high and that they have the necessary skills and knowledge to either enter the professional field or continue their studies in a master's programme. That this is indeed the case can be derived from the fact that the majority of students is accepted into a master's or in some cases research master's programme, either in Groningen or at other universities. The panel supports the programme in its ambition to find ways to keep sight of the careers of its graduates, both in the Netherlands and abroad.

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

Bachelor's programme Art History

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

The chair, prof. dr. Annick Schramme, and the secretary, dr. Jesseka Batteau, of the panel hereby declare that all panel members have studied this report and that they agree with the judgements laid down in the report. They confirm that the assessment has been conducted in accordance with the demands relating to independence.

Date: 2 March 2020

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

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

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

Findings

Profile

The profile of the bachelor's programme Art History at the University of Groningen is informed by a view of art history as an inclusive, object-based approach in which the human relationship to the artefact takes on a central role. The programme focuses on the history of three art domains: visual arts, architecture and landscape. These three domains are not only studied as subjects in their own right, but also taught in an integrated and transhistorical manner. The programme incorporates a wide range of perspectives in its study of the history, contexts, meaning and impact of the visual arts, architecture and cultural landscapes, combining historical, theoretical, technical, institutional and practical perspectives in equal measure, while also stressing the importance of an interdisciplinary approach to the history of art. One of the core principles of the profile is that students work with art objects, architectural and urban structures and landscapes *in situ*, that is, outside the walls of the university and the study room. Content-wise, the focus is on the history of art in Europe (including Central and Eastern Europe) and the United States, from the early Middle Ages to the present day, complemented by more global perspectives.

Since the previous site visit, the Bachelor's programme has been substantially revised, in answer to the generally felt need to update the curriculum, the faculty-wide internationalisation of the curricula and the implementation of a new minor system which no longer offers the minor Landscape History. For this reason, the programme incorporated the History of Landscape into its Art History major, alongside the two other majors, Art and Architecture. The new English-taught programme was initiated in 2016-2017 and is presently in its third year – the first cohort of the new curriculum is expected to graduate at the end of this academic year (2018-2019).

The panel is positive about the international and interdisciplinary profile of the programme, which it considers clear, distinctive and relevant with regard to recent developments in the art and cultural domain. It appreciates the self-reflective attitude of the staff members in designing the programme's profile, short- and long-term goals. It observes, based on conversations during the site visit, that students share this vision on the profile of the programme. The inclusion of Landscape History in the profile is unique in the Netherlands, according to the panel. Furthermore, the panel appreciates the programme's aim to combine traditional art historical expertise with a dynamic, interdisciplinary approach, which is explicitly highlighted as important to the field in the KNAW exploratory survey *Verschilzicht. Beweging in het kunsthistorisch onderzoek in Nederland* (2013). The panel understands the practical and academic advantages of an English-taught curriculum, and supports this choice, but would encourage the programme not to lose sight of Dutch art, art history and its context. The programme representatives ensured the panel that they intend to retain their focus on local and national art history, parallel and in relation to, the history of Western art history and the inclusion of subjects relating to global art history.

Intended learning outcomes

The bachelor's programme in Art History aims to prepare students for work in the respective domains (art, architecture or landscape) at an academic level. Students who complete the programme will have acquired a broad training in the history of these domains and are able to apply the knowledge and skills that they have gained in a wide range of situations within the social and institutional contexts of art, architecture, and cultural landscapes. Besides training for the professional field,



students will also have acquired sufficient academic skills and domain-specific knowledge to successfully apply for a relevant master's or research master's programme.

The learning outcomes of the programme (cf. appendix 1) are derived from the five Dublin descriptors – in the documentation for the site visit, the panel was presented with a clear overview of the relationship between this international standard and the learning outcomes formulated by the programme. In addition, the programme complies with the international standard set out in the Subject Benchmark Statement for History of Art, Architecture, and Design by the UK Quality Code of Higher Education. The panel observes that the intended learning outcomes are well-chosen and clearly formulated, detailed and specific, forming a good translation of the programme's academic orientation and distinctive profile. For example, learning outcome T4 shows that students are trained to do visual and iconographic analyses in accordance with the object-centered profiles, while learning outcome O2 stresses the importance of the student's ability to critically reflect on different contextual (policy, communication, transfer) aspects of the three domains. Also, the focus on the three domains art, architecture and landscape is clearly incorporated into the intended learning outcomes. The panel appreciates that the programme has taken the advice of the previous assessment committee to heart and made efforts to reformulate its learning outcomes in such a way that they are not over-ambitious and more in line with what students can be expected to learn in a three-year bachelor programme. The panel encourages the programme to make its interdisciplinary focus (between the three domains, but also between these and other fields and disciplines) more explicit in its intended learning outcomes.

Considerations

The panel believes that the chosen profile of the programme is clear, distinctive, and relevant to the ongoing developments in the contemporary field, given its focus on three art domains, the emphasis on the art object itself and the human-artefact relationship, and its interdisciplinary orientation. It appreciates the wide range of perspectives students are offered and the attention paid to the interdisciplinary context and situatedness of the artwork. According to the panel, the profile has been translated adequately into the intended learning outcomes, which convey the goals of the programme in a concise and precise manner. The outcomes are aligned with the professional and research field and match national and international requirements, thus reflecting the academic level of the bachelor's programme. The panel encourages the programme to emphasise its interdisciplinary focus more and make the dynamic relationships between the different art domains and other disciplines more explicit in the formulation of its intended learning outcomes.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Art History: the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

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

Findings

Curriculum

The bachelor's programme Art History (180 EC) is fully English-taught. Its influx has increased since the introduction of the new programme to around 30-40 students per year. In the programme, students study art, architecture and cultural landscapes; they learn to engage with a broad range of cultural artefacts, buildings, rural and urban environments and parks and gardens. They are studied from different historical and theoretical perspectives. The first bachelor year (BA1) provides a chronological overview of the three domains and consists of twelve mandatory courses of 5 EC (total of 60 EC) in which students gain a solid knowledge basis of the domains, supported by relevant theoretical and historical approaches, skills and methodologies. The second year (BA2) focusses on the deepening, strengthening and contextualising of knowledge and skills acquired in the first year.

It offers eleven mandatory courses of 5 EC, plus an elective course of 5 EC (total of 60 EC). Year three (BA3) is aimed at preparing students for the professional field and offers students further training in academic skills. Students follow a minor (30 EC), participate in an excursion abroad (10 EC) and write their bachelor's thesis (10 EC). This academic year, third year students will for the first time take part in a 'Practice Lab' (5 EC) in which they gain hands-on, practical experience in the domain of a specialisation (art, architecture or landscape). The writing of the thesis is supported and preceded by an advanced academic skills course (5 EC). See appendix 2 for an overview of the curriculum.

The panel discussed the curriculum with management, staff and students and alumni and concludes that the current programme is well-designed, with a cohesive structure and good build-up from a general chronological overview of the arts, architecture and landscape in the first year, to more specialised knowledge and advanced skills per domain during the second and third year. The panel concludes that the programme indeed teaches what it aims to teach, allowing students to acquire the intended learning outcomes at the expected level. The panel is very positive about the focus on the materiality of art and its making: for instance, in the first-year course 'From paint to pixel: Artists' Materials & Techniques', students experiment with artists' materials in the workshops of Art Academy Minerva; in BA2 the course 'Towards Modernity' introduces drawing as a research method. Furthermore, the panel recognises the programme's interdisciplinary profile throughout the curriculum, most notably in the transhistorical/diachronic thematic courses in BA1 and BA2. The panel thinks the programme should emphasize its interdisciplinary focus more within the curriculum so that it is also clear to the students. This way students will be further encouraged to actively seek out and engage productively with the many interrelations between domains and disciplines.

The panel appreciates the way academic and practical skills are taught within the programme. Both are integrated within the different courses and incorporated into the learning outcomes of each module, developing cumulatively throughout the three years of the programme. In BA1, students are trained in visual analysis, close reading, academic writing, presentation and other domain specific practical skills. BA2 develops these skills further and introduces skill building in academic genres particular to the field, such as field notes, archival research, catalogue entries and wall labels. In BA3 this is followed up by a course in advanced academic writing skills, 'From Theory to Practice', in preparation of the bachelor thesis trajectory. The students the panel spoke to confirmed that they are offered ample opportunity to practice their research skills in the courses and feel that the programme prepares them well for the thesis trajectory in the final year.

In line with the Faculty-wide internationalisation policy, the programme has chosen to be a fully English-taught curriculum. The panel is positive about this choice, as it enhances the international accessibility and scope of the programme and matches the international perspective in the arts and culture sectors around the world. At the same time, the panel would like to emphasize the importance of retaining attention for (the context of) Dutch art and culture, so that students can acquire the necessary knowledge, language and discourse to be able to work in the art sector in the Netherlands. In its conversations with the panel, the programme explained that the Dutch art and cultural context is an integral part of the curriculum, and that staff members make sure that all students are familiar with the professional terminology within the Dutch art sector, for example via glossaries with translations of key terms. The English curriculum still attracts many Dutch students (in 2018-2019, 31 of the 39 first-year students are from the Netherlands) most of whom aim to find work in the Dutch cultural sector, as the panel learned during the site visit. Likewise, international students are interested in Dutch art and culture and actively engage with these subjects during their studies in Groningen. Therefore, the panel is satisfied that the Dutch cultural context is an important feature of the curriculum.

Professional orientation

The panel was pleased to see that the bachelor's programme actively invests in its relationship with the professional field, offering students different contexts and venues in which they can train their professional skills and competencies. There is a structural collaboration with the art and culture



domain, both locally, regionally and (inter)nationally. Guest lecturers are invited on a regular basis, and each year offers excursions and field trips in which students are able to train different professional skills, such as studying art *in situ*, meeting and speaking with artists, giving presentations on site and organising discussions and small-scale exhibitions. Students the panel spoke to were very positive about the mandatory Florence excursion in BA1, which was also praised in the student chapter of the self-evaluation report. In addition to the field trips to cities, regions and museums, BA2 pays special attention to production and presentation during studio visits of artists, designers and landscape architects. In BA3, students go abroad to conduct research. Depending on their specialisation, they go either to Berlin (Art & Architecture) or to Italy/UK (Cultured Landscapes). This year, in parallel to the research skills course, students will participate in the Practice Lab: this course is offered in three separate labs (Art, Architecture or Landscape) each of which entails students working in small teams on a project, in collaboration with professionals from the field. The project results in a professional product, such as an exhibition, symposium, or publication.

Student-centred learning

The programme allows students to partly shape their own educational experience. The courses in BA1 are mandatory, due to the relatively small size of the programme. In BA2 students have 5 EC to fill according to their own preferences. The minor in BA3 (30 EC) can be followed within the faculty or other faculties of the University of Groningen. The minor can also be used for an international exchange with the Erasmus partners of the university, something which the programme encourages students to do. Moreover, students specialise in one of the domains (art, architecture or landscape) in year three, choosing a specific excursion abroad, one of the Practice Labs and the subject of their thesis. The students the panel spoke to are satisfied with the options they have and feel there is enough variety and choice for them to delve into subjects of their own interest during the programme. They do not object to the relatively fixed structure of the curriculum in BA1 and BA2, since this part of the curriculum is essential to acquiring the knowledge and skills necessary to make a well-informed choice for a specialisation in the third year.

Feasibility and guidance

According to the panel, the programme has a good support structure in place for its students. During the site visit, the panel learned from students that they are content with the guidance and support they receive and are satisfied with how the programme is organised. Students and alumni are pleased with the availability and approachability of staff members, and highly value the personal and informal atmosphere created within the programme by teaching and supporting staff. The feasibility of the programme is further supported by clear communication structures (such as the efficient use of Blackboard) and detailed course and thesis manuals. The fact that each cohort follows the same courses throughout the three years ensures that the design and build-up of the curriculum are clear to all involved.

In the first year, students receive mentoring in small groups from staff members and senior students, in some cases PhD students. Mentors offer plenary meetings for questions about the programme, time management, and academic skills. In addition, first-year students have two individual meetings with the staff mentor. The study advisor monitors students throughout the degree programme. In addition to individual meetings with students, she provides cohort information about the current and upcoming academic years (i.e. BSA, minors, electives, graduation, MA enrolment). The study advisor keeps track of the progress of every student, individual regulation, pro-actively identifies bottlenecks and communicates these to individual staff members, programme coordinator, and the head of department.

Following the recommendations of the accreditation committee in 2013, the programme has taken active measures to increase graduation rates. In order to improve study performance, student progress and drop-out rates are regularly monitored and analysed. The bachelor thesis trajectory was revised in 2015-2016 and made more transparent, with central monitoring, a phased deadline schedule, fail grades and a clear manual. The recent introduction of the new research skills course 'From Theory to Practice' also helps students to become well prepared for the writing of the bachelor's

thesis. The panel appreciates the design and guidance of the thesis trajectory, which starts early on in BA3 with the research skills course and involves two assessors in giving the go/no-go for the thesis proposal. Recent study-progress figures show that these measures have already taken effect: in 2016-2017 more than half of the students with a visual arts specialisation completed their thesis within the deadline; in 2017-2018 this was 86%.

The programme hosts a variety of students from other programmes in its courses. It provides the Visual Art specialisation (30 EC) for the Arts, Culture & Media degree programme, which consists of six Art History bachelor courses. Since 2018-2019, the degree programme contributes 15 EC to the University Minor *Art & Religion* (Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies). Furthermore, the programme has an influx of exchange students and students following Art History electives as well as students from the Higher Professional Education who follow courses as part of their pre-master's programme. During the site visit, the panel discussed the diversity of the student body with staff members and students, in order to establish in what way its composition might affect teaching in class. According to both students and staff, teachers are well aware of the various educational backgrounds of students in class and are most often successful in aligning their teaching with possible differences in levels of knowledge and acquired skills. To enhance the coherence, continuity and cumulative structure of particular education units, the programme consists of sets of courses which share a specific topic, timeframe or domain and a mix of domain specific knowledge and skill building components. There is also a restriction of the accessibility of some of the larger courses (70+ students) for exchange and elective students.

The panel is pleased to note that staff members are aware of the challenges posed by a growing international student body and that these are discussed with the whole team during recurring staff days. For example, international students cannot make use of free public transport and not all institutions accept large groups. Also, the language barrier can pose a challenge when visiting Dutch museums and institutions, both for the students and the receiving party. The panel realises that the programme is still in the process of evaluating and fine tuning the new curriculum, in close consultation with students and staff (with input from programme committee and the 'Town Hall Meetings' with students), and is confident that it is able to deal with the challenges it encounters while profiting from the advantages of an international classroom and English-spoken curriculum.

Teaching methods

The panel compliments the application of the teaching methods in the programme, which are varied and suited to the goals of the courses, including various realistic and authentic settings in which students can practice their academic and professional skills. In line with its educational approach, the programme deploys two modes of teaching and learning: knowledge transfer through lecturing and skill building in interactive seminar-groups. Lectures are given to the entire group of students, whereas in seminars students are divided into smaller groups of circa 20 students. They come together on a weekly basis, and work on shared assignments under supervision of their lecturer(s). Teaching in the bachelor's programme progresses from knowledge acquisition towards more creativity, independence and the further strengthening of academic and professional skills.

The programme offers many excursions and field trips in which students are able to study art *in situ*, meet and speak with artists, give presentations on site and organise discussions and exhibitions. The panel was pleased to learn that teaching in the programme is enhanced by the diversity of students and a vibrant international classroom. The diverse backgrounds of the international students are actively deployed in in-class projects and discussions, enriching the content of the programme.

Teaching staff

The panel observes that the programme is taught by a dedicated and highly qualified team of lecturers, the composition of which reflects the three domains and the international orientation of the programme's profile. All permanent staff members have many years of teaching experience and meet the UTQ requirements and the programme pays special attention to English proficiency. English proficiency is a requirement for hiring new staff and all staff members of the current team have been



tested for their English language skills. The Faculty offers tailor-made English classes for teachers who feel the need for additional training. Student evaluations indicate that this policy has been successful. The panel is positive about the strong coherence within the team and the dedication and commitment demonstrated by staff members in the implementation and ongoing fine tuning of the new curriculum. It values the open and critical manner in which the team collectively reflects on the relationship between the different domains and the developments in the art and culture sector at large. It appreciates the good collaboration between the staff members of the Art History programme and that of the Arts, Culture and Media programme when it comes to sharing expertise and courses.

In recent years, the faculty and university boards have strengthened the permanent staff, in response to the observation of the previous evaluation committee that staff numbers and consequently expertise were a point for concern. Key vacancies have been filled and several chairs have been appointed (chair of modern & contemporary art, chair of history of architecture & urban studies, an assistant professor early modern art, a Rosalind Franklin Fellow early modern art and a professor by special appointment in museums & publics). Staff members indicated that the work load is high, given the many administrative duties and growing student numbers; pressures that are having a negative effect on the humanities departments at other universities as well. The panel is pleased to hear that the Faculty has taken a number of measures to alleviate the work load of its staff by decreasing administrative tasks and increasing the hours allotted to teaching. It has enabled the programme to employ temporary staff to support permanent staff members in their different tasks.

The students and alumni the panel spoke to praise the expertise, commitment and accessibility of staff members, a finding that is confirmed in the National Student Survey in which lecturers score above the national average (NSE 2016: 4.27, NSE 2017: 4.03). The small scale of the programme and the location at the Oude Boteringestraat ensure that there is an open, informal atmosphere conducive to the creation of a tightly-knit and productive learning environment.

Considerations

The panel concludes that the curriculum and the teaching-learning environment of the bachelor's programme are designed and implemented in such a way that students are able to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The design of the programme is conducive to its feasibility, and students clearly receive the support and guidance they need. Though the programme has a fixed structure, students have the opportunity to shape their own educational experience via the minor, the elective and by choosing a specialisation (art, architecture or landscape) in the third year. The programme makes use of a wide range of teaching methods – which include various activating and innovative approaches – suited to the goals of the courses and the learning trajectory of the students. The panel is positive about the quality of the teaching and support staff. It praises their commitment to students and the efforts the team has put into the implementation and fine tuning of the new programme. It is confident that the programme will deal appropriately with the challenges of an English-taught curriculum and a growing student body, while at the same time profiting from the advantages a varied, international student population brings. The panel appreciates the programme's strong orientation on the professional field through its focus on practical skills, the many excursions and field trips, and the Practice Lab in year three. Though the interdisciplinary focus of the programme is visible in the curriculum and a shared ambition of all staff members, the panel thinks the programme could do more to highlight its interdisciplinary approaches so that these are also clear to students. This way, students will be further encouraged to engage productively with the interrelations between disciplines and domains and be able to translate these insights into interdisciplinary research projects in the bachelor's thesis trajectory.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Art History: the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 3: Student assessment

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

Findings*Assessment policy and recent developments*

The assessments and assessment system of the bachelor's programme are aligned with rules and regulations set out by the Faculty of Arts, which in turn are derived from the RUG-wide assessment policy. Central to the assessment policy is the notion that assessment is an integral part of the learning process. Following the recommendations of the previous panel, the Faculty has initiated improvements to the quality assurance of its assessments, in particular within the context of the 'bestuurlijke afspraken' with the NVAO dating from November 2013. It has invested in professionalisation of its staff with regard to assessment skills and competencies (e.g. by means of university-wide training and peer support sessions) and the further improvement and harmonisation of guidelines and procedures.

As of 1 January 2019, the six clustered Examination Boards have been incorporated into one single central faculty-wide Examination Board for the Faculty of Arts (ECL), with six disciplinary Expertise Teams for each cluster of programmes. The panel is positive about the centralisation of the assessment quality assurance, which will contribute to the harmonisation and streamlining of the assessment procedures, while allowing the expert teams to take responsibility for monitoring the content and design of the assessment plans and their execution. The panel is positive about the centralisation of the assessment quality assurance and its intention to contribute to the harmonisation and streamlining of the assessment procedures. Like the staff, it is confident that it will indeed turn out to allow the expert teams to take responsibility for monitoring the content and design of the assessment plans and their execution. However, the panel would suggest that the programme continue to monitor the efficacy of the new system, given the potential risks of too many bureaucratic levels within the organisation. A New-Style Assessment Plan was introduced in the academic year 2017-2018. This will be a fixed component of the Teaching and Examination Regulations (TER) of each programme from 2019-2020 onwards. The plan is the responsibility of the Cluster Board and is submitted to the Programme Committee and to the (Expertise Team of the) Examination Board, in order to ensure the feasibility, transparency, objectivity and validity of the assessments.

Assessment system and procedures

The programme's assessment plan provides an overview of the modes of assessment and assessment periods of each course unit and specifies how students will achieve the intended learning outcomes throughout the curriculum. The panel established that the assessments are sufficiently varied, including formative and summative assessments, ranging from written and multiple-choice exams to oral presentations, group discussions and written assignments. The programme has also started to implement digital exams in order to investigate whether these can help in reducing the workload of the teachers, the results of which will be evaluated throughout the year.

The programme makes use of the four-eyes principle in the design of its assessments and the assessment matrices and rubrics, as well as in the assessment of the bachelor's thesis. The panel also observed that the variation and complexity of the assessments develop as the programme progresses. Corpus knowledge and academic skills are tested both orally and in writing during the first year; the number of written exams decreases in the second year, while the required number and length of papers and portfolios increases. Students are challenged to develop their conceptual, practical and organisational skills, for example, by preparing a conversation with an artist or architect in their studio or by organising an exhibition. In the third year, the emphasis lies on designing and carrying out independent research, with a focus on an object/building/region during the field trip abroad and the final research project. A practice-oriented and publicly accessible test is held during the last semester of the third year (Practice Lab), whereby groups of students organise an exhibition,



symposium or produce a publication. The panel noted that there is a clear orientation towards the professional field in the assessments of the programme.

The content and goals of the assessments are clear to students, the panel observes. Each course has a syllabus with all the necessary information. It describes all assignments in detail and specifies how and when each component is assessed. In its conversations with the students, the panel could establish that students are content with the quality and transparency of the assessment system deployed by the programme, a conclusion that is supported by the results of the NSE in 2017 (3.65 on a 5-point scale for assessment modes and 3.8 for alignment with course content).

Thesis assessment

The assessment of the thesis is executed according to the procedures described in the bachelor's thesis syllabus. Two supervisor and the assessor are involved in the grading of the thesis; both fill out the assessment form independently, after which they determine the final grade together. The supervisor is involved in the process of research and writing, the second reader only assesses the research proposal at the start of the project and the thesis when it is completed. The roles of supervisor and assessor are described explicitly in the bachelor's thesis syllabus and on the assessment form, as the panel could observe in the presented documents.

Overall, the panel was satisfied with the quality of the fifteen thesis assessments it studied, which provided sufficient information on the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis in question and addressed the relevant criteria in a suitable manner, though in some cases the commentary was rather brief. Another point of attention, according to the panel, was that it was not always clear to what extent the process of research and writing had influenced the final grade. The panel recommends that the difference between the research and writing process and the end product – and how both are weighed in the final grade – be made more explicit in the assessment procedure and forms. Furthermore, though the programme has clearly described the role of the first and second assessor in its syllabus and assessment form, the panel observed that the role of the second assessor is not always as clear cut, as he/she is sometimes involved as an additional expert/specialist to advise students who have chosen an interdisciplinary subject that exceeds the expertise of the first supervisor. The panel supports the interdisciplinary orientation of the programme, but would recommend that the programme continues to ensure, particularly in the case of interdisciplinary research projects, that there is always an independent assessor involved in the assessment of the final result. Furthermore, the panel encourages the programme to reflect on the role of the assessment form and to decide whether it is simply an evaluation of the student's written report or if it is intended as an instrument in the learning process of the student. Finally, given the recent restructuring and renewal of the curriculum, the panel advises the programme to explicitly refer to the revised/newly formulated learning outcomes and interdisciplinary profile in its assessments and assessment forms of the final products, whether this be the thesis or the newly introduced Practice Lab.

Examination board

During the site visit, the panel spoke with representatives of the Examination Board of the Faculty of Arts. As mentioned, the board has recently been restructured, with a central board at Faculty level, supported by disciplinary Expertise Teams per cluster of programmes. The central Examination Board has final responsibility when it comes to the general procedures, such as the appointment of qualified examiners, appeals and requests for exemptions, and the monitoring of the quality of the assessments. This offers the Expertise Groups room to focus on the content of the assessment plans and their execution within the programmes itself. The Board has played an active role in the renewal of the assessment system following the recommendations of the previous committee and the subsequent 'bestuurlijke afspraken'. Course and thesis assessments have been reviewed systematically throughout recent years to see if they are in keeping with course objectives and assessment criteria. Recently, in 2016-2017, the board set up a review protocol to monitor all of the assessment modes and forms in an objective and thorough manner, while also allowing for the disciplinary specificity of each programme.

The Examination Board meets once a month with the Faculty Board, Expertise groups and the Cluster Board. The Board writes an annual report for the Faculty Board on its activities, including a report from each of the Expertise Groups. The panel concludes that board members are well aware of the requirements of assessment quality assurance, are knowledgeable of the procedures in place and have a clear vision on what needs to be done for further improvement. The panel appreciates the proactive role of the Examination Board in the continuous improvement of the assessment system and the dedication with which it monitors the quality of the assessments.

Considerations

The panel is positive about the assessment system of the programme, which complies with Faculty and university-wide assessment policies. It appreciates the improvements made by the Faculty and programme following the previous accreditation visit, not only investing in professional development of its staff members and Examination Board, but also embarking on a thorough review of its course and thesis assessments. New protocols and formats have been developed to streamline assessment procedures in each programme and further enhance the transparency, validity and objectivity of the assessments deployed. The panel underwrites the current organisation of the Examination Board with one central board at Faculty level, supported by Expertise Teams per cluster of programmes, but also urges the programme to continue to be aware of the potential risks of too many bureaucratic levels. The panel appreciates the proactive, reflective and knowledgeable role of the board members in the monitoring of the assessment quality.

The panel approves of the form, variation and build-up of the assessments throughout the three years of the programme, which are aligned with the goals of the courses per year and which involve more knowledge, insight, conceptual thinking and practical skills as the student progresses. The programme adheres to the four-eyes principle in the design of its assessments as well as in the assessment of the end product, the thesis. Though the programme explicitly spells out the roles of the supervisor and second assessor in its syllabus and assessment form, in the case of interdisciplinary research projects the role of the second assessor is not always as clear-cut. The panel therefore recommends that the programme ensures that in the case of interdisciplinary research projects the role of the second assessor is clear and that there is always an independent assessor (a person who is not involved in the process) involved in the thesis assessment for the final evaluation. Furthermore, the panel urges the programme to make the weighing of the process versus the end product in the final grade more transparent, and suggests including interdisciplinarity in the assessment criteria of the thesis in case a thesis is interdisciplinary. Finally, the panel would encourage the programme to think about how it instrumentalises the assessment form and to be consistent in its approach to the evaluation process and procedure.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Art History: the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

Thesis quality

The bachelor's thesis and the Practice Lab project are the final projects of the bachelor. Since the first edition of the Practice Lab will take place after the site visit, the panel has read 15 bachelor theses to gain insight into the end level of the programme. Overall, the panel was quite positive about the level of the theses. The selection included many good, and in some cases, even excellent, examples of art historical bachelor's theses, which according to the panel were based on well-chosen subjects relevant to current questions and developments in the academic field. In many cases, the panel spoke positively about the way students had acquired their primary source material, the



thorough application of research methodologies, which included visual and iconographic analyses, as well as different research methodologies, and the critical-productive use of secondary literature. It was pleased with the logical and clear structure of the texts and the meticulous description of historical contexts of artefacts. With regard to the theses that received lower grades, the panel agreed with the assessments given by the examiners. In these cases, the lower grading had often to do with one or more aspects of the theses, such as the quality of writing, the text structure, the use of literature and the distinction between interpretation and factual analysis. Nevertheless, though these theses were of lesser quality, they all had various redeeming qualities – good research questions, thoroughly executed empirical research methodologies, well written introductions and conclusions, for example – thus ensuring that they rightly received a pass for the final assignment. Furthermore, though the first cohort of the new programme will be graduating this year, the panel was pleased to observe that it could already identify the new focus on interdisciplinarity in some of the theses it had studied. It expects that the interdisciplinary perspective will receive more attention in the future and even become an integral component of the theses from this year onwards.

Alumni success

The panel found that very few alumni of the bachelor's programme (intend to) enter the job market directly after graduation; the majority enrol in a master's programme. On the basis of the documentation that the panel studied and its conversations with students, alumni and representatives of the working field (Advisory Board), it concludes that graduates of the programme do not encounter adjustment problems in the continuation of their studies, either in Groningen or elsewhere. Graduates of the programme have direct access to the master's degree programme in Arts and Culture in Groningen, including Art History (and Curator Studies), History of Architectural and Landscape History, and can also enroll in similar research master's and master's degree programmes offered by the Faculty of Arts or other faculties/universities. Alumni have been admitted to the prestigious master's programmes of the University of St. Andrews, the Courtauld Institute and several research master's programmes in the Netherlands.

The programme indicated that though it uses several instruments (the National Alumni Survey; a bi-monthly newsletter and Facebook-page as well as an alumni lecture series and Alumni Day) to receive feedback, create an alumni community and keep sight of its graduates, it remains difficult to stay in touch with international graduates. For this reason, the programme plans to develop its own alumni survey (a pilot has already been carried out) in order to monitor the professional and academic careers of its graduates more closely. The panel supports these ambitions and thinks this can contribute to improving the connection between the bachelor's programme, the demands of the professional field and the requirements of master's programmes both in the Netherlands and abroad.

Considerations

The panel is positive about the general quality of the theses: many give evidence of good, sometimes even excellent, research and writing skills. Theses that were of lesser quality, in writing, structure, use of literature or analytical rigour, were graded as such. The panel is of the opinion that, overall, the level of graduates of the programme is high and that they have the necessary skills and knowledge to either enter the professional field or continue their studies in a master's programme. That this is indeed the case can be derived from the fact that the majority of students is accepted into a master's or in some cases research master's programme, either in Groningen or at other universities. The panel supports the programme in its ambition to find ways to keep sight of the careers of its graduates, both in the Netherlands and abroad.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Art History: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'meets the standard'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

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

Conclusion

The panel assesses the *bachelor's programme Art History* as 'positive'.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

Dublin Descriptors	Learning outcomes of the degree programme Graduates of the Bachelor's degree programme in Art History have:
<p>K Knowledge and Understanding Graduates have demonstrated knowledge and understanding in a field of study that builds upon and exceeds their secondary education, and is typically at a level that, whilst supported by advanced textbooks, includes some aspects that will be informed by knowledge of the forefront of their field of study.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. knowledge of relevant art-historical library collections, bibliographical material and databases; knowledge and understanding of general IT applications as study tools and means of communication 2. general knowledge and understanding of the most important developments in the fields of art history of the Western world from classical antiquity down to the present day 3. knowledge and understanding of the historical connections between the visual arts, architecture and urban planning, landscape history as well as their historical specificity 4. knowledge and understanding of the most important modern art-historical views and theories, and knowledge and understanding of the main points in the history of the discipline 5. knowledge and understanding of the functions that works of art, buildings and urban environments, and landscapes fulfil and have fulfilled in society 6. specialized knowledge and understanding of one of the three subfields: Visual Arts, Architecture and Urbanism, and Landscape History 7. knowledge and understanding of the various ways in which art-historical knowledge is applied in society today
<p>T Applying knowledge and understanding Students can apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner that indicates a professional approach to their work or vocation, and have competences typically demonstrated through devising and sustaining arguments and solving problems within their field of study.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the ability to gather, analyse and critically assess relevant literature 2. the ability to independently gather data concerning provenance, state, date, style, technique and display of art-historical objects 3. the ability to critically evaluate theories, methods and research results in the field of the visual arts, architecture and urban planning, and Landscape History, and use these evaluations when analysing and interpreting objects from the visual arts, architecture and urban planning, and Landscape History. 4. the ability to independently conduct visual and iconographical analyses 5. the ability to investigate and analyse the relationships between art-historical objects and the social (i.e. cultural, socioeconomic and political) context within which they were created and function or have functioned 6. the ability to set up and conduct a limited academic art-historical research project and report



	on this project in a form that satisfies the qualitative criteria of academic literature
<p>O Forming judgements Students have the ability to gather and interpret relevant data (usually within their field of study) to inform judgements that include reflection on relevant social, scientific or ethical issues.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the ability to critically reflect on current views and on the results and methods of art-historical research 2. the ability to critically reflect on questions of policy, transfer and communication in the field of art history, architecture and urban planning, and Landscape History, in contemporary society
<p>C Communication Graduates are able to communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the ability, individually or as a member of a team, to report at academic level both orally and in writing on art-historical research 2. the ability to give presentations about discipline-related subjects for an interested general public, individually or as a member of a team 3. the ability to communicate adequately with art historians, historians of architecture and urban planning, and landscape historians, in the field 4. familiarity with the academic codes of behaviour/ethics regarding references to and use of the work and insights of others, and the ability to act accordingly
<p>L Learning skills Graduates possess such study skills as are necessary for students to pursue further study with a high degree of autonomy.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the ability to follow the academic literature and debate in their field in efficient and effective ways 2. proficiency in English and other relevant languages to a sufficient extent to properly be able to follow the academic literature and the debate in their field.

APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Year 1							
Sem. 1 A	Beyond Antiquity: Visual Arts 400-1400 (5)	Beyond Antiquity: Architecture 400-1400 (5)	Seeing and Knowing: Visual Analysis & Iconography (5)				
B	Towards Modernity: Visual Arts 1400-1800 (5)	Towards Modernity: Architecture and Landscapes 1400-1800 (5)	Paint to Pixel. Artists Materials & Techniques (5)				
Sem. 2 A	Reality contested: Visual Arts 1800-1914 (5)	Style & Modernity: Architecture & Urbanism 1800-1914 (5)	Florence Excursion (5)				
B	Blurring Boundaries: Visual Arts 1914- now (5)	Blurring Boundaries: Architecture & Urbanism 1914- now (5)	Reading Cultural Landscapes: Past and Present (5)				
Year 2							
Sem. 1 A	Architecture, City & Freedom (5)	Medieval Landscapes & Architecture (5)	Renaissance Art: Individual/Institution (5)				Elective (5)
B	Art Now (5)	Designed Landscapes 1800-present (5)					
Sem. 2 A	Art & Science (5)	Global Dutch Art (5)	European Country House Landscapes (5)				
B	Art & Environment (5)	Art & Institutions (5)	Architecture, Nature & Enlightenment (5)				
Year 3							Minor (30)
Sem. 1 A							
B							
Sem. 2 A	From Theory to Practice (5)		Excursion abroad (10)				
B	Practice Lab: Art/Architecture/Landscape (5)		BA thesis (10)				



APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

DAG 1 Donderdag 4 april 2019

09.00 09.30 Ontvangst en welkom
09.30 12.00 Voorbereidend overleg en inzien documenten
12.00 12.30 Lunch
12.30 13.30 Interview inhoudelijke verantwoordelijken
13.30 14.15 Interview studenten B Kunsten, Cultuur en Media
14.15 15.00 Interview docenten BA KCM
15.00 15.45 Pauze en rondleiding zaal obs34 002
15.45 16.30 Interview Ba studenten Kunstgeschiedenis
16.30 17.15 interview docenten B Kunstgeschiedenis
17.15 17.45 Pauze / intern overleg
17.45 18.30 Interview examencommissie

DAG 2 Vrijdag 5 april 2019

09.00 10.00 Intern overleg panel, inzien documenten en inloopspreekuur (09.30–10.00)
10.00 10.30 Interview Ma studenten KG en KCM
10.30 11.00 Interview docenten M Kunst- en Cultuurwetenschappen
11.00 11.30 Intern overleg
11.30 12.30 Eindgesprek management
12.30 13.00 Lunch
13.00 16.00 Opstellen voorlopige bevindingen en voorbereiden mondelinge rapportage
16.00 16.30 Mondelinge rapportage voorlopig oordeel
16.30 17.30 Ontwikkelgesprek

APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied fifteen theses of the bachelor's programme Art History. Information on the selected theses is available from QANU upon request.

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

- Self-evaluation report of the Bachelor Art History, including Student Chapter.
- Education policy University of Groningen
- Strategic plan University of Groningen 2015-2020
- Strategic Plan Faculty of Arts 2016-2020
- Vision for Education Faculty of Arts 2018
- Overview organisation Faculty of Arts
- Overview committees Bachelor Art History
- Overview advisory boards Faculty of Arts
- Overview staff members (expertise, qualifications and FTE)
- Overview partner universities
- Matrix relating course units to intended learning outcomes
- Matrix of skills programme within the courses
- Annual report Advisory Board (2018)
- Assessment Policy University of Groningen
- Teaching and Examination Regulations Faculty of Arts
- Assessment Plan Bachelor Art History
- Bachelor's thesis manual
- Bachelor's thesis assessment form
- Annual reports Examination Board
- Annual reports Programme Committee Art History
- Quantitative data teaching-learning environment 2013-2019
- Course materials of the following courses (including exams and model answers):
 - Beyond Antiquity: Visual Arts 400-1400
 - Paint to Pixel
 - Designed Landscapes 1800-present
 - Medieval Landscapes & Architecture
 - Ba-scriptie Architectuur en Stedenbouw
 - Ba-scriptie Visuele kunsten

