

MASTER'S PROGRAMME

ARTS AND CULTURE

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 MASTER’S PROGRAMME ARTS AND CULTURE 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	6
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	9
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENTS.....	11
APPENDICES	21
APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES	23
APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM	25
APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT	31
APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL	32

This report was finalized on 2 March 2020.



REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME ARTS AND CULTURE 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

Master's programme Arts and Culture

Name of the programme:	Arts and Culture (Kunst- en Cultuurwetenschappen)
CROHO number:	60087
Level of the programme:	master's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	60 EC
Specialisations or tracks:	Art History Arts, Cognition and Criticism Arts, Policy and Cultural Entrepreneurship Film and Contemporary Audiovisual Media History of Architecture and Town Planning Landscape History (Dutch) Music, Theatre and Performance Studies
Location:	Groningen
Mode of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	Dutch, 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 master's programme Arts and Culture 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 master's programme Arts and Culture 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. Dr. Fiona Schouten, Petra van den Hoorn MSc, drs. Lieke Ravesteyn 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. (Yoeeri) Meessen
- Prof. dr. J. (Joost) Raessens
- Dr. M. (Margriet) Schavemaker
- Drs. E.A.M. (Liesbeth) Schöningh
- Prof. dr. C.B. (Cas) Smithuijsen
- Dr. M.T.A. (Marie-Thérèse) van Toor
- Prof. dr. E. (Lies) Wesseling
- 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 September 2016 and September 2018. A variety of topics and tracks and a diversity of examiners were included in the selection. The project manager and panel chair assured that the distribution of grades in the selection matched the distribution of grades of all available theses.

Of the Arts, Cognition and Criticism track 2 theses were selected (total 8); 2 theses were also selected for Arts, Policy & Cultural Entrepreneurship (total 16), Film and Contemporary Audiovisual Media (total 13) and Landschapsgeschiedenis (total 20). 3 theses were selected for the track Art History (total 23) as well as Music, Theatre and Performance Studies (total 8). 1 thesis was selected for History of Architecture and Town Planning (total 2).

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 (Jesseka Batteau) 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 welcomes the ambitious profile of the programme which is narrowly aligned with recent developments in the domains of art and culture. It endorses the programme's distinctive focus on relevant approaches (historical, social, cognitive and cultural) and appreciates the measures that have been taken to improve the clarity and visibility of the different tracks and of the programme as a whole. It also approves of the choices that have been made with regard to the language of the tracks. It would encourage the programme to thinking of ways to reintroduce the art education route, given the interest for this specialisation among students, the current demands in the work field and the existing expertise within the staff team. According to the panel, the profile has been translated adequately to the intended learning outcomes, which convey the goals of the programme in a precise and concise manner. The outcomes are aligned with the professional and research field and match national and international requirements, thus reflecting the academic level of the master's programme. The panel encourages the programme to further emphasise its professional orientation by specifying which professional skills students must acquire per track.

The panel concludes that the curriculum and the teaching-learning environment of the master's programme are student-centred, well-designed and implemented in such a way that students are able to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The panel is positive about varied the design of the programme which offers relevant tracks in art disciplines and specialised professional orientations. It appreciates the strong professional orientation of the curriculum and the way students deepen and strengthen their academic and professional skills, learning to combine theoretical and methodological reflections with practical applications. They are given the opportunity to further develop these skills in challenging internships in the art and culture domains. According to the panel, the programme is sufficiently feasible for most students, though it also observes that the study load is high and that many students take (or choose to invest) more time in order to successfully complete the curriculum. The panel is pleased to hear that the programme has taken several measures to increase the feasibility of the curriculum and recommends that it finds ways to improve its support of students during their search for suitable placements, especially for international students. Given the high work load and the importance of the internships, the panel thinks the programme is worth being extended to 1,5 years. The panel is positive about the quality of the teaching and support staff. It praises their expertise, international orientation and networks, their commitment to students and the efforts put into the ongoing improvement of the programme. Now that the programme is up and running, the panel encourages it to investigate how the curriculum might profit from innovative cross-overs and multi- and interdisciplinary collaborations between different tracks.

The panel is positive about the assessment system of the programme, which complies with Faculty and university-wide assessment policies. It has appreciation for 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 is positive about 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 the design of the assessments of the master's programme, which are aligned with the goals of the courses and incorporate a wide variety of appropriate research- and practice-oriented assessment methods. The programme adheres to the four-eyes principle in the design of its assessments as well as in the assessment of the internships and end product, the thesis. The panel approved the assessments of the theses it studied, which overall correctly addressed the weaknesses and strengths of the thesis in question. One thesis, which the panel judged to be insufficient, resulted in a pass. 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. Furthermore, the panel urges the programme to make the weighing of the research and writing process versus the end product in the final grade more transparent and clear, and to introduce its interdisciplinary and profession-oriented profile explicitly into the assessment criteria of the thesis. In relation to this, the panel recommends to ensure that the quality of the end product always meets the expected master's level, and that the role of the second assessor is clear cut and that there is always an independent assessor (a person who is not involved in the process) involved in the thesis assessment.

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, with the exception of one thesis. The panel is convinced that the current supervisory and assessment structure will ensure this remains an exception. In the opinion of the panel, the overall level of graduates of the programme is high and they have the necessary skills and knowledge to either enter the professional field or to continue with an academic career. That this is indeed the case can be derived from the fact that the majority of students finds work in the domains of art and culture. The panel encourages the programme 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:

Master's programme Arts and Culture

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

The chair, prof. dr. 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

The profile of the master's programme Arts and Culture at the University of Groningen is characterised by seven tracks which either offer in-depth knowledge in a range of art disciplines or focus on specialised professional profiles, combined with a focus on practical skills and social engagement, critical and creative thinking, and academic leadership. The tracks prepare students for job opportunities in the cultural sector, such as programming and curating, journalism and publishing, education, policy functions and management. Students can also qualify for cultural entrepreneurs and initiate art-related events and companies.

The master's programme Arts and Culture (A&C) is the outcome of a merger between two previously separate master's programmes: Arts, Culture and Media, and Art History. The new programme offers the following tracks: (1) Art History; (2) Arts, Cognition and Criticism; (3) Arts, Policy and Cultural Entrepreneurship; (4) Film and Contemporary Audiovisual Media; (5) History of Architecture and Town Planning; (6) Landschapsgeschiedenis (Landscape History) and (7) Music, Theatre and Performance Studies. Six tracks are taught in English; the track 'Landschapsgeschiedenis/Landscape History' is in Dutch. The panel supports the choice for English-taught tracks, since it matches the developments in the professional field and has many academic and practical advantages. Landscape History has a strong orientation on the Dutch domain, therefore the panel feels that the programme is right to retain the Dutch language for this particular track.

The panel welcomes the ambitious profile of the programme which is narrowly aligned with recent developments in the domains of art and culture, and incorporates distinctive tracks and relevant approaches (historical, social, cognitive and cultural). The panel appreciates the measures that have been taken to improve the clarity and visibility of the different tracks and the programme as a whole. It also appreciates the self-reflective attitude of the staff members in their thinking about the programme's profile and its short- and long-term goals. The panel observes, based on conversations during the site visit, that students share the vision of the programme. The panel regrets that the track for art education (which prepares students for art teacher positions at secondary schools (CKV) and in other educational contexts) has been discontinued, despite the excellent expertise available on this subject within the staff team. Staff members indicated that some of the topics connected to this study route have been incorporated into the track 'Arts, Cognition and Criticism' and they are considering a shift towards a stronger educational focus.

Intended learning outcomes

The master's programme aims to prepare students for professional roles at an academic master's level in the field of arts and culture. Each track offers students advanced knowledge of art disciplines and the academic and professional skills to future functions as cultural professionals, policy makers, researchers, and leaders in the world of the arts. 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 intended learning outcomes correspond to 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 profile. It recognises the separate learning outcomes for the different tracks (A5 and A8). 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 one-year master's programme. The panel encourages the programme to make its professional orientation more explicit in the learning outcomes, by referring to the intended goals of the internships, and specifying professional skills within section D (which currently only refers to academic skills). The panel would also advise the programme to make more concrete which specific professional skills are necessary per track.

Considerations

The panel welcomes the ambitious profile of the programme which is narrowly aligned with recent developments in the domains of art and culture. It endorses the programme's distinctive focus on relevant approaches (historical, social, cognitive and cultural) and appreciates the measures that have been taken to improve the clarity and visibility of the different tracks and of the programme as a whole. It also approves of the choices that have been made with regard to the language of the tracks. It would encourage the programme to thinking of ways to reintroduce the art education route, given the interest for this specialisation among students, the current demands in the work field and the existing expertise within the staff team. According to the panel, the profile has been translated adequately to the intended learning outcomes, which convey the goals of the programme in a precise and concise manner. The outcomes are aligned with the professional and research field and match national and international requirements, thus reflecting the academic level of the master's programme. The panel encourages the programme to further emphasise its professional orientation by specifying which professional skills students must acquire per track.

Conclusion

Master's programme Arts and Culture: the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

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

Findings

Curriculum

The master's programme Arts and Culture is comprised of seven tracks, each of which consists of 60 EC (see appendix 2 for an overview of the curriculum). The Art History track also offers the study route 'Curatorial Studies', which consists of 90 EC – students are selected for this trajectory which includes a longer internship at one of the partner museums of the programme. During the first semester (30 EC), students take courses that develop their insights into an art discipline (film, music, fine arts, architecture and landscape) in relation to its function in culture and society or a specialised profile ('Arts, Policy and Cultural Entrepreneurship' and 'Arts, Cognition and Criticism'). The second semester is devoted to a master's thesis (for most tracks 20 EC, in some cases 15 EC) and an internship (for most tracks 10 EC, in some cases 5 EC). The A&C programme as a whole is currently in its fourth year; four tracks have started in the academic year 2018/2019, three tracks were already in place. Since its implementation, the programme has had a total of 60-70 students in the different tracks; this academic year (2018/2019) it has had an influx of over 50 students. It indicates that the changes made to the programme have had a positive impact on the number of students coming in. The panel supports the programme's intentions to keep monitoring the number of incoming students per track in order to ensure that it can continue to deliver what it promises and to keep the diverse offer of tracks sustainable.

The panel discussed the curriculum with management, staff and students and alumni and concludes that the current programme is carefully designed, with a cohesive structure and good build-up in each track. The panel compliments the programme for the manner in which each specific track is set up according to the standards and requirements of the disciplinary and/or professional domain for

which the students are trained. It is positive about the increased visibility of the Film and Contemporary Audiovisual Media track, which students find to be inspiring and relevant. 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. Now that the programme is up and running, the panel urges the programme to consolidate what it has achieved. This will give the staff room to investigate how the curriculum might profit from innovative cross-overs and trans- and interdisciplinary collaborations between the different tracks. It also advises the programme to continue to fine tune its Arts, Policy and Cultural Entrepreneurship track, particularly with regard to its conceptual approach and development of the notion of cultural entrepreneurship.

The panel appreciates the way students deepen and strengthen their academic and professional skills within the different tracks. Students develop their research skills through assignments that prepare them for larger research tasks. They also learn to combine theoretical and methodological approaches with practical applications. In the preparatory trajectories for the master's thesis, students carry out literature reviews, learn how to relate theoretical frameworks to concrete case studies and/or practices in the art worlds, how to approach case studies and/or practices, and how to develop relevant research questions. The students the panel spoke to confirmed that they receive ample training and support in preparation of their master's thesis trajectory in the final semester.

Professional orientation

The panel is pleased to see that the master's programme actively invests in its relationship with the professional field. In the first semester, courses address concrete case studies in which students learn to combine academic knowledge and methodological approaches with the required professional and practical skills. The tracks 'Art History,' 'History of Architecture and Town Planning,' and 'Landschapsgeschiedenis' contain excursions, fieldwork, visits to and collaborations with organisations, enabling students to train various academic (research) skills in the field. Other practice-based learning methods are implemented in the tracks as well, such as organising exhibitions and engaging in collaborative projects with artists. These learning methods are followed up by an internship in the second semester. To realise these internships, the programme maintains structural collaborations with the art and culture domain, both locally, regionally and (inter)nationally. Examples of placements can be found at a wide range of cultural organisations, local and national cultural authorities, film festivals, theatre and dance companies, national and international museums and cultural departments of embassies. Students are involved in many professional activities during the internships, such as devising and executing marketing campaigns, doing audience research, curating exhibitions, drawing up policy advices for subsidy allocations, or researching cultural participation.

Student-centred learning

The programme allows students to shape their own educational experience through the interactive nature of educational methods (seminars, discussions and assignments tailored to the interests of the students) and the strong focus on the independent development and application of research skills. The panel is also pleased to observe that the Art History track allows students to choose from different courses in the first semester. In the second semester, students choose the venue of their internship and the subject matter of their master's thesis. The students the panel spoke to are satisfied with the options they have to shape their own study trajectory and delve into subjects of their own interest. However, during conversations with the students during the site visit, the panel learned that some students may be interested in designing their own curriculum, choosing from different courses within the seven tracks. The panel thinks this might be an attractive and viable option for future students and would encourage the programme to investigate if a more individualised study trajectory per student is desirable, and if so, feasible.

Feasibility and guidance

According to the panel, the programme is sufficiently feasible for most students. It does however observe that the study load is high and that many students take (or choose to invest) more time in order to successfully complete the curriculum. The programme indicated during the site visit that it



is aware of the heavy work load for its students and that it has taken several measures to increase the feasibility of the curriculum; it has adjusted the nature and timing of assessments to accommodate students in the management of their study load and has also improved the thesis trajectory in response to recommendations proposed by the previous accreditation panel. It has shortened the thesis writing process, bringing it back from a longer trajectory (running alongside the internships) to a shorter period of three and a half months in the final semester. The restructured thesis trajectory is now organised per track and is clearly structured according to strict deadlines. The current panel approves of these measures and thinks they will contribute to a higher percentage of students graduating within the expected time frame. The panel recommends that the programme also invests in the internship procedure with regard to the support of students in finding suitable placements. Though each track has its own internship coordinator, some tracks (Art History and Curatorial Studies, for example) give more guidance to students than others. Particularly international students encounter obstacles when looking for the right placements. This has often to do with the language barriers and knowledge of the local cultural sector; organisations frequently require that the students are proficient in Dutch and familiar with Dutch cultural policy frameworks. Given the high study load, the weight of the internship and the necessity of students to fully master the knowledge and skills particular to the art domains or professional profiles, the panel thinks the programme is worth being extended to 1,5 years.

During the site visit, the panel learned from students that they are content with the information, 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. Students feel that the programme does a good job in informing them about the nature of the different tracks when they apply for the programme. Also, the panel concludes that the programme is well aware of the importance of English proficiency; incoming students must meet the expected standard of English and staff members invest a lot of time in the supervision of writing and presenting in English while also addressing differences in standards for academic work.

Teaching methods

The panel is positive about the varied, interactive and small-scale teaching methods in the programme. In line with the programme's educational approach, courses during the first semester are highly interactive and principally take place in seminar format. Through discussions and assignments in varied formats – such as in-class writing assignments, oral presentations, Perusall annotations, peer-reviewing or essay writing – students are stimulated to engage critically with the scholarly aspects of the subject matter and are encouraged to apply acquired skills to their professional aspirations. The research expertise of the staff members is reflected in the design and content of the courses, thus creating an educational environment that is continuously informed by scholarly research. All tracks have a focus on research: during course work students acquire the skills to independently conduct research in the art discipline and/or methodological approach of their track. The panel was pleased to learn that teaching in the programme is enhanced by the diversity of the students and a vibrant international classroom.

Teaching staff

The panel observes that the programme is taught by a professionally diverse, dedicated and highly qualified team of lecturers, the composition of which reflects its international orientation as well as the various art disciplines and professional profiles of the different tracks. Staff members have different cultural and geographical backgrounds, represent a wide range of scholarly and methodological traditions, are themselves active in a wide range of professional roles and have good professional (inter)national networks which they employ to the benefit of the curriculum. All permanent staff members have many years of teaching experience and meet the UTQ requirements. The programme pays special attention to English proficiency of the non-native speakers in its team, offering tailor made courses for those who wish to improve their English language skills.

The panel appreciates the strong coherence of the teams within each track and the dedication and commitment demonstrated by staff members in ongoing improvement of the curriculum. It values the open and critical manner in which the team collectively reflects on the ambitions, structure and position of the programme as a whole. This is confirmed by the experience of the students and alumni the panel spoke to, who praise the knowledge, didactical skills, commitment and accessibility of staff members. The panel would like to encourage the staff members to further invest in multi- and interdisciplinary collaborations between the tracks, now that the new programme is in place. The programme confirmed that this will indeed be the next step in the further development and fine-tuning of the curriculum.

Staff members indicated that the work load is high, given the many administrative duties and growing numbers of international students; pressures that are having a negative effect on 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 panel thinks that the programme will benefit from a sustained attention for the high work load and extra support when it comes to administrative tasks and teaching hours.

Considerations

The panel concludes that the curriculum and the teaching-learning environment of the master's programme are student-centred, well-designed and implemented in such a way that students are able to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The panel is positive about varied the design of the programme which offers relevant tracks in art disciplines and specialised professional orientations. It appreciates the strong professional orientation of the curriculum and the way students deepen and strengthen their academic and professional skills, learning to combine theoretical and methodological reflections with practical applications. They are given the opportunity to further develop these skills in challenging internships in the art and culture domains. According to the panel, the programme is sufficiently feasible for most students, though it also observes that the study load is high and that many students need (or choose to invest) more time in order to successfully complete the curriculum. The panel is pleased to hear that the programme has taken several measures to increase the feasibility of the curriculum and recommends that it finds ways to improve its support of students during their search for suitable placements, especially for international students. Given the high work load and the importance of the internships, the panel thinks the programme is worth being extended to 1,5 years. The panel is positive about the quality of the teaching and support staff. It praises their expertise, international orientation and networks, their commitment to students and the efforts put into the ongoing improvement of the programme. Now that the programme is up and running, the panel encourages it to investigate how the curriculum might profit from innovative cross-overs and multi- and interdisciplinary collaborations between different tracks.

Conclusion

Master's programme Arts and Culture: the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 3: Student assessment

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

Findings

Assessment policy and recent developments

The assessments and assessment system of the master's programme are aligned with the 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 the 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 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 continue ensuring 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, and that the programme uses the four-eyes principle in the design of its assessments and the assessment matrices and rubrics, as well as in the assessment of the internship and the master's thesis. The programme matches its assessments carefully with the goals of its courses, employing assessment methods such as oral presentations, written papers, small-scale research projects, field reviews and essays. More practice-based learning formats are tested through a wide range of practice-oriented formats, such as field notes and reviews, debates, poster presentations, research project designs, theory position papers, peer reviews or cumulative portfolios.

Internships are tutored by a staff member with expertise in the internship organisation. For the assessment of the internship, the programme uses standard faculty assessment methods and forms, which include the formulation of learning outcomes in an internship plan, an assessment provided by the host organisation, an internship report detailing the activities carried out during the internship and a reflection on the learning outcomes.

The panel observes that 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. Furthermore, the curriculum has devised a matrix which shows to what extent and at what level courses test the intended learning outcomes. 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.

Thesis assessment

The assessment of the thesis is executed according to the procedures described in the master's thesis syllabus and assessment form. The thesis is assessed on the basis of a thesis proposal ('pass/fail' assessment) and the final version of the thesis (grade). For the assessment of the proposal the programme uses a standard form which allows examiners to provide a narrative evaluation on the core criteria for a thesis. Together, the two examiners (supervisor and second assessor) decide whether the thesis proposal meets the required standard as starting point for the research trajectory. Both also assess the final thesis, using a form that allows them to provide a narrative evaluation of the thesis based on the criteria stipulated in the thesis course syllabi and assessment form.

For the site visit, the panel studied fifteen theses and their assessments. Overall, the panel was satisfied with the quality of the assessments, 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 one case the commentary was rather brief. The panel judged one thesis to be of insufficient quality. Though the commentary in the assessment form was very critical, the student nevertheless received a pass. The panel also deduced from the assessment form that the student had received relatively little guidance during the thesis trajectory. In order to avoid this happening again in the future, the panel advises the programme to differentiate more between process and product evaluation – and to explicate how this is weighed in the final grade – in the assessment procedure and forms. For example, the supervisor may take into account the intellectual and personal development of the student during the process of writing. Furthermore, the panel observed that the role of the second assessor is not always 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 supervisor. The panel supports the interdisciplinary orientation of the programme, but would recommend that the programme take measures in order to continue ensuring that there is always another independent assessor (in the sense of someone who is not involved in the process) involved in the assessment of the final result – if a project requires two expert supervisors, this would mean involving an additional assessor to establish the final grade. Furthermore, the panel encourages the programme to reflect on the role of the assessment form and to be consistent in the implementation of this choice, deciding on whether it is simply an evaluation of the student's written report or intended as an instrument in the learning process of the student. Finally, given the interdisciplinary and profession-oriented profile of the curriculum, the panel advises the programme to explicitly refer to these aspects in the assessment forms of the final products.

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 should offer the Expertise Teams 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 and track.

The Examination Board meets once a month with the Faculty Board, Expertise Teams and the Cluster Board. The Board writes an annual report for the Faculty Board on its activities, which includes a report from each of the Expertise Teams. 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 has appreciation for 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 is positive about 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 the design of the assessments of the master's programme, which are aligned with the goals of the courses and incorporate a wide variety of appropriate research- and practice-oriented assessment methods. The programme adheres to the four-eyes principle in the design of its assessments as well as in the assessment of the internships and end product, the thesis. The panel approved the assessments of the theses it studied, which overall correctly addressed the weaknesses and strengths of the thesis in question. One thesis, which the panel judged to be insufficient, resulted in a pass. 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. Furthermore, the panel urges the programme to make the weighing of the research and writing process versus the end product in the final grade more transparent and clear, and to introduce its interdisciplinary and profession-oriented profile explicitly into the assessment criteria of the thesis. In relation to this, the panel recommends to ensure that the quality of the end product always meets the expected master's level, and that the role of the second assessor is clear cut and that there is always an independent assessor (a person who is not involved in the process) involved in the thesis assessment.

Conclusion

Master's programme Arts and Culture: the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

Thesis quality

The master's thesis is the final project of the master's programme. The panel has read 15 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 and original, examples of research, 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 originality and relevance of the research questions, the thorough application of research methodologies, systematic analyses and the critical-productive use of secondary literature. The panel also praised the structure and excellent writing of various theses and it was pleased to observe that it could identify the professional orientation and the focus on interdisciplinarity in many of the theses it had studied.

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 terminology and literature, the connection between analysis and theory, the distinction between interpretation and factual analysis, sound academic argumentation and a balanced point of view of the author. Nevertheless, though these theses were of lesser quality, the theses in question had various redeeming qualities – original subject, good research questions, well written, good structure or a good choice of literature, for example – thus ensuring that they rightly received a pass for the final assignment.

As mentioned in chapter 3, one of the theses read in preparation of the visitation did not meet the standard of an academic master's thesis. The panel considered various aspects of the thesis to be very weak or insufficient, such as the overall structure and use of English, the formulation of the research question, the connection between theory, methodology and the presentation of primary

sources and the formulation of the final conclusion. The panel also deduced from the assessment form that in this case there had been relatively little supervision and guidance during the master's thesis trajectory. However, given the on average good quality of the other theses studied, and its conversations with representatives of the programme, the panel is satisfied that this one thesis is an exception and that the programme has a solid supervision and assessment structure in place to ensure that current and future students indeed achieve the intended end level as defined by the learning outcomes.

Alumni success

On the basis of the documentation studied and its conversations with students, alumni and representatives of the working field (Advisory Board), the panel concludes that graduates of the programme are successful in finding fitting positions in the domains of art and culture. They have established themselves as cultural entrepreneurs, policy-makers, curators, artists or art managers. Some students have continued their studies in the two-year research masters *Arts, Media and Literary Studies* or *Cultural Leadership*. Graduates of the Landscape track are the most successful in finding work in their academic and professional field: the job rate is almost 100% after graduation.

The programme indicated that though the various tracks use several instruments to receive feedback, create an alumni community and keep sight of its graduates, it remains difficult to stay in touch with (inter)national graduates. The panel would like to encourage the programme to find ways to improve the monitoring of its alumni, particularly since the student body is becoming increasingly international. This would help to remain aligned with the requirements of the professional field 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, with the exception of one thesis. The panel is convinced that the current supervisory and assessment structure will ensure this remains an exception. In the opinion of the panel, the overall level of graduates of the programme is high and they have the necessary skills and knowledge to either enter the professional field or to continue with an academic career. That this is indeed the case can be derived from the fact that the majority of students finds work in the domains of art and culture. The panel encourages the programme to find ways to keep sight of the careers of its graduates, both in the Netherlands and abroad.

Conclusion

Master's programme Arts and Culture: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'meets the standard'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The panel assessed standards 1, 2 3, and 4 of the 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 *master's programme Arts and Culture* as 'positive'.



APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

Dublin descriptors Master's level	Learning outcomes
<p>A. Knowledge and understanding⁴¹</p> <p>Students have demonstrated knowledge and understanding that is founded upon and extends and/or enhances that typically associated with Bachelor's level, and that provides a basis or opportunity for originality in developing and/or applying ideas, often within a research context.</p>	<p>Graduates have demonstrable:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. understanding of the content and structure of the academic field covered by the degree programme, broad-based knowledge and understanding of the most important theoretical, methodological and/or historical approaches to art and the art world, the built environment and landscape, and the ability to critically reflect on these 2. general knowledge of the historical development of art, the built environment and landscape, as well as their reception – and more detailed knowledge of these developments within the field of their specialization – in relation to developments in the media and Western economic, political and sociocultural history. 3. knowledge of the history of thought on art, the built environment and landscape, and their functions. 4. knowledge and understanding of the development of the art world or its structure, both internal and in relation to other domains in society (e.g. politics, economics and education), knowledge and understanding of how the arts function in Western society today 5. [Specializations/tracks: MTPS/FCAM/AH/Arch/Land] knowledge and understanding of the development, nature (analysis and theory) and social functioning of at least one of the following disciplines: film, theatre, music, literature, visual arts, architecture, landscape history 6. [Specializations/tracks: [AH/ACC] knowledge and understanding of current developments in the world of the arts and their carriers (media), in particular at the interfaces of different art forms 7. [Specializations/tracks: AH/APCE] knowledge and understanding of the influence that the organization (policy, management of institutions, entrepreneurship and marketing) of the art world has on how the arts function in society 8. [Specialization: ACC] knowledge and understanding of art as a form of cognition and the influence that art criticism and/or the organization of culture education (primary, secondary or adult education) have on how the arts function in society.
<p>B. Applying knowledge and understanding</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ability, based on their acquired knowledge, to describe and analyse an object or practical case study



Students can apply their knowledge and understanding, and problem solving abilities in new or unfamiliar environments within broader (or multidisciplinary) contexts related to their field of study.	2. ability, based on literature and source research, to formulate a problem definition, develop a suitable method for historical, theoretical and/or empirical research and conduct this research in such a way that it results in an answer to the problem definition.
<p>C. Making judgements</p> <p>Students have the ability to integrate knowledge and handle complexity, and formulate judgements with incomplete or limited information, but that include reflecting on social and ethical responsibilities linked to the application of their knowledge and judgements.</p>	<p>1. overview and understanding of the results, concepts and methods of the academic field such that they are able to recognize academic problems and determine their academic and social relevance</p> <p>2. ability, based on C1, to form a well-founded judgement on this, if necessary developing several different options for action and making a substantiated choice between them.</p> <p>3. ability, based on C1 and C2, to explore a new insight or pathway of further research or come up with a solution for the problem studied.</p>
<p>D. Communication</p> <p>Students can communicate their conclusions, and the knowledge and rationale underpinning these, to specialist and non-specialist audiences clearly and unambiguously.</p>	<p>1. ability to present the results of careful research in a clear, straightforward and well-argued manner, in correct Dutch and/or English, both orally and in writing as well as audiovisually, to an audience of both specialists and non-specialists</p> <p>2. ability to introduce their own insights into the debate with peers and to comment on the work of others orally and in writing in an atmosphere of mutual respect.</p> <p>3. 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>
<p>E. Learning skills</p> <p>Graduates have developed those learning skills that are necessary for them to continue to undertake further study with a high degree of autonomy.</p>	<p>1. ability to follow the academic literature and debate in their field in efficient and effective ways and to contribute to its development.</p> <p>2. proficiency in English and other relevant languages to a sufficient extent to properly be able to continue to follow the academic literature and the debate in their field.</p>

*1 The abbreviations under learning outcomes A5 to A8 refer to the following tracks:

AH:	Art History
ACC:	Arts, Cognition and Criticism
APCE:	Arts Policy and Cultural Entrepreneurship
FCAM:	Film and Contemporary Audiovisual Media
Arch:	History of Architecture & Town Planning
Land:	Landschapsgeschiedenis (Landscape History)
MTPS:	Music, Theatre and Performance Studies

APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Track Art History

The first semester consists of one required course, Art History Now, and two course that complement the student's specialization.

In the second semester, the Early Modern and Modern and Contemporary Art students write a thesis of 15 EC and complete an internship of 10 EC. The Curatorial students write a thesis of 20 EC and follow a tutorial of 5 EC. These students conclude their studies in the third semester with an internship of 30 EC. All students go on an excursion abroad in the second semester.

Courses	Periods					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
> Art History Now: Theory, Method, Historiography (10 EC)	■					
> Collections & Artefacts: Boijmans (10 EC, optional)	■					
> Media, Materials, Makers: Arts and/as Research (10 EC, optional)	■					
> Museums: The Making-Of (10 EC, optional)	■					
> Topics in Italian Renaissance Art (10 EC, optional)	■					
> Excursion (5 EC)			■			
Master Thesis: Curatorial & Museum studies (20 EC, optional)			■			
> Master Thesis: Early Modern European Art / Modern & Contemporary Art (15 EC, optional)			■			
Research Internship (10 EC, optional)			■			
Tutorial: Curatorial & Museum studies (5 EC, optional)			■			
Museum Internship: Curatorial & Museum studies (30 EC, optional)					■	



Track Arts, Cognition and Criticism

This is a one-year MA track (60 EC). In semester 1 students follow:

- 4 compulsory 5 EC modules (20 EC total);
- 10 EC from the other tracks within the Arts and Culture MA program (Music, Theatre and Performance Studies; Film and Contemporary Audiovisual Media; Arts, Policy and Cultural Entrepreneurship).

In semester 2 students write their MA thesis (20 EC) and finish with an internship/traineeship (10 EC). The latter can be replaced by another course or a tutorial.

Courses	Periods			
	1	2	3	4
Arts and the Public Sphere (5 EC)	■			
Classical Music in the Digital Age I (5 EC, optional)	■			
Contemporary Film and Media Curating (5 EC, optional)	■			
Dramaturgy (5 EC, optional)	■			
Music Technologies and Ideologies (5 EC, optional)	■			
The Film Experience (5 EC, optional)	■			
Theorising Performance (5 EC, optional)	■			
Media, Materials, Makers (10 EC)	■			
Adaption Theory and Practice (5 EC, optional)		■		
Arts and Brain in Culture (5 EC)		■		
Capita Selecta (5 EC)		■		
Classical Music in the Digital Age II (5 EC, optional)		■		
Contemporary Complex Cinema (5 EC, optional)		■		
First-Person Documentary and the Real (5 EC, optional)		■		
Music, Politics and Resistance (5 EC, optional)		■		
Music in the City (5 EC, optional)		■		
Narrative Arts as Value Laboratory (5 EC)		■		
Ma Internship (10 EC)			■	
Master's Thesis (20 EC)			■	

Track Arts, Policy and Cultural Entrepreneurship

Courses	Periods			
	1	2	3	4
Arts and the Public Sphere (5 EC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Classical Music in the Digital Age I (5 EC, optional)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Contemporary Film and Media Curating (5 EC, optional)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Dramaturgy (5 EC, optional)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Media, Materials, Makers (5 EC, optional)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Music Technologies and Ideologies (5 EC, optional)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Public Arts Policy in Global Context (5 EC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
The Film Experience (5 EC, optional)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Theorising Performance (5 EC, optional)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Adaption Theory and Practice (5 EC, optional)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Arts Sociology (5 EC)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Capita Selecta (5 EC, optional)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Classical Music in the Digital Age II (5 EC, optional)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Contemporary Complex Cinema (5 EC, optional)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
First-Person Documentary and the Real (5 EC, optional)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Music, Politics and Resistance (5 EC, optional)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Music in the City (5 EC, optional)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
The Global/Local Cultural Leader (5 EC)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Ma Internship (10 EC)			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Master's Thesis (20 EC)			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	



Track Film and Contemporary Audiovisual Media

In the first semester the students follow courses of 30 EC. Here 20 EC come from the Film and Audiovisual Media track. The remaining 10 EC can be chosen from the other tracks within the Arts and Culture MA programme (Arts, Cognition and Criticism; Music, Theatre and Performance Studies; Arts, Policy and Cultural Entrepreneurship). In the second semester students write their MA thesis (20 EC) and do an internship/traineeship (10 EC). The internship can also be replaced by a course or a tutorial.

Optional courses from the other tracks:

Semester 1a: Media, Materials, Makers, Arts and the Public Sphere, Classical Music in the Digital Age I, Dramaturgy, Music Technologies and Ideologies, Theorising Performance.

Semester 1b: Adaption Theory and Practice, Arts and Brain in Culture, Capita Selecta, Classical Music in the Digital Age II, Music in the City, Music, Politics and Resistance, Narrative Arts as Value Laboratory.

Courses	Course Catalog >	Periods			
		1	2	3	4
Contemporary Film and Media Curating (5 EC)		■			
The Film Experience (5 EC)		■			
Optional course 1 (5 EC, optional)		■			
Optional course 2 (5 EC, optional)		■			
Contemporary Complex Cinema (5 EC)			■		
Documentary Now! (5 EC)			■		
Ma Internship (10 EC)				■	
Master's Thesis (20 EC)				■	

Track History of Architecture and Town Planning

The Master's track has two distinct components. The first semester is organized around a number of courses that foster the intense cooperation between students (historians, architects, environmental scientists, etc.) and staff. The second semester urges the students to develop their personal skills, culminating in individual research projects. Here the personal preferences, skills and ambitions of the students are embedded in a custom made programme that includes interaction with a range of different institutions (architectural firms, urban planning boards, healthcare institutions, etc.).

Courses	Course Catalog >	Periods			
		1	2	3	4
Architectural History: Origins of the Healthy City (10 EC)		■			
Architect. History: Research & Excursion (10 EC)		■			
Architectural History: Global Tendencies vs. Local Identities (5 EC)		■			
Architectural History.: Typological Repertory (5 EC)			■		
Architectural History: Internship / individual (research) project (10 EC)				■	
Master Thesis Architectural History (20 EC)				■	

Track Landscape History (Landschapsgeschiedenis)

Vakken	Periodes			
	1	2	3	4
LG: Paleografie & Archiefonderzoek (5 EC)	■			
LG: Landschappen van Nederland (10 EC)	■■■■			
LG: Actuele Vraagstukken (5 EC)		■		
LG: GIS voor Landschapshistorisch onderzoek (5 EC)		■		
Masterscriptie Landschapsgeschiedenis (voorbereiding) (5 EC)		■		
LG: Landschappen van Europa (5 EC)			■	
LG: Historische Buitenplaatsen (10 EC, facultatief)			■■■■	
LG: Specialisatieproject (10 EC, facultatief)			■■■■	
Masterscriptie Landschapsgeschiedenis (15 EC)			■■■■	
Masterstage Landschapsgeschiedenis (10 EC, facultatief)			■■■■	
Programma-opties				
> Masterstage (specialisatie)				
> Master Honours College (honoursprogramma)				

Track Music, Theatre and Performance Studies

In this track students follow 30 EC in courses in the first semester (5 EC modules) related to their chosen specialisations. During the second semester they write a Master's Thesis (20 EC) under the supervision of two Arts in Society professors. They also choose between a research-related tutorial or an arts internship (10 EC).

Courses	Periods			
	1	2	3	4
Arts and the Public Sphere (5 EC, optional)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Classical Music in the Digital Age I (5 EC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Contemporary Film and Media Curating (5 EC, optional)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Dramaturgy (5 EC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Media, Materials, Makers (5 EC, optional)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Music Technologies and Ideologies (5 EC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Public Arts Policy in Global Context (5 EC, optional)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
The Film Experience (5 EC, optional)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Theorising Performance (5 EC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Adaption Theory and Practice (5 EC)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Arts and Brain in Culture (5 EC, optional)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Arts Sociology (5 EC, optional)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Capita Selecta (5 EC, optional)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Classical Music in the Digital Age II (5 EC)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Contemporary Complex Cinema (5 EC, optional)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
First-Person Documentary and the Real (5 EC, optional)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Music, Politics and Resistance (5 EC)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Music in the City (5 EC)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Narrative Arts as Value Laboratory (5 EC, optional)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
The Global/Local Cultural Leader (5 EC, optional)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Ma Internship (10 EC)			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Master's Thesis (20 EC)			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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 master's programme master's programme Arts and Culture. Information on the selected theses is available from QANU upon request.

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

- Self-evaluation report of the Master Art and Culture, 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 Master Art and Culture
- Overview advisory boards Faculty of Arts
- Overview staff members (expertise, qualifications and FTE)
- Matrix relating course units to intended learning outcomes
- Matrix of achieved level intended outcomes per course
- Annual report Advisory Board (2018)
- Assessment Policy University of Groningen
- Teaching and Examination Regulations Faculty of Arts
- Assessment Plan Master Art and Culture
- TER/OER Master Art and Culture
- Annual reports Examination Board 2016-2018
- Annual reports Programme Committee 2016-2018
- Quantitative data teaching-learning environment Master Art and Culture 2013-2018
- Course materials of the following courses (including exams and thesis manuals):
 - LG: Landschappen van Nederland
 - Art History Now
 - A&U: Typological Vademecum (semester 2a)
 - Ma-scriptie Landschapsgeschiedenis
 - Ma-scriptie Architectuur en Stedenbouw
 - Master's Thesis Art History
 - Arts and the Public Sphere
 - The Film Experience
 - Music in the City
 - Adaptation Theory and Practice
 - Ma-scriptie Kunsten, Cultuur en Media