DUAL MASTER'S PROGRAMME

HERITAGE STUDIES (120 EC)

CURATING ART AND CULTURES

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

CONTENTS

This report was finalized on 10 December 2019.

REPORT ON THE DUAL MASTER'S PROGRAMME HERITAGE STUDIES (120 EC) OF THE UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

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

Dual master's programme Heritage Studies

Name of the programme:	Heritage Studies: Curating Art and Cultures (Erfgoedstudies)
CROHO number:	60836
Level of the programme:	master's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	120 EC
Specializations or tracks:	-
Location:	Amsterdam
Modes of study:	dual
Language of instruction:	English
Submission deadline NVAO:	01/05/2020

The visit of the assessment panel Arts and Culture to the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Amsterdam took place on 15, 16 and 17 May 2019.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

Name of the institution:	University of Amsterdam
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 Dual master's programme Heritage Studies (120 EC) consisted of:
- Prof. dr. J. (Jan) Baetens, professor in Literary Theory and Cultural Studies at the KU Leuven (Belgium) [chair];
- Prof. dr. P.B.M. (Paul) van den Akker, professor in Art History at Open Universiteit;
- Prof. dr. K. (Karel) Vanhaesebrouck, professor in Theatre Studies at the Université Libre de Bruxelles (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. H.J.G. (Henri) Beunders, professor in Developments in Public Opinion at Erasmus University Rotterdam;
- Prof. dr. M. (Mark) Delaere, professor in Musicology at KU Leuven (Belgium);
- M. (Mirjam) Deckers BA, research master's student Arts & Culture at the University of Groningen [student member];
- Prof. dr. A. (Ann) Rigney, professor in Comparative Literature at Utrecht University [referee].

The panel was supported by dr. F. (Fiona) Schouten and P. (Petra) van den Hoorn-Flens MSc, who acted as secretaries.

WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The site visit to the dual master's programme Heritage Studies (120 EC) at the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Amsterdam was part of the cluster assessment Arts and Culture. Between February and December 2019, the panel assessed 34 programmes at 10 universities. The following universities participated in this cluster assessment: Erasmus University Rotterdam, Leiden University, Open University, University of Groningen, Maastricht University, University of Amsterdam, Tilburg University, Radboud University Nijmegen, Utrecht University, and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.

On behalf of the participating universities, quality assurance agency QANU was responsible for logistical support, panel guidance and the production of the reports. Dr. Fiona Schouten was project manager for QANU. Fiona Schouten and Petra van den Hoorn MA 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-Jose) 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) Legene
- Prof. dr. P. (Philippe) Meers
- Drs. Y.H.M. (Yoeri) Meessen
- Prof. dr. J. (Joost) Raessens
- Dr. M. (Margriet) Schavemaker
- Drs. E.A.M. (Liesbeth) Schöningh
- Prof. dr. C.B. (Cas) Smithuijsen
- Dr. M.T.A. (Marie-Therese) van Thoor
- 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]
- Prof. dr. A. (Ann) Rigney [referent]
- Em. prof. dr. C. (Carel) Jansen [referent]

- Prof. dr. E.J. (Liesbeth) Korthals Altes [referent]
- Dr. J.W. (Jan Willem) Honig [referent]
- Prof. dr. D. (Dominiek) Sandra [referent]
- Dr. K.E. (Kim) Knibbe [referent]

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

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

Before the site visit to the University of Amsterdam, 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 existed of 8 theses and their assessment forms for each programme, based on a provided list of graduates between July 2017 and December 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.

The requirements of the NVAO concerning the selection of under 15 theses per programme were met. The programme shares the Board of Examiners of the Graduate School of Humanities with the other master's programmes in the School. The programme overlaps entirely with the 120 EC dual master's programme Heritage Studies offered by Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, which was assessed by the same panel in the Arts and Culture site visit on 10-12 December 2019 (15 theses selected there). For UvA, 8 out of 10 theses written over the past 2 academic years were selected.

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 Amsterdam took place on 15, 16 and 17 May 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.

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.

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 Humanities 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

Dual master's programme Heritage Studies (120 EC)

Intended learning outcomes
Curating Art and Cultures is designed to train the curators of the future. It aims to develop students both academically and professionally, combining interdisciplinary knowledge with practical skills and insights into the responsibilities of the curator. The programme has a one-year professional component, the internship, and explicitly opts for the high art segment of the curatorial world by collaborating with larger institutions. The panel considers the CAC's profile to be unique in the Netherlands and applauds the programme's clear connection with and view of the needs of the professional field. It advises the Faculty to heed the CAC programme management and not to admit more students than can be expected to find employment. It also recommends formalising the programme's strong professional connection by involving alumni and professionals in an advisory board. It concludes that the programme-specific intended learning outcomes match the programme's academic as well as professional orientation, reflect the Dublin descriptors for master's programmes and convey CAC's unique profile. It is pleased with the recent revision of the programme-specific ILOs, which has resulted in more concise and coherent learning outcomes.

Teaching-learning environment
The panel praises the design and setup of CAC. It is impressed with the way academic and professional approaches are juxtaposed in the programme, allowing cross-fertilisation between the two perspectives. It is pleased that while half of the programme is made up of individual internships, the programme has measures in place to ensure that students have comparable experiences and realise the intended learning outcomes. It finds that the content and materials of the courses are topical, relevant and of a clearly academic level. It praises the programme for increasing the theoretical components in the core modules as well as the amount of attention paid to academic skills, while retaining the professional orientation of the courses. It applauds the variety in teaching methods.

The panel concludes that the programme is feasible. This is ensured by a careful selection process, extensive internship and thesis guidance, clear protocols and information concerning the thesis and internship, and a sense of community, not only among the students and staff, but also among the professionals involved in CAC and the programme's alumni. Students can experience issues when lessons or activities are scheduled in such a way that they lack preparation time, but the panel finds that feasibility is not threatened as long as the programme management ensures this remains the exception rather than the rule. The return to the thesis after the internship can cause delays, but the programme is planning adequate measures to address this issue. The panel is pleased that students are offered the opportunity to shape their own learning trajectory: they can choose from a sufficient number of electives, and the programme takes into account their interests and preferences when matching them with an internship institution.

CAC changed from Dutch to English in 2017-2018 in order to create a better synergy with the more internationalised context in which Dutch museums operate today and to open up to a more diverse student body. This switch created some issues: it is more difficult to find internships for international students, and they can run into communication issues on the job, in spite of being asked to gain a passive command of Dutch. The panel agrees with the motivation for the switch, since the programme focuses on the more diverse and international institutions. It finds CAC staff members to be well-equipped to offer their courses in English. It feels that since the programme has chosen English as its main language, it should address the international market and the international perspective more explicitly in the curriculum. The programme could also formulate a more specific profile of the international students it would welcome and the command of Dutch that is expected of them.

The panel is satisfied with the quality of the staff members and praises their dedication and accessibility. Staff quantity is an issue in the programmes. The teaching staff experiences a high workload, which is worsened by the '884' academic calendar according to the panel. In CAC, the two coordinators play a pivotal part in the success of the programme, which makes it vulnerable. The panel advises investigating whether more personnel could be used to support the internship process. It recommends allowing the programme some space and autonomy in addressing the issue of workload. It also recommends including the programme committee in this process. Finally, the panel stresses the importance of controlling the number of students allowed to enter the programme, in order to avoid a further increase of work pressure due to an increase in student numbers.

Student assessment
The panel considers assessment within CAC to be very varied and fitting. The assessment matrix show clearly that all learning outcomes are achieved. The panel advises the programme to investigate whether digital assessment would be a useful addition to current assessment practices. It also recommends investigating whether assessment could be adapted in such a way that the workload is reduced while the effectiveness of assessment is retained. It is pleased with the assessment of the internship and the thesis, which are well designed and include input from the work field. The internship trajectory has a number of clearly marked formative assessment moments, and the assessment always follows the five focus areas stated in the internship guide. The panel is positive about the standard thesis assessment form used by the programmes, which offers ample space for comments. It recommends also using this form for mid-term feedback during the writing of the thesis, so that students receive optimal feedback in the process.

The panel is impressed with the way the Board of Examiners safeguards the quality of assessment of the master's programme. It found that the BoE works very hard to manage this, not only taking samples of course assessments and theses, but also discussing assessment practices with staff members of the programmes. It advises the Faculty to increase the BoE's capacity. The BoE could use this capacity to proactively inform the programme about possibilities to streamline assessment and reduce the corresponding workload. In that way, the BoE could be of even more value to the programme.

Achieved learning outcomes
The panel read a selection of CAC master's theses and considers them to be of an adequate to good academic level. It also gained a positive impression from the detailed and very self-reflective internship dossiers it saw. It confirmed that alumni tend to find suitable jobs as assistant or junior curators. The programme fully matches the professional requirements and expectations and provides its students with a very good preparation for the work field.

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

Dual master's programme Heritage Studies (120 EC)

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 of the panel, prof. dr. Jan Baetens, and the project manager, dr. Fiona Schouten, 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: 10 December 2019

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

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes
The intended learning outcomes tie in with the level and orientation of the programme; they are geared to the expectations of the professional field, the discipline, and international requirements.

Findings
The 120 EC dual master's programme Heritage Studies, henceforth referred to as Curating Art and Cultures (CAC), is offered jointly by the University of Amsterdam and the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. Each university offers the programme independently, but in practice UvA and VU students follow the same courses from the same lecturers and have to pass the same assessments.

Curating Art and Cultures is designed to train the curators of the future. It aims to develop students both academically and professionally, combining interdisciplinary knowledge with practical skills and insights into the responsibilities of the curator – whether in museums or in other cultural institutions. The programme combines academic training and a one-year curatorial internship, during which students become acquainted with the acquisition and management of, research into, and presentation of objects. For this professional component, the programme works together with 15 leading Dutch museums and exhibition institutions, such as the Rijksmuseum and the CoBrA Museum.

The panel considers the programme to be unique in the Netherlands. CAC distinguishes itself from similar programmes through its one-year professional component, and explicitly opts for the high art segment of the curatorial world in collaborating with larger institutions. The panel noticed to its satisfaction that thanks to these partnerships, the programme management has a clear view of the developments and challenges that the professional field is faced with. In line with Faculty policy, the programme has recently started admitting more students. It has now decided against further growth, since the working field cannot absorb more graduates. The panel advises the Faculty to heed the CAC programme management in such matters and not to admit more students than can be expected to find employment. The panel also advises formalising the programme's strong professional connection by involving alumni and professionals (who are currently involved in the programme's selection procedure) in an advisory board, similar to that of the Art History bachelor's programme. In this way, the professional field is a formally represented stakeholder in the programme and can proactively advise on future developments.

The programme shares eight intended learning outcomes (ILOs) with the other master's programmes in the Faculty. According to the panel, these general outcomes provide an accurate description of what can be expected of a humanities master's graduate. The learning outcomes reflect the Dublin descriptors for master's programmes and are of a clear academic level. The programme also shares two ILOs with the other dual programmes, which describe its professional aims. Finally, CAC has programme-specific ILOs, which also follow the Dublin descriptors (see Appendix 1). These specific ILOs have recently been revised and modified in cooperation with the VU. Their number has been reduced, and they have been made more explicit and concrete. The panel is pleased with this revision: the new ILOs are more concise and coherent. It considers both the old and the new ILOs to clearly convey the programme's unique profile and to reflect its academic and professional orientation.

Considerations
Curating Art and Cultures is designed to train the curators of the future. It aims to develop students both academically and professionally, combining interdisciplinary knowledge with practical skills and insights into the responsibilities of the curator. The programme has a one-year professional component, the internship, and explicitly opts for the high art segment of the curatorial world by collaborating with larger institutions. The panel considers the CAC's profile to be unique in the

Netherlands and applauds the programme's clear connection with and view of the needs of the professional field. It advises the Faculty to heed the CAC programme management and not to admit more students than can be expected to find employment. It also recommends formalising the programme's strong professional connection by involving alumni and professionals in an advisory board. It concludes that the programme-specific intended learning outcomes match the programme's academic as well as professional orientation, reflect the Dublin descriptors for master's programmes and convey CAC's unique profile. It is pleased with the recent revision of the programme-specific ILOs, which has resulted in more concise and coherent learning outcomes.

Conclusion
Dual master's programme Heritage Studies (120 EC): 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 curriculum of CAC (see appendix 2) starts with the course modules Collecting, Curating and Display (CCD) I and II (6 EC each). In these courses, students are presented with a broad overview of the theoretical and historical aspects of collecting, curating and display. In the first semester, they also follow 18 EC in electives and/or tutorials. In the second semester, they embark on their 60 EC internship, which runs from 1 February to 31 January. In parallel, on Fridays during semesters 2 and 3, they follow Curatorial Practices in the Contemporary World (CPCW) I and II (6 EC each). CPCW I provides students with the means to reflect on their own practice during the internship through excursions to various types of institutions around the Netherlands, and through close reading of and debate around key texts. CPCW I also includes a five-day excursion to Berlin. CPCW II is a research seminar in which students work towards a symposium on scholarly issues related to curatorial practices. The seminar helps students prepare for their thesis research. In the final semester, students finish the internship and write their thesis (18 EC).

The panel studied the curriculum and considers it to be well-designed. It is impressed with the way academic and professional approaches are juxtaposed in the programme, for instance through the parallel programming of CPCW and the internship, allowing cross-fertilisation between the academic and the professional perspectives. It is pleased to note that while half of the programme is made up of individual internships, the programme ensures that students have comparable experiences. Central to achieving this is a 'five-point plan' of the educational objectives of the internship agreed upon by the programme and its partner institutions, which is used in the preparation, supervision and assessment of the internship. The panel is satisfied with the way the programme guarantees that the individual trajectories always lead to the programme's learning outcomes.

The panel finds that the content and materials of the courses are topical, relevant and of a clearly academic level. Following a recommendation of the previous panel, the programme increased the theoretical components in the core modules and the attention paid to academic skills. CPCW II was changed into a research seminar, actively teaching students research skills before they embark on their thesis. The panel praises the programme for these effective improvements, which strengthen CAC's academic strand. At the same time, it is glad to see that the courses have retained their professional orientation: representatives from the professional field are often involved in the courses, and excursions to institutions in the Netherlands and abroad are frequent.

Teaching methods
Teaching methods within CAC are designed in accordance with the teaching philosophy of the UvA, which includes research-based learning and student activation. They also follow the LWWL concept of 'learning while working, working while learning'. The teaching methods include presentations, excursions, visits, workshops, discussions, peer feedback and the internship. The panel applauds this variety. It was pleased to learn that in their excursions, students also visit less 'high art' institutions in the Netherlands and abroad, thus becoming acquainted with a broad spectrum of institutions and approaches.

Feasibility and student-centred learning
CAC offers a maximum of 17 places due to the limited number of internships available. Applicants must have a bachelor's degree in art history, cultural studies, history, media studies, archaeology, anthropology, or related/equivalent programmes. They are selected based on their grade point average (at least 7.0), their CV, a written paper and a motivation letter. International candidates are asked to demonstrate a willingness to learn Dutch. After a first selection round, the remaining 20-25 applicants are asked to submit an opinion piece about one of the participating institutions or a similar institution in their home country. Finally, there is an interview with the programme coordinators and representatives from partner museums.

The panel considers this careful selection process beneficial to the programme's feasibility. Thanks to its admission policy, CAC has highly motivated students with a demonstrably high academic level and the necessary writing and communication skills. The fact that there is only a limited number of students in the programme also improves its feasibility: the lines of communication among students themselves as well as between students and the teaching staff are very short. The panel noticed that there is a sense of community, not only among the students and staff, but also among professionals involved in the programme and the programme's alumni. CAC graduates are sometimes still involved in the programme, either as guest professors or because they have ended up working at one of the partner institutions.

It is clear to the panel that CAC's curriculum was designed to maximise its feasibility. The first semester, with the CCD courses, allows students to find their bearings and offers an overview of the relevant academic and professional fields, creating a level playing field among the students, whose previous education varies. The internship is set up in such a way that students return to the programme once every two weeks, allowing them to regularly step out of their professional role and reflect on it. Since the internship starts after the first semester, it is unavoidable that the electives have to be placed right at the start of the programme. Due to this timing, the choice students have is somewhat limited: the electives cannot exceed the space reserved for them. In practice, this means they can choose between UvA and VU electives. The panel is pleased that students are offered the freedom to follow electives in this rather full programme. It finds that thanks to the VU courses, they have an ample list to choose from.

The panel learned from its discussions with students and the programme management that the course meetings on Fridays during the internship period sometimes cause students to experience minor feasibility issues. The programme takes into account that the internship does not allow students much time to prepare for their classes. As a rule, these classes and excursions are organised every other Friday, allowing students to study and prepare for them on the Fridays when no activities are planned. However, it sometimes happens that students have lessons on consecutive Fridays. As a result, they do not always manage to prepare for their classes. The panel understood that this occurs only incidentally, for instance when an important guest speaker visits. It finds that feasibility is not threatened as long as the programme management ensures this remains the exception rather than the rule.

The programme management matches students with the available internship positions. Previously, students paid a visit to every partner institution and were matched with an institution based on their own interests and preferences. Occasionally, the programme sought new partnerships to

accommodate the students' profiles and interests. Now, the number of students and partner institutions has become too large for this approach. Instead, students visit a selection of partner institutions and write a brief motivation letter for each institution about why they would consider themselves a suitable match. Based on this input, the programme coordinators look for a match. Students and the teaching staff are pleased with this procedure, which they consider effective. The panel praises this effort the programme makes to match students with internship positions, taking their interests and preferences into consideration.

The information provided to students prior to and during the internship is clear and extensive. Students as well as the partner institution, which signs a formal agreement before the internship starts, are well aware of the aims of the internship. The programme has created not only a 'five-point plan' outlining the various types of expertise the students are to acquire during the internship, ranging from organisation and policy to research and art handling, but also a list of 10 competencies related to this plan. Students have an institutional supervisor and a university supervisor (one of the two programme coordinators). At the start of the internship, they prepare a work plan in cooperation with their supervisors. On the job supervision takes place through weekly meetings with the institutional supervisor. As a general guideline, the student and the institutional supervisor meet with the university supervisor every two to three months. It is up to the student to arrange these meetings in a timely fashion. Before each meeting, the student submits a list of her/his activities since the previous meeting, following the scheme of the 'five-point plan'. In this way, the student's performance and the fulfilment of the work plan can be monitored and adjusted if necessary. Students also give and receive peer feedback on their internship during some of the Friday classes of CPCW I. The panel is impressed with the organisation of the internship and the amount of guidance students receive.

Thesis writing and supervision take place according to a faculty-wide guideline and follow a trajectory with set deadlines and regular supervision meetings. The panel was told during the site visit that students sometimes struggle to return to their thesis after having been immersed in practice for so long, which can lead to study delay. Some students are offered jobs immediately after completing their internship and put off writing the thesis. The programme is working on ways to address this and will be starting a thesis workshop from November 2019. The aim is to actively help students start on their thesis during or just after finishing the internship. The programme is also reaching out to its institutional partners to raise awareness concerning this issue. The panel appreciates these measures and expects them to have positive effects on the programme's feasibility.

Language
CAC changed its title and language of instruction from Dutch to English in 2017-2018. This switch is intended to create a better synergy with the more internationalised context in which Dutch museums operate today. The programme also wants to open up to a more diverse student body and admit students coming from Dutch University Colleges. The programme has encountered certain issues as a result of the language switch. The language used in museum contexts is still predominantly Dutch, which leads to some difficulties in finding internships for international students. These students can also run into communication issues on the job, in spite of the programme's explicit desire that international students gain at least a passive knowledge of Dutch.

The panel understands and agrees with the programme's motivation for the language switch, especially since CAC focuses on the larger institutions, which have a more diverse and international staff than the smaller Dutch museums. It considers CAC's staff members, some of whom have an international background, to be well-equipped to offer their courses in English. They are also aware of the intercultural skills needed to function in an international environment. The panel feels that since the programme has chosen English as its main language, it should offer a better preparation for the international market and include the international perspective more explicitly in the curriculum. The programme could also formulate a more specific profile of the international students it would welcome and the command of Dutch that is expected of them.

Teaching staff

The teaching staff in the programmes is highly appreciated by the students. All core university staff members hold university teaching qualifications and have an excellent network in the professional field, which they put to use for their students. The panel is satisfied with the quality of the staff and praises their dedication and accessibility. The many guest lecturers are carefully selected and instructed by the programme management.

Like elsewhere in the Faculty, staff quantity is an issue in the programme. As student numbers have increased, so has the workload for these high-quality staff members. This workload is worsened by the academic '884' calendar, with semesters containing 2 blocks of 8 and 1 block of 4 weeks. As a result, there are no less than 40 consecutive weeks of teaching per year, which weighs heavily on teaching staff and allows little room for research, resits, and administrative duties. The Faculty management acknowledges this issue and has formulated a policy to adapt the allocation system, using a more realistic estimate of hours per task and freeing up time for research activities. The panel finds that a breaking point has been reached and warns that this situation will negatively affect the quality of education if measures are not taken in the very short term.

In the case of CAC, the two coordinators play a pivotal part in the success of the programme: they are important to its organisation and provide extensive guidance during the internship. The fact that so much responsibility lies with two key figures makes the programme vulnerable. The panel advises investigating whether more personnel could be used to support the internship process. It stresses the importance of controlling the number of students allowed to enter the programme, in order to avoid a further increase of work pressure due to an increase in student numbers. The panel recommends allowing the programme some space and autonomy in addressing the issue of work pressure. It also recommends including the programme committee in this process.

Considerations

The panel praises the design and setup of CAC. It is impressed with the way academic and professional approaches are juxtaposed in the programme, allowing cross-fertilisation between the two perspectives. It is pleased that while half of the programme is made up of individual internships, the programme has measures in place to ensure that students have comparable experiences and realise the intended learning outcomes. It finds that the content and materials of the courses are topical, relevant and of a clearly academic level. It praises the programme for increasing the theoretical components in the core modules as well as the amount of attention paid to academic skills, while retaining the professional orientation of the courses. It applauds the variety in teaching methods.

The panel concludes that the programme is feasible. This is ensured by a careful selection process, extensive internship and thesis guidance, clear protocols and information concerning the thesis and internship, and a sense of community, not only among the students and staff, but also among the professionals involved in CAC and the programme's alumni. Students can experience issues when lessons or activities are scheduled in such a way that they lack preparation time, but the panel finds that feasibility is not threatened as long as the programme management ensures this remains the exception rather than the rule. The return to the thesis after the internship can cause delays, but the programme is planning adequate measures to address this issue. The panel is pleased that students are offered the opportunity to shape their own learning trajectory: they can choose from a sufficient number of electives, and the programme takes into account their interests and preferences when matching them with an internship institution.

CAC changed from Dutch to English in 2017-2018 in order to create a better synergy with the more internationalised context in which Dutch museums operate today and to open up to a more diverse student body. This switch created some issues: it is more difficult to find internships for international students, and they can run into communication issues on the job, in spite of being asked to gain a passive command of Dutch. The panel agrees with the motivation for the switch, since the programme focuses on the more diverse and international institutions. It finds CAC staff members

to be well-equipped to offer their courses in English. It feels that since the programme has chosen English as its main language, it should address the international market and the international perspective more explicitly in the curriculum. The programme could also formulate a more specific profile of the international students it would welcome and the command of Dutch that is expected of them.

The panel is satisfied with the quality of the staff members and praises their dedication and accessibility. Staff quantity is an issue in the programme. The teaching staff experiences a high workload, which is worsened by the '884' academic calendar according to the panel. In CAC, the two coordinators play a pivotal part in the success of the programme, which makes it vulnerable. The panel advises investigating whether more personnel could be used to support the internship process. It recommends allowing the programme some space and autonomy in addressing the issue of workload. It also recommends including the programme committee in this process. Finally, the panel stresses the importance of controlling the number of students allowed to enter the programme, in order to avoid a further increase of work pressure due to an increase in student numbers.

Conclusion
Dual master's programme Heritage Studies (120 EC): 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 within CAC follows the assessment policy of the Faculty of Humanities, which is in line with the university-wide assessment policy. These documents describe standards and procedures for the organisation of assessment. According to the assessment policy, each course needs to have multiple assessments at different moments in time, in order to spread the workload and activate students from the start of the course. The panel studied the assessment matrix for the master's programme CAC and noticed that there are at least two tests per 6 EC course, and often more. Even though it appreciates the wish to spread assessment evenly throughout the courses, it finds that in practice, this leads to an overload of tests and assessment moments. The large number of assessments, together with the rubrics, matrices and assessment forms involved, adds to the teaching staff's workload. The result is a high workload to guarantee the quality of assessment. Pressure is added by the '884' system, which allows little margin for delays. The panel recommends investigating whether assessment in the programme could be adapted in such a way that the workload is reduced while the effectiveness of assessment is retained.

Assessment within the programme is very varied and fitting. The assessment matrix shows clearly that all learning outcomes are assessed. For the academic part of the programme, assessment formats range from papers and presentations to self-evaluations and reports. The CCD courses make use of frequent formative assessments, such as participation in class discussions and peer feedback on the draft versions of the final project. The CPCW courses focus on presenting and participating; in CPCW II, the various assessments mirror the different steps in giving a lecture at a scholarly conference. For the oral presentation in this course, supervising curators from the museums are invited to attend and give feedback. The course culminates in a written paper. The panel considers the assessment of the courses to be well done. It advises the programme to investigate whether digital assessment would be a useful addition to current assessment practices.

The assessment of the internship takes place in close cooperation with the partner institution. As mentioned under Standard 2, the supervision is carefully regulated. The student builds up a dossier containing documents prepared for or after supervision meetings, progress reports and self-reflections. Halfway through, there is a formal progress talk. The internship trajectory thus has a number of clearly marked formative assessment moments. After the internship is concluded, the two

supervisors and the student come together for the final assessment of the entire internship, based on the five focus areas stated in the internship guide and the ten competencies of the curator. The student prepares for this meeting by writing the final dossier, in which he/she discusses each of the aspects of the 'five-point plan'. During the meeting, the student's performance and the quality of the end products of the internship are discussed. Both supervisors document their findings using an assessment form. The dossier, the final discussions and the assessment forms are used to determine the final mark. The panel is positive about the thorough assessment of the internship. It studied a selection of internship dossiers during the site visit and agreed with their assessment.

The panel is also pleased with the assessment of the thesis. It is positive about the standard assessment form used by the programmes, which offers ample space for qualitative comments. It recommends also using this form for mid-term feedback during the writing of the thesis, so that students receive optimal feedback in the process. It looked at a selection of theses and the accompanying assessment forms. It considers the assessments adequate, insightful and clearly motivated. The assessment of the thesis is done by the thesis supervisor. Where applicable, a curator from the museum is also involved as a second thesis supervisor. This supervisor is not formally an examiner, but gives input from a work field perspective. A second reader from the university department is always assigned as well. The panel appreciates this approach and considers the inclusion of a professional supervisor a valuable addition.

Board of Examiners
The Board of Examiners (BoE) of the Graduate School of Humanities is responsible for the quality of assessment in all master's programmes in the faculty. The BoE has 5 members and consists of representatives from the various clusters of programmes. Each programme has a delegate who functions as an intermediary between the programme and the BoE. This delegate advises on programme-specific, regulated procedures, such as student requests and plagiarism matters. Larger themes are dealt with directly by the BoE, which proactively selects themes and issues to promote quality assurance in the programmes. It also promotes knowledge concerning assessment among the teaching staff and management of the programmes. Central to the BoE's activities is the regular check on assessment within courses and on the quality of theses.

The panel is impressed with the way the BoE safeguards the quality of assessment of the master's programmes. It found that the BoE works very hard to manage this, not only taking samples of course assessments and theses, but also discussing assessment practices with staff members of the programmes. It appreciates the fact that the BoE first opts for talking to its peers before considering taking more formal measures. The BoE's capacity is rather limited in view of the large number of programmes and students it is responsible for, and it is looking for ways to become more effective in executing its legal tasks given the limited time and budget it has at its disposal. The panel recommends that the Faculty increase the BoE's capacity. It advises the BoE not to use this extra capacity to take even more samples of course assessments and theses, but rather to invest it actively in keeping a close eye on assessment in all programmes and tracks, including CAC. The BoE could proactively inform the programmes about possibilities to streamline assessment and reduce the corresponding workload. In that way, the BoE could be of even more value to the programmes.

Considerations
The panel considers assessment within CAC to be very varied and fitting. The assessment matrix shows clearly that all learning outcomes are achieved. The panel advises the programme to investigate whether digital assessment would be a useful addition to current assessment practices. It also recommends investigating whether assessment could be adapted in such a way that the workload is reduced while the effectiveness of assessment is retained. It is pleased with the assessment of the internship and the thesis, which are well designed and include input from the work field. The internship trajectory has a number of clearly marked formative assessment moments, and the assessment always follows the five focus areas stated in the internship guide. The panel is positive about the standard thesis assessment form used by the programmes, which offers ample

space for comments. It recommends also using this form for mid-term feedback during the writing of the thesis, so that students receive optimal feedback in the process.

The panel is impressed with the way the Board of Examiners safeguards the quality of assessment of the master's programme. It found that the BoE works very hard to manage this, not only taking samples of course assessments and theses, but also discussing assessment practices with staff members of the programmes. It advises the Faculty to increase the BoE's capacity. The BoE could use this capacity to proactively inform the programme about possibilities to streamline assessment and reduce the corresponding workload. In that way, the BoE could be of even more value to the programme.

Conclusion
Dual master's programme Heritage Studies (120 EC): 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
The panel read a selection of CAC master's theses. It considers them to be of an adequate to good academic level. The themes dealt with are usually well-chosen, topical and very relevant from the perspective of the work field. The panel also gained a positive impression from the detailed and very self-reflective internship dossiers it saw.

The programme closely follows its graduates and provided the panel with an overview of the positions currently occupied by its alumni. The panel also interviewed a number of recent alumni, as well as representatives from the professional field. It concluded that alumni tend to find suitable jobs as assistant or junior curators. Some alumni end up as curators in the larger institutions; others are hired by smaller museums or find employment as exhibition or public programme coordinators, researchers or PhD students. The alumni mentioned to the panel that they felt very well prepared for their position. Representatives from the work field made it clear to the panel that the programme fully matches the professional requirements and expectations. The panel concludes that the programme provides its students with a very good preparation for the professional field.

Considerations
The panel read a selection of CAC master's theses and considers them to be of an adequate to good academic level. It also gained a positive impression from the detailed and very self-reflective internship dossiers it saw. It confirmed that alumni tend to find suitable jobs as assistant or junior curators. The programme fully matches the professional requirements and expectations and provides its students with a very good preparation for the work field.

Conclusion
Dual master's programme Heritage Studies (120 EC): the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'meets the standard'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The panel assessed standards 1, 2 3, and 4 of the dual master's programme Heritage Studies (120 EC) 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 *dual master's programme Heritage Studies (120 EC)* as 'positive'.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

a. Academic ability
The student who has completed the Master's degree programme:
1. should have insight into the key research methods in the field;
2. should be able to interpret, assess and take an individual position on academic practice – and the results thereof – within the field of study;
3. should be able to assess relevant scientific literature;
4. should be able to independently formulate questions with regard to the field of study, to operationalise those questions and represent them in a research plan;
5. should be able to independently carry out research in the field of study and report on that research orally and in writing in a way that complies with the common academic conventions in the field of study;
6. should be able to present any scientific knowledge and insights gained during the degree programme and transfer them to a broader audience than the academic community;
7. should be able to answer scientific questions using knowledge of a specialism within the degree programme;
8. should be able to work in a team and give and incorporate feedback in a constructive way.

b. Subject-specific exit qualifications
The student who has completed the Master's degree programme:
1. should have gained extensive and successful practical experience in the field at one or several relevant institutions outside the University of Amsterdam;
2. should be able to analyse and critically evaluate any (professional) experience gained in practice, resulting in a scientific reflection on the profession in general.

c. Track-specific exit qualifications
The student who has completed the Curating Art and Cultures track:

Knowledge and understanding
1. should have solid historical and theoretical knowledge and understanding of the body of concepts and the most important academic issues, research methods and developments within the field of museum and curatorial studies, particularly with regard to collecting, curating and display;
2. should possess in-depth knowledge and understanding of one or several subjects, themes or perspectives within their chosen specialisation, i.e.: art history, design cultures, history or archaeology;
3. should have solid and active knowledge of art and cultural objects from the area corresponding to the chosen specialisation and their function in the context of museums and cultural institutions;
4. should be able to adopt a critical perspective on national and international discussions and developments in the professional field and the world of museums and cultural institutions, and can contribute to the discourse on an academic level;

Applying knowledge and understanding
5. should be able to independently apply historical and theoretical knowledge and insights in order to analyse and interpret the subjects of research;
6. should be proficient in setting up, preparing and conducting academic research under limited supervision and using primary sources and/or up-to-date research methods;
7. should be able to consider and analyse knowledge and insights in the chosen specialisation in relation to the field of museum and curatorial studies;
8. should be able to put historical and theoretical knowledge and understanding of the profession to practical use in the setting of a museum or cultural institution for the purposes of compiling and managing collections, conducting collection-related research and organising exhibitions.
9. should be able to perform the job-specific tasks of the curatorial profession at an academic level;

Making judgements

10. should be able to locate and search in primary and secondary, contemporary and historical sources, image banks, museum collections, finding aids and lexicons using both traditional and digital techniques, and to independently and critically select results based on a research question and (in part) according to criteria of quality, reliability and theoretical/historical context;

11. should be able to adequately analyse, interpret and evaluate academic research conducted by others;

12. due in part to having trained their visual-spatial imagination, should be able to apply and integrate visual material into argumentation in such a way that the argument is clarified and/or strengthened;

13. should be able to reflect critically on the acquisition, conservation and presentation of objects of art and culture, as well as the communication and research in connection with these objects, in museums or cultural institutions;

Communication

14. should be able, in both Dutch and English, to deliver a clear and substantiated written or oral presentation on their own research results or those of others, and adjust this presentation to an academic or lay audience;

15. should be able, in both Dutch and English, to participate constructively and critically in academic and societal discourses (both written and oral), to adopt and defend standpoints and to put forth arguments to critique and revise their own standpoints and those of others;

16. should be able to render academic research accessible to a wider audience in the context of a museum and/or cultural institution;

Learning skills

17. should have acquired competences and skills relating to organisation and policy, research and registration, art handling, restoration and conservation, representation and communication and curating itself, such that they are able to independently practise the curatorial profession;

18. should be qualified to successfully pursue a doctoral programme that is largely self-directed in nature.

APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Year 1/Semester 1

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16	17.	18.	19.	20.
Collecting, Curating and Display I (6 EC)*								Collecting, Curating and Display II (6 EC)*								[Tutorial/ elective (6 EC)]			
Elective (6 EC)								Elective (6 EC)											

*CCD I + II constitute a single module of 12 EC.

Year 1/Semester 2

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.	17.	18.	19.	20.
Internship (6 EC)*								Internship (6 EC)								Internship (6 EC)			
Curatorial Practices in the Contemporary World I (6 EC)								Internship (6 EC)											

*The internship constitutes one module of 60 EC.

Year 2/Semester 1

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.	17.	18.	19.	20.
Internship (6 EC)								Internship (6 EC)								Internship (6 EC)			
Curatorial Practices in the Contemporary World II (6 EC)								Internship (6 EC)											

Year 2/Semester 2

21.	22.	23.	24.	25.	26.	27.	28.	29.	30.	31.	32.	33.	34.	35.	36.	37.	38.	39.	40.
Internship (6 EC)								Internship (6 EC)								Thesis (18 EC)			
								Thesis (18 EC)											

APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

Woensdag 15 mei 2019			
09.00	09.15	Ontvangst en welkom	
09.15	11.15	Voorbereidend overleg panel en inzien documenten	
11.15	12.30	Presentatie onderwijsdirecteuren en interview inhoudelijke verantwoordelijken	
12.30	13.00	Lunch	
13.00	13.45	Interview studenten Ba Kunstgeschiedenis	Interview studenten Ba Muziekwetenschap
13.45	14.30	Interview docenten Ba Kunstgeschiedenis	Interview docenten Ba Muziekwetenschap
14.30	15.00	Terugkoppeling panel en pauze	
15.00	15.45	Interview studenten Ba Cultuurwetenschappen	Interview studenten Ba Theaterwetenschap
15.45	16.30	Interview docenten Ba Cultuurwetenschappen	Interview docenten Ba Theaterwetenschap
16.30	17.00	Terugkoppeling panel en pauze	
17.00	17.30	Interview examencommissie bacheloropleidingen	
17.30	18.30	Intern overleg + opstellen voorlopige bevindingen, waarbij mogelijkheid is tot vragen stellen aan opleidingsmanagement (18.00 – 18.30)	

Donderdag 16 mei 2019		
09.00	11.15	Aankomst, panel intern opstellen voorlopige bevindingen (incl. inloopspreekuur, 10.00 – 10.30 uur)
11.15	11.40	Interview studenten M Erfgoedstudies 120 EC (duaal)
11.40	12.05	Interview docenten M Erfgoedstudies 120 EC (duaal)
12.05	12.40	Lunch
12.40	13.40	Interview studenten M Erfgoedstudies 90 EC (duaal/ deeltijd) en studenten M Erfgoedstudies 60 EC (vol-/deeltijd)
13.40	14.40	Interview docenten M Erfgoedstudies 90 EC (duaal/ deeltijd) en docenten M Erfgoedstudies 60 EC (vol-/deeltijd)
14.40	14.55	Pauze
14.55	15.35	Interview studenten master K&C 60 (vol-/deeltijd)
15.35	16.15	Interview docenten master K&C 60 (vol-/deeltijd)
16.15	16.30	Pauze
16.30	16.55	Interview studenten masteropleiding Kunst- en Cultuurwetenschappen (duaal)
16.55	17.20	Interview docenten masteropleiding Kunst- en Cultuurwetenschappen (duaal)
17.20	18.30	Intern overleg panel en opstellen voorlopige bevindingen

Vrijdag 17 mei 2019		
09.00	09.30	Aankomst, intern overleg panel
09.30	10.15	Interview examencommissie masteropleidingen
10.15	10.45	Intern overleg panel
10.45	11.45	Eindgesprek management
11.45	12.45	Panel intern opstellen voorlopige bevindingen
12.45	13.15	Lunch
13.15	16.00	Panel intern opstellen voorlopige bevindingen en voorbereiden mondelinge rapportage
16.00	16.30	Mondelinge rapportage voorlopig oordeel
16.30	17.30	Ontwikkelgesprek (parallelsessies)

Dual master's programme Heritage Studies, University of Amsterdam

APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied 8 theses of the dual master's programme Heritage Studies (120 EC). 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):

General documents
- Facultair rapport onderwijsvisitaties
- Instellingsplan 2015-2020: Grenzeloos nieuwsgierig
- Notitie Taalbeleid onderwijs binnen de FGw: naar een Tweetalige Faculteit
- Facultair Strategisch Plan 2016-2020
- Vooruit Faculteit der Geesteswetenschappen: Innovatie in het bacheloronderwijs 2016-2018
- Kader Toetsbeleid
- Arbeidsmarktperspectief. Een onderzoek naar arbeidsmarktperspectieven onder alumni van de Faculteit der Geesteswetenschappen
- Examencommissie College of Humanities, Bachelorscripties en hun beoordeling

Reports Boards of Examiners
- Jaarverslag 2016-2017 & 2017-2018, Examencommissie College of Humanities
- Jaarverslag 2016-2017 & 2017-2018, Examencommissie Graduate School of Humanities

Reports Programme Committees
- Jaarverslag OC ACW 2016-2017
- Jaarverslag OC ACW 2017-2018
- Jaarverslag OC Theaterwetenschap 2016-2017
- Jaarverslag OC Theaterwetenschap 2017-2018
- Jaarverslag OC Muziekwetenschap 2017-2018
- Jaarverslag OC Kunstgeschiedenis 2016-2017
- Jaarverslag OC Kunstgeschiedenis 2017-2018
- Annual report OC MA Heritage 2016-2017
- Annual report OC MA Heritage 2017-2018
- Annual report MA Preservation and Presentation of the Moving Image 2016-2017
- Annual report MA Preservation and Presentation of the Moving Image 2017-2018
- Annual report OC MA K&C 2016-2017
- Annual report OC MA K&C 2017-2018

Course selection
Van onderstaande vakken is het studiemateriaal (studiehandleidingen, toetsdossier) digitaal aangeboden. Daarnaast heeft het panel toegang gehad tot de Canvasomgeving van deze vakken.

Ba Cultuurwetenschappen
- Internationaal cultuurbeleid
- I Amsterdam
Ba Kunstgeschiedenis
- Kunsttechnieken en visuele analyse II
- Tekeningen in Focus
Ba Muziekwetenschap
- An Introduction to Cultural Musicology
- Historische Muziekwetenschap 1600-1800
Ba Theaterwetenschap
- Dramaturgie

- Performance Analyse

DMa Erfgoedstudies 90
- Track AIS 90: Society and Its Infrastructures
- Track AIS 90: Recordkeeping Informatics
- Track PPMI: Preservation & Restoration
- Track Museumstudies: History, Theory and Sources
- Track Heritagestudies: 147613096Y / MA Heritage Studies: Heritage & Memory Theory

DMa Erfgoedstudies 120
- Collecting, Curating and Display
- Curatorial Practices in the Contemporary world I
- Curatorial Practices in the Contemporary world II

M Erfgoed 60
- Information Analytics and Digital Humanities

Ma Kunst- en cultuurwetenschappen 60
- Art and Activism
- Kunst en de canon
- Comparative and Cultural Analysis
- Kunst en cultuur in het publieke domein
- How Music Works: Cognitive and Computational Perspectives

DMa kunst- en cultuurwetenschappen 90
- Seminar Dramaturgy
- Key Concepts In Theatre and Performance Studies

Other
- Sample internship reports and assessments Dual Ma Heritage Studies (120 EC) Curating Art and Cultures.
- Verslag veldadviesraad mei 2019 BA en MA Kunstgeschiedenis mei 2019
- Kengetallen CoH K&C
- Kengetallen GSH K&C