

Master of Interior Architecture ArtEZ

*Report of the extensive programme assessment
1 and 2 July 2021*

Colophon

Master of Interior Architecture

ArtEZ University of the Arts

Location: Zwolle

Mode of study: fulltime

Croho: 49238

Result of institutional assessment: not applied for

The assessment was conducted under responsibility of:

AeQui VBI

PO Box 5050

3502 JB Utrecht

The Netherlands

www.AeQui.nl

This document is best printed in duplex

Table of contents

Colophon	2
Table of contents	3
Summary	4
Introduction	7
Intended learning outcomes	9
Staff	18
Services and facilities.....	19
Quality assurance.....	21
Assessment.....	23
Achieved learning outcomes.....	26
Attachments.....	29
Attachment 1 Assessment committee.....	30
Attachment 2 Program of the assessment	31
Attachment 3 Documents	32

Summary

On 1 and 2 July 2021 a committee of AeQui visited the master programme Interior Architecture at ArtEZ. The committee assesses that the programme meets each standard; the overall quality of the programme **meets the standard**. The programme presents itself as Corpo-real; a learning community focusing on the interconnection between bodies and space.

Intended learning outcomes

The committee assesses that the intended learning outcomes (competences) meet the standard (standard 1). The intended learning outcomes (competences) of the programme tie in with (inter)national requirements for (international) interior architecture and are in tune with the demands from the professional field. All competences and sub criteria are covered in the programme. In addition, the Dublin descriptors are reflected in the intended learning outcomes (competences). The programme's emphasis on research is reflected in the competences. The committee is of the opinion that the programme's proposition regarding the interconnection between body and space has significant potential and can be transferred to humans and the (changing) world. The programme has adequate contacts with the professional field, which contribute to the relevance and topicality of the programme.

Curriculum

Based on the interviews and the underlying documentation, the committee qualifies that the programme meets the standards related to the curriculum (standards 2, 3, 4, and 5). The programme enables students to realise the intended learning outcomes. The programme grounds students in relation to their positioning in their future practice. This is part of an ongoing discourse between students and their tutors. Research skills are sufficiently being addressed in the different tracks (learning lines). Research has different forms and is directly connected to students future practice and learning objectives. The committee appreciates the way academic research and artistic research are combined. The different tracks (or learning lines) are helpful in creating a coherent and well-structured programme. The committee values that the outcome of the case study track is open and not necessarily a design or a product. The structure of the learning environment,

the small and informal scale and the respectful atmosphere in the programme allow for interactive contact between students and tutors and a student-centred approach. An adequate enrolment procedure is in place.

Staff

Based on the interviews and underlying documentation, the committee assesses that the programme meets this standard (standard 6). Tutors are very committed, competent and rigorous. All tutors involved have their own (international) practice, as an interior architect, architect, dancer, designer, researcher or any other art and design related practice. The tutors and staff involved have an adequate command of the English language. And the programme is able to realise an adequate balance between fixed and freelance staff.

Facilities

Based on the interviews and underlying documentation, the committee concludes that the programme meets the standards regarding the facilities (standards 7 and 8). A sufficient infrastructure is in place for realising the programme. At the location in Zwolle different studios, equipment and materials are available. This is valued by the students and alumni the committee met with. The committee appreciates that the public presentation of the students' work is in the city centre.

The tutoring of students is tailored to the needs of the students, reflects the small and intensive scale of the programme and matches the self-direction expected of master's students. Adequate facilities are available to provide students with information about the programme, assessments, schedules and to provide extra support for students when needed.

Quality assurance

Based on the interviews and underlying documentation, the committee assesses that the programme

meets this standard (standard 9). An adequate quality assurance system in place. ArtEZ's quality assurance system and planning and control cycle is translated in the ArtEZ master programmes and the course. All relevant stakeholders are involved in the quality assurance process. The programme combines the formal system with an informal one, in which students feel heard. The committee values the involvement of students in shaping the programme and the programme's continuous effort to improve.

Assessment

Based on the interviews and underlying documentation, the committee concludes that the programme meets this standard (standard 10). An adequate system of assessment is in place. In addition, the quality assurance of the assessment system is sufficient. It includes measures to guarantee the validity, reliability and transparency of the assessments that match the formative and subjective assessments within art education. These include using the four-eye principle and assessment criteria when possible.

The board of examiners is pro-active in safeguarding the quality of the assessments. Each year, the board randomly checks the quality of graduation projects. The committee is pleased that examiners are expected to keep their qualifications up to date.

Achieved learning outcomes

Based on the interviews and underlying documentation, the committee assesses that the programme meets this standard (standard 11). The programme has an adequate graduation procedure in place. In assessing students final work, multiple examiners are involved including an external expert / critic.

Based on the studied student files and the visit of the graduation exhibition, the committee concludes

All standards of the NVAO assessment framework are assessed positively; the assessment committee therefore awards a positive recommendation for the accreditation of the master programme Interior Architecture at ArtEZ.

On behalf of the entire assessment committee,
Utrecht, October 2021

Raoul van Aalst
Chair

that the overall quality of the studied theses is adequate and that graduates achieve the required level. The quality of the writing in the studied theses is good. The theses studied represent the programmes focus on research. The discussions with the students during the graduation exhibition also reflected this focus.

In addition, the themes of the works were quite interesting ranging from inclusion and exclusion to temporary construction in architecture and changing concepts. The works represent the programme's ambition for students to follow their own interest. The meetings with students and alumni during the site-visit confirmed the adequate level of the final work. The students and alumni the committee met with, seem capable of creating their own career path and practice. This was attested by the presented overview of current practices of alumni.

Suggestions

In order to bring the programme to an even higher level of quality in the future, the committee provides the following suggestions:

- to further develop its positioning regarding the interconnection between body and space from critical thinking to critical involvement;
- to develop an agenda, for example related to the big questions in the field in the (near) future;
- to organise a more systematic and strategic exchange with other programmes;
- to improve the structure of and communication in the case study track;
- to consciously balance the international composition of the student group;
- to encourage students to setting high standards regarding tectonic, spatial and material sensibility of the physical outcome of students' research (the final work).

Titia Buising
Secretary

Overview

The assessments per standard are presented in the table below.

Standard	Judgement
1. Intended learning outcomes	<i>Meets the standard</i>
2. Orientation of the curriculum	<i>Meets the standard</i>
3. Contents of the curriculum	<i>Meets the standard</i>
4. Structure of the curriculum	<i>Meets the standard</i>
5. Qualifications of incoming students	<i>Meets the standard</i>
6. Staff: qualified and size	<i>Meets the standard</i>
7. Accommodation and infrastructure	<i>Meets the standard</i>
8. Tutoring and student information	<i>Meets the standard</i>
9. Evaluation of the programme	<i>Meets the standard</i>
10 Assessment system	<i>Meets the standard</i>
11 Achieved learning outcomes	<i>Meets the standard</i>
Overall assessment	Positive

Introduction

This report reflects the results of the assessment of the master programme in Interior Architecture of ArtEZ University of the Arts. The programme presents itself as Corpo-real; a learning community where new and hybrid forms of research lead to new understanding of the interconnection between bodies and space.

The institute

The programme is part of ArtEZ University of the Arts. ArtEZ aims to prepare students to function at the highest level as professional artists & designers or teachers, in a wide scope of contexts such as visual art, design, architecture, music, dance and theatre. ArtEZ offers bachelor's and master's programmes in visual art, architecture, fashion, design, music, theatre, creative writing, dance and art education.

The master programme in Interior Architecture was part of the Graduate School, which was established in 2016. The Graduate School was positioned as a critical corpus of knowledge, practices, performances and processes that establishes the arts a creative force of transformation and (social) change in contemporary times. The Graduate School aimed to work towards incubating and prototyping new research practices and processes which could then be upscaled and networked across the entire university. The Graduate School was focused on education (in the form of eleven master's programmes), research and valorisation. Mid 2019 the Graduate School ceased to exist as an organizational structure. However, the community continues to be active in connecting master level education and research within ArtEZ.

ArtEZ also offers an associate degree and a bachelor's programme in interior architecture. Together with the master's programme, this column of three levels aims to contribute to lifelong learning within the field of interior architecture.

The programme

The two-year master programme (120 EC) is offered in a fulltime variant. The programme focuses on exploring the connections between theory and practice-based research. During the first year, students develop a theoretical research question, which they will then consolidate during the first half of the second year in the form of a written paper. In the second year, students explore and challenge their theory through artistic and practice-based research. In the final thesis students demonstrate how their theory and the practice-based research are interconnected, and how this has led to new findings and insights.

Since the last accreditation, several changes have been made. The language of the programme has changed to English, the programme moved from the faculty of Architecture in Arnhem to the ArtEZ University of the Arts campus in Zwolle and the structure of the programme has changed. The latter includes the implementation of five tracks (or learning lines): Practice, Theory, Case, Reflect and Finals. With these tracks, the programme aims for students to develop a research-driven spatial design practice geared towards the unknown future.

The programme notes that changing the language to English has led to a community of both EU and non-EU students with a diversity in backgrounds and thus led to a large increase in enrolments. It also enabled the programme to more easily invite tutors from the international professional field. The programme remarks that this has led to a quality impulse reflected in an increase in critical thinking and diversity in research outcomes. The committee considers the change of the language to English a well-founded decision.

The assessment

ArtEZ assigned AeQui to perform a quality assessment of its master programme Interior Architecture. In close co-operation with the programme management, AeQui convened an independent and competent assessment committee. A preparatory meeting with representatives of the programme was held to exchange information and plan the date and programme of the site-visit.

In the run-up to the site visit, the assessment committee has studied the self-evaluation report on the programme and reviewed a sample of student work. The findings were input for discussions during the site visit.

The site visit was carried out on 1 and 2 July 2021, according to the programme presented in attachment 2. No use was made of the consultation hour. The committee has carried out its assessment in relation to, and in consideration of, the cluster of programmes in which this programme is placed. The contextualisation of the programme within its cluster was conducted by the

complete committee during the preliminary meeting and the final deliberations. The knowledge required for this was present in (part of) the committee.

The committee has assessed the programme in an independent manner; at the end of the visit, the chair of the assessment committee presented the initial findings of the committee to representatives of the programme and the institution.

In this document, the committee is reporting on its findings, considerations and conclusions according to the 2018 NVAO framework for extended programme assessment. A draft version of the report was sent to the programme management; its reactions have led to this final version of the report.

Initiated by the programme, a development dialogue will be planned in the course of 2021. The results of this development dialogue have no influence on the assessment presented in this report.

Intended learning outcomes

The committee concludes that the intended learning outcomes (or competences) of the Corpo-real programme have been concretised with regard to content, level and orientation and meet international requirements for interior architecture and are in tune with the demands from the professional field. The programme adheres to the national master profile for Fine Art and Design and the 'Wet op de Architectentitel' (WAT). The committee encourages the programme to further develop its positioning regarding body and space, to human and the world, to critical thinking and critical involvement. The committee also suggests the programme to develop its own agenda, for example related to the big questions in the field in (near) future. The programme is adequately embedded within the (international) professional field, which contributes to the relevance and topicality of the competences and the programme.

Standard 1: 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

As mentioned before, the programme presents itself as Corpo-real; a learning community where new and hybrid forms of research lead to new understanding of the interconnection between bodies and space. According to the programme, 'corpo' stands for bodies in general and 'real' for the reality that they relate to. The programme focuses on researching the endlessly changing relationship between bodies and space: the body as repository of social reality and spatial truth. In doing so, the programme aims to include and share different disciplines such as sociology, performative arts and theory in the arts.

Students (and tutors) are challenged to critically examine the connection between bodies and space, while the programme strives to work beyond the disciplinary limits of interior architecture. This includes experimental thinking to initiate innovation and emancipation within, and for, the field of interior architecture. And asking questions regarding new theoretical constructions, re-imagine the future, and creating new perspectives for the professional field. The programme aims to deepen and innovate the domain of interior architecture and considers art education a rapidly evolving domain of research and practice.

The programme notes that research is imperative in the Corpo-real research practice: the synthesis of thinking, making and reflecting. According to the programme, the intertwining of theoretical research and artistic research and the importance of the role of theory in the programme distinguishes the programme from other master's programmes in interior architecture.

In the discussion with management about the focus and positioning of the programme, it was noted that regarding research the discourse is about 'the work that research does'. Research at ArtEZ is expected to contribute to building resilient futures, to diversity and to a critical society. For the Corpo-real programme this includes the importance of the notion of incorporating the body and its precarities in the discussion about research.

Regarding the central theme of the programme, bodies and space, it was remarked that there is not a fixed interpretation of what this could be. In the case study track (see also standard 3) for example, body and space is elaborated in human and world. Moreover, the different cultural and academic backgrounds of students ensure that this is interpreted in different ways.

The committee also discussed how the students freedom to choose their research topic relates to a possible agenda of the programme. It became clear that students value this freedom very much.

It allows them to follow their own interest and inspiration. It was also noted that the programme does not have a specific agenda, with for example research topics related to societal themes. During the conversations between students and their tutors, the relevance of their research topics is however discussed. And it was also remarked that the practice track and the case study track (see standard 2 and 3) have a common theme or framework to which students can relate their work. In general, it was noted that the goal is for students to formulate and own their own positioning and to be able to critically reflect on this.

Intended learning outcomes

The intended learning outcomes are based on the national master profile for Fine Art and Design. This profile defines the general master level, and is used to emphasise the variety and diversity of courses within the master of Arts and Design programmes (MFAD). The Corpo-real programme was involved in the development of these specifications for the master level. The overall master level is articulated in four points of reference applicable to all programmes involved: research, context, discipline, and self-direction.

The programme is also embedded in the 'Wet op de Architectentitel' (WAT). In the Netherlands Interior Architects, Architects, Landscape Architects and Urban designers have to register in the Architect's register. After graduation and completion of a two-year professional traineeship, graduates of the master programme in Interior Architecture are eligible for registration as an interior architect in the Architects' Register in the Netherlands.

The intended learning outcomes comprise three Corpo-real core competences:

- researching and designing ability;
- personal competencies;
- professional competencies and professional attitude.

The competencies are elaborated in sub criteria. For the first competence this includes for example the ability to formulate, from the perspective of the student's own research, a design assignment that allows the student to gain new professional

knowledge. The programme presented an overview that shows the relation between the competences, the sub criteria and the national competences as defined in the national Master profile for Fine Art and Design. In addition, it shows in which tracks (learning lines) the competences and sub criteria are addressed and the assessment criteria used.

Links with professional practice

Different ways are used to align the programme with the demands of and developments in the professional field. Tutors (and guest tutors) have ample experience in a broad interdisciplinary and international range of professional fields through their own practice as practicing artists, interior architects, filmmakers, photographers, dancer or storyteller. Moreover, external critics are involved in evaluating the graduation presentations and the overall level of the programme.

Considerations

Based on interviews and the examination of underlying documentation, the committee concludes that the intended learning outcomes (competences) of the programme tie in with (inter)national requirements for (international) interior architecture and are in tune with the demands from the professional field. The programme presented an overview in which the national competences are related to the programme's competences and the different tracks (learning lines). Based on this, the committee concludes that all the competences and sub criteria are covered in the programme. In addition, the committee establishes that the Dublin descriptors are reflected in the intended learning outcomes (competences).

The committee also notes that the programme's emphasis on research is reflected in the competences. The committee is of the opinion that the programmes proposition regarding the interconnection between body and space has significant potential and can be transferred to humans and the (changing) world. The committee encourages

the programme to develop this positioning further from critical thinking to critical involvement.

The committee encourages the programme to develop its own agenda, for example related to the big questions in the field in (near) future. This will offer students a frame of reference and room for communal discussions and criticality.

The committee establishes that the programme has adequate contacts with the professional field, which contribute to the relevance and topicality of the programme. Tutors and guest tutors have ample (international) professional experience in

their own practice and external critics are involved in evaluating the end level and the overall quality of the programme. The committee encourages the programme to organise a more systematic and strategic exchange with other master programmes within ArtEZ. This can benefit the programmes positioning and the students' possibilities in gaining experiences elsewhere.

Based on the interviews and examination of the underlying documentation, the committee establishes that the intended learning outcomes (or competences) **meet the standard**.

Curriculum

The committee establishes that the standards for the curriculum are met. The programme enables students to realise the intended learning outcomes. The programme grounds students in relation to their positioning in their future practice. This is part of an ongoing discourse between students and their tutors. The committee concludes that research skills are sufficiently being addressed in the different tracks (learning lines). Research has different forms and is directly connected to students future practice and learning objectives. The committee appreciates the way academic research and artistic research are combined. The different tracks (or learning lines) are helpful in creating a coherent and well-structured programme. The committee values that the outcome of the case study track is open and not necessarily a design or a product. The structure of and communication in this track could however be improved. The structure of the learning environment, the small and informal scale and the respectful atmosphere in the programme allow for interactive contact between students and tutors and a student-centred approach. An adequate enrolment procedure is in place.

Orientation

Standard 2: The curriculum enables the students to master appropriate (professional or academic) research and professional skills.

Findings

The programme aims to involve professionals from a broad interdisciplinary and international range of professional fields. These professionals are typically involved as guest tutor. The guest tutors are expected to have strong connections with the professional field, through their own practice. The current guest tutors involved work for example as practicing artists, interior architects, filmmakers, photographers, dancer or storyteller.

Moreover, the programme addresses entrepreneurship as part of students' individual perspective plan and the accompanying talks. At the start of the programme, students are asked to formulate the professional field in which they wish to be active, explicitly within the specific time frame of five to ten years after obtaining their degree. In doing so, students analyse websites, conduct interviews, and visit potential practices. A self-assessment is used to determine the degree to which students' current skills and qualities have already prepared them for this future scenario. This adds up to a conversation between the student and the programme to determine the student's learning goals. The programme aims for

students to be able to position themselves independently and distinctively within the professional field, as designers and as human beings.

The programme also offers skills workshops in the practice track, for example regarding academic writing, entrepreneurship, photography, research by making, etc (see also standard 3).

In the case study track students' work in groups that represent a studio, on an urgent societal research question in collaboration with external partners. The programme notes that the challenges addressed do not require immediate and concrete solutions; rather, the clients are looking for unexpected new strategies and scenarios.

The goal of research is to teach students how to go on developing, exploring and innovating practice and thinking around practice. Researching sources, making good use of sources, communicating what is uncovered and discovered, organising dialogues and exhibitions for diverse publics are, according to the programme, articulations of this goal. Research is addressed in the five tracks (learning lines, see also standard 3) in different ways. In the practice track, students focus on research by making. In the theory track, on research by thinking. In the case track, research by experiment is addressed and in the reflect track students conduct research by reflecting. In the finals

track, research is the result of merging theory and practice. During the tracks students engage in different research methods such as empirical research, design thinking strategies, literature research, comparative analysis, direct observations and exploratory interviews. In addition, students learn to think of themselves as instruments of research, artistically as well as journalistically.

As part of the theory track (see also standard 3), students formulate a research question in the first semester, which will be developed into a research proposal in the second semester. Several so-called master forum meetings throughout the year (see also standard 4) are organised in which students discuss their research ideas with their peers. In the third semester, students explore and connect the theory of their research with artistic and practice-based research. This results in the final theoretical paper. Students can also use this as part of their research for their final thesis (see standard 11).

The theory track comprises four theory modules in the first two semester (see also standard 3) and offers 'academic reading and writing', 'theoretical research skills' and an introduction to available sources in the library.

Regarding research skills, it was remarked during the site visit that students learn academic research skills and combine these with their own more personal and practical research skills. Making processes are also used in this.

Regarding the importance of the aesthetic of the making it was noted during the site visit that even though the objects students make can be seen as sculptures, these objects are primarily the construction of the students thoughts. The making is aimed to be intuitive and afterwards reflection on the making related to theory takes place.

Considerations

The committee considers that the programme adequately addresses professional and research skills. The case study track, the attention for entrepreneurship (aka defining the own professional field students want to work in), the practice

track and the involvement of guest tutors ground students in relation to their future practices.

Research is a continuous part of the programme and present in all tracks (learning lines) and can have different forms. Research is practice and theory based and students are encouraged to use research methods from other disciplines such as film, performance, dance and social sciences. Research is usually directly connected to students learning objectives and their future positioning. The committee appreciates the way academic research and artistic research are combined.

Based on the interviews and examination of the underlying documentation, the committee establishes that the programme **meets this standard**.

Contents

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

Findings

As mentioned before, the programme is organised in five so called Tracks (learning lines): Practice, Theory, Case, Reflect and Finals. The tracks are present in the first two semesters, where students get acquainted with the programme, gradually feel part of the community and practice with a variety of research methods and strategies both in theoretical and artistic research. In the second year the tracks become more connected and students start to explore the interconnection of theory and practice. The finals track is elaborated on in standard 11.

The practice track focuses on research of space through intuitive physicality focusing on bodies and space and their environment. In the first year students practice with research by making, thinking through making and making through thinking as important methods. In addition, different research methods and ways of working are introduced within a year theme to experience different approaches to practice-based research. In the second year the interconnection of the theoretical

research and artistic experimentation is addressed. This results in the final thesis of the graduation phase. The practice track also includes instructions for the wood, metal and plastic workshops, 'research by making', screen printing, bookbinding, photography, creative writing or film.

The theory track focuses on theory research. Students theoretical research focuses on a contemporary issue that is relevant to the professional field. Students are expected to position the theme within current international discourse, while seeking out the (social) relevance to the discipline of interior architecture. In the first two semesters, four modules are programmed in which students obtain the critical and theoretical foundation for their research. This includes topics concerning critical theory, historical theory, interdisciplinary theory and contextual theory. In these modules various tutors are involved, on different aspects of theory. The specifics regarding the research question and research proposal are discussed in standard 2.

As mentioned in standard 2, the case study track is centred around an urgent societal research question in collaboration with external partners. An example is the theme of the case study in 2021: Hospitality and Care after Corona: What can the view on humans of both hospitality and care teach us about how to design our spaces and environment in the future? Students cooperate with the ArtEZ Professorship Product & Interior Design, the University of Humanistic Studies and Hotel school The Hague.

The case study track also (formatively) addresses subjects specifically related to the theme of the case study such as (inter)cultural awareness or teambuilding. This includes several meetings with professionals from the field of teambuilding. The programme notes that intercultural awareness is not only needed for the case-study track but for the community of students and tutors in general. In the intercultural awareness workshop, topics such as stereotyping, cultural prejudice and

creating a safe environment for all students are discussed.

Students the committee met with, value the collaboration with their peers in the case study track. Students and alumni pointed out during the site visit that the guidance and structure in the case study track can be improved. In addition, students and alumni would like to have more resources; such as access to connections with external organisations and people. Students noted that these issues were discussed in the master forum meetings and that the programme has been made aware.

In the reflect track students focus on research on themselves. The track also addresses the exchange of experiences and knowledge related to the topics of the research questions, among students as well with their attending tutors. This takes place in the so-called master forum. In addition, individual perspective (IP) talks are held. These are discussed in standard 8. In this track topics as Entrepreneurship, Online Awareness and Visibility, Golden Circle and Canvas Model Business are discussed (formatively) as well.

The international character of the programme is reflected in the international community, consisting of students and tutors from all over the world; Taiwan, India, South Africa, Colombia, Bulgaria, Croatia or the Netherlands. In addition, two international study trips per year are organised. These include a study-trip to a European Biennale in the fall and an additional field excursion in January with a different destination each year. The aim is for students to consider their own development and research within a broader context. During the study trips so called interventions are organised. These are intense workshops during which students work on site on a specific and current theme. In these interventions, students are introduced to other research methodologies and collaborations together with other master students from the ArtEZ master community.

The module descriptions provide students with an overview of the content, learning goals, teaching methods, assessment and schedule of each module / part of the programme.

Students the committee met with, value the freedom in the programme to follow their own research interest. In addition, the focus on critical thinking and on the process (and development) rather than the result is appreciated. This was also noted regarding the case-study track, where the outcome can be research, a process, a description as well as a design or a product.

Considerations

The committee considers that the content of the programme enables students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The committee concludes that the Corpo-real theme of body and space is implemented and realised throughout the programme. During the site-visit, the committee noted that the literature and articles used in the programme are up-to-date, relevant and comprehensive for a master programme in Interior Architecture.

The committee is of the opinion that the programme is coherent and well structured; the different tracks are helpful in this. The committee especially values the case study track. This allows for collaboration between students and with external partners. The committee also appreciates that the outcome of the case study track is open and not necessarily a design or a product and that the results of the case study track are published. Despite this, the committee agrees with the students and alumni that the structure of and communication in this track should be improved.

Based on the interviews and examination of the underlying documentation, the committee establishes that the programme **meets this standard**.

Structure

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

Findings

In the pedagogical perspective of the Corpo-real programme students are at the heart of the programme. The programme positions itself as a learning community with a strong emphasis on individual development. The programme aims to facilitate access: informal and easy contact between students and the team of core tutors. And a safe space where knowledge and experiences can be shared, risks can be taken and failures can be part of the progress. In addition, the programme emphasises self-guidance by students. Students are encouraged to find their way in the programme and in the world.

Different educational formats are used throughout the programme, including the afore mentioned interventions, the master forum, and individual talks. In addition, teaching formats such as field work, studio days, field excursions, group workshops, collective reading, discussions, writing exercises, individual talks and feedback and in class peer to peer review are used.

The master forum, during which all first- and second year students come together with the head of the programme and programme coordinator, is held every three weeks. Students are in charge of the meetings. The meetings offer intervision focused on the exchange of experiences and knowledge related to the topics of the research questions and thesis, the case study, and any other design research questions. Students provide each other with advice, feedback and opinions. In addition, practical aspects such as schedules, preparation for the travels and the various workshops are discussed.

Part of the theory track is the Corpo-real Discourse. This addresses the main focus of the programme: the relationship between bodies and

space in the broadest sense. Students are provided with a diversity of insights and perspectives on the theme Corpo-real. To enable this, an external moderator with a new network is invited each year, who, together with the students, develops a programme of lectures, workshops, reading sessions and studio or gallery visits.

Students and alumni would like to have more contact with other master and bachelor students, the committee learned during the site visit. Even though first year students already collaborate with other master students this could be expanded.

During the lockdown in the spring of 2020, all education was organised online. Since the programme, as an art programme, is labelled as a practical programme, in academic year 2020 - 2021 most education could be continued in a reasonable normal manner, with regard to the relevant guidelines. If needed, for example in the case of the master forum meetings, where the group was too large, meetings have taken place in an online format. The online meetings also allowed for international guest tutors /artists to join in a more accessible manner. This was, according to the programme, very valuable.

Since the annual trip to the Venice biennale could not take place in 2020, current students are invited to join next year's group of students to visit the biennale. And in 2020 the international travels were changed to different destinations in the Netherlands.

Considerations

The committee concludes that the structure of the learning environment and the small and informal scale of the programme allow for interactive contact between students and tutors and an individual approach. Different teaching formats are used, that leave room for individual and group work. The committee notes that the programme succeeds in creating an effective learning community with a strong focus on self-directed and

student-centred learning. In addition, the committee sensed a respectful atmosphere between students and tutors.

The programme creates an ongoing discourse with students about their (future) positioning. The committee was impressed by the involvement of students in the programme (in for example the master forum meetings and the discourse programme).

Based on the interviews and examination of the underlying documentation, the committee establishes that the programme **meets this standard**.

Incoming students

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

Findings

The legal enrolment criteria apply to the programme. The programme aims for small scale education and individual guidance; therefore 15 students are admitted each year. And the total cohort the programme aims for comprises 25 students. In realising this, the programme has an intensive and selective admission procedure in place. This includes submitting a portfolio, a motivation letter, a research proposal and a CV. Candidates are interviewed by two members of the staff (the admissions committee).

The programme selects candidates not only based on their creativity but also on their contribution to the learning community they become part of.

The programme aims to attract a diverse group of students. Currently 80% of the students is non-European. The programme notes that the number of European and non-European applications is increasing for academic year 2021 - 2022.

Students and alumni value the input from and connection to their international peers, the committee learned during the site visit. Students

noted however that the composition of the student group could be more diverse.

Candidates are informed about the programme through social media, the website and current students. Through so-called online Corporate Talks and by connecting candidates to students and alumni, candidates are informed about the themes and the research of the programme and students.

Considerations

The committee considers that the legal enrolment criteria are applicable to the programme. And

that the programme meets different backgrounds and interests of the students. The intensive and selective selection procedure ensures that motivated students enrol the programme.

The committee recommends the programme to ensure that the composition of the international student group is balanced; e.g. avoiding that one nationality is overrepresented.

Based on the interviews and examination of the underlying documentation, the committee establishes that the programme **meets this standard**.

Staff

The committee considers that the staff involved in the programme is very competent and approachable. In addition, the composition of the staff reflects the international and interdisciplinary practice of interior architecture and tutors have ample (international) academic and professional experience. The programme ties in with the universities employment policy and procedures.

Standard 6: The staff team is qualified for the realisation of the curriculum in terms of content and educational expertise. The team size is sufficient.

Findings

The programme ties in with the ArtEZ employment policy. Within this policy, life-long learning and professionalisation at course, programme and institutional level are supported. The staff policy includes an annual cycle of performance reviews for all members of staff with contracts of 0,4 fte or more. For these staff members courses such as the Basic qualification Examination (Basiskwalificatie Examinering /BKE), the Basic qualification Didactical Competence (Basiskwalificatie Didactische Bekwaamheid /BDB) and the Senior Qualification Examination (SKE) are available. These courses are mandatory for staff with specific teaching and assessment responsibilities.

The programme is taught by a small team of core tutors (0,24 fte). The core tutors meet with students on a weekly basis throughout the programme, which ensures that they know all the students. Moreover, a wide variety of guest tutors (0,6 fte in total) is involved in the lectures, workshops and seminars of the programme. Both core and guest tutors are expected to have strong and continuously renewed connections with the professional field, through their own practice. The current tutors involved, work for example as practicing interior architects, architects, filmmaker, photographers, researcher and tutor at other universities, dancer or storyteller. The lector of the professorship Product & Interior Design at ArtEZ is also involved as guest tutor. The average staff student ratio is 1:20.

In addition to the tutors, a head of the programme, a program coordinator and a (management) assistants are available. The programme notes that to strengthen the coherence between students, staff and alumni, recently an alumna and two students have been appointed as assistants.

The site visit revealed that students and alumni are in general content with their tutors. They appreciate the small scale character of the programme and the approachability of their tutors.

Where needed the programme enables tutors to make use of English courses. However, since all tutors and guest-tutors are either international or already familiar with English spoken education, this does not happen frequently.

Considerations

The committee considers that tutors are very committed, competent and rigorous. All tutors involved have their own (international) practice, as an interior architect, architect, dancer, designer, researcher or any other art and design related practice. The committee noted that the tutors and staff involved have an adequate command of the English language.

In addition, the committee concludes that the programme is able to realise an adequate balance between fixed and freelance staff.

Based on the interviews and examination of the underlying documentation, the committee establishes that the programme **meets this standard**.

Services and facilities

The committee establishes that the standards for services and facilities are met. The committee concludes that a sufficient infrastructure is in place for realising the programme. At the location in Zwolle different studio's, equipment and materials are available. This is valued by the students and alumni the committee met with. The committee also concludes that the tutoring of students is tailored to the needs of the students, reflects the small and intensive scale of the programme and matches the self-direction expected of master's students. Adequate facilities are available to provide students with information about the programme, assessments, schedules and to provide extra support for students when needed.

Accommodation and infrastructure

Standard 7: The accommodation and material facilities (infrastructure) are sufficient for the realisation of the curriculum.

Findings

Regarding housing, ArtEZ has formulated six themes: internal connection, functionality versus flexibility, home base, knowledge and coffee, routing and external connections. These themes have led to the 'ArtEZ Huisvestingsplan'. This plan sets out a shortlist of desirable and feasible measures for each ArtEZ location in the short and medium term.

The programme is organised in the LAB base at the location of ArtEZ in Zwolle. The programme notes that the LAB base was created to meet, to have conversations and to exchange ideas. Students work together in their studios, use other spaces to create larger work, and from these spaces connect with inspiring (inter-)national peers in online and on-site meetings.

In Zwolle individual and group workspaces, facilities and equipment for print, 3-d design, theatre/dance studio's, bookbinding workshop, photography and film workshop etcetera are available. Students are also free to visit the other two locations and accompanying facilities of ArtEZ in Enschede and Arnhem.

ArtEZ provides online facilities such as ArtEZ intranet, ArtEZ email, electronic learning environments, student portfolios, free Wi-Fi, printing and copying facilities.

During the site visit, the committee discussed the position of an international programme in Zwolle. It was remarked by students that being in Zwolle helps them to understand the Dutch heritage and mindset. In addition, management noted that being in Zwolle allows for more connection to the other master's programmes and the atmosphere and identity of the Zwolle location of ArtEZ. To create a connection with the city, projects are organised. For example, last year's case study track included a collaboration with the municipality and a neighbourhood in eastern Zwolle.

Considerations

The committee considers that the facilities of Corpo-real programme are satisfactory. The students and alumni the committee met with, value the different workshops that are at their disposal (wood, metal, plastic, paper, etcetera). This allows them to go through the process of making.

The committee also appreciates that the public presentation of the students' work is in the church in the city centre.

Based on the interviews and examination of the underlying documentation, the committee establishes that the programme **meets this standard**.

Tutoring and student information

Standard 8: The tutoring of and provision of information to students are conducive to study progress and tie in with the needs of students.

Findings

In the beginning of the programme, students develop their individual perspective plan. With this plan, the programme aims for students to become the owner of their study process and learning goals during the programme. The plan is discussed during the individual perspective talks with the head of the programme that are scheduled twice per semester. During these meetings, students discuss their personal goals, expectations and their future plans.

Throughout the programme, students are also guided by the head, the coordinator of the programme and their tutors. The head of the programme is mentor of the students and stays in contact with the students regarding their study progress and other relevant matters (for the student).

A student counsellor is available for all students that find themselves confronted with personal or study problems and where they feel that they could use some help. The student counsellor maintains an independent position at ArtEZ and is therefore able to discuss any subject with a student in confidence. An international office is available as well as an International Student Circle. The latter is a platform/community where all students, not just international students, can exchange information and expertise.

Regarding students with extra needs, the committee learned during the site visit, consultation between student, head of the programme, student counsellor and the board of examiners takes place. The board of examiners approves and registers the measures taken.

Students (and tutors) are informed about the programme, assessment, timetables etcetera through a mix of course guides, websites and/or electronic learning environment.

As mentioned before, in the spring of 2020 the programme was offered online. In academic year 2020 - 2021, only meetings with large groups were held online, other forms of education could take place at the location in Zwolle. The programme notes that the small and informal scale of the programme was helpful in staying in touch with students during the online period. To help students in financial need, students were hired as assistants and a scholarship was organised.

Students the committee met with, are content with the guidance they receive. They pointed out that if needed extra guidance is available and that this can be addressed in the weekly discussions with their tutors.

Considerations

The committee concludes that adequate tutoring is available for students. The tutoring ties in with the independence expected from students in a master programme. If needed extra support is available for students.

Based on the interviews and examination of the underlying documentation, the committee establishes that the programme **meets this standard**.

Quality assurance

The committee establishes that the standard for quality assurance is met. The committee concludes that the programme has an adequate quality assurance system in place. ArtEZ's quality assurance system and planning and control cycle is translated within the ArtEZ community of Master courses and the programme. The committee notes that all relevant stakeholders are involved in the quality assurance process. The programme combines the formal system with an informal one, in which students feel heard. The committee values the involvement of students in shaping the programme and the programme's continuous effort to improve.

Standard 9: The programme has an explicit and widely supported quality assurance system in place. It promotes the quality culture and has a focus on development.

Findings

The quality assurance plan of ArtEZ is leading for the programme. This plan contains the universities vision on quality assurance, which includes a focus on an ongoing dialogue on the quality of education and research and the involvement of all stakeholders in this dialogue. The PDCA cycle is used as a base model for quality assurance.

The head and the coordinator of the programme are responsible for the quality of the teaching processes and for promoting the quality culture. They translate the strategic plan into their own plan for the programme. Together with the management-assistant and the student-assistant they plan the admissions and study programme, are responsible for setting up the teaching and testing programme, evaluating the programme and determining and coordinating improvement activities at curriculum level with the tutors involved.

The quality of the programme is evaluated in the continuous formal and informal talks with students, tutors, guest tutors, crits and formal advisory committees. This includes for example the afore mentioned master forum meetings and the advisory committee. In addition, alumni surveys are held and the programme participates in the National student Survey. The results of these surveys are analysed and if needed acted upon. The

master forum meetings are held every three weeks with both first and second year students, the head of the programme and the programme coordinator. These meetings are not only used for intervision between students but also for sharing and reflecting on experiences.

The head of the programme and the tutors stay in contact with experts in the field. The head of the programme also works together with colleagues from other programmes in Interior Architecture to start a European collaboration where heads of programmes get together, exchange experiences and collaborate.

Also, within the Master course community, a cluster network is in place that considers growth and development from the perspectives of learning, identity, policy and research experiments. All staff members are invited to join the cluster of their choice.

The advisory committee consists of current students and the programme coordinator. The committee provides input for actualising the curriculum, related to the Education and Examination Regulations. In addition, informal and formal contacts with the professional field, students and tutors ensure that the programme can be actualised on a yearly basis.

Students are involved in quality assurance by means of the before mentioned advisory committee, the International Student Circle where they

engage in dialogue about their learning programmes, facilities and other relevant issues that affect their study, and the Education Committee. The latter operates across all the master's programmes. The Education Committee discusses policies and strategic decisions with the director ArtEZ Master programmes. Moreover, students are involved in the formal evaluations that are held each semester.

The visiting critics involved in the evaluation of the graduation presentations (see also standard 11) also has an important role in evaluating the programme. The external critic assesses whether the programme has correctly performed its educational duties, resulting in a graduation plan at the desired level. The visiting critic writes down his/her findings in a brief report.

Considerations

The committee concludes that an adequate quality assurance system is in place. The system contains checks and balances to ensure the quality of the programme. Relevant stakeholders such as students, tutors and the professional field are involved. The committee notes that the programme is continuously learning and evolving.

Based on the discussions during the site-visit, the committee concludes that students feel heard. By means of the evaluations, the master forum meetings and the Corpo-real discourse programme (see standard 4), students have an important role in (re)shaping the programme.

Based on the interviews and examination of the underlying documentation, the committee establishes that the programme **meets this standard**.

Assessment

The committee considers that an adequate system of assessment is in place. The intended learning outcomes (or competences) are at the basis of this system. Sufficient measures are taken to guarantee the validity, reliability and transparency of the assessments, by using the four-eye-principle (or double marking principle) in all summative assessments and by communicating assessment procedures and criteria at an early stage. The board of examiners is pro-active in safeguarding the quality of the assessments.

Standard 10: The programme has an adequate student assessment system in place.

Findings

The ArtEZ assessment policy is leading for the programme's assessment system. The institute's assessment policy describes the institute's vision of assessment and the aims regarding content, organisation and expertise. It also notes that the testing policy of each study programme is described in a testing plan and worked out in the education and testing programme, the tests themselves, course descriptions and assessment forms. Related to the curriculum and teaching methods, programmes make their own choices regarding the test types used, the units to be tested and the number of formative and summative moments.

The head of the programme is responsible for the overall quality and structure of the assessments. The core team of tutors is responsible for the organisation of the assessments and the assessment forms. Together they are responsible for implementing and compiling assessment materials, monitoring the outcomes and maintaining student files. All tutors are involved in the formative assessments.

The programme notes that assessment is based on the achievement of the competences (see standard 1). The competences are formulated into concrete abilities in the assessments and assessment forms. Assessment of students is mainly focused on development. A constant dialogue with students regarding their individual ambitions and progress is key in this. The programme also notes that an important part of the assessment is

the application of formative assessment and the continuous feedback from staff and assessors within the learning community. Feedback and reflection are an integral part of the didactical approach and reflected and reinforced in the summative assessments of the programme.

All tracks are assessed (summative) at the end of each semester in a joint assessment. The assessment methods used include an individual presentation in the practice and theory track or a group presentation in the case study track.

In general, an 80% attendance is expected from students. And all formative aspects of a module have to be passed before students can pass the module.

To guarantee the quality of the assessments, the programme makes students aware of the assessment procedure and the assessment criteria for the different summative assessments well in advance. In addition, the formative assessments (and continues feedback from the tutors and assessors) prepare students for the summative assessments at the end of each semester. These formative assessments are scheduled well before the summative assessments and students are informed about the results.

Moreover, for all summative assessments, the principle of double marking is used. This means that more than one assessor is involved in the assessment, which allows for calibration of the grades / marks.

Students are informed about the assessments through the different platforms such as O365

Teams and Osiris and/or by their tutors. The programme aims to inform students about the assessment procedures well in advance. And in doing so giving students the opportunity to ask for clarification.

Students and alumni value the feedback from their tutors, the committee learned during the site visit. The weekly meetings and the conversations with their tutors ensure that tutors are aware of the development and processes of the students. Students noted that in the summative assessments the process they went through is also important. Students are informed about the assessment criteria through the course descriptions and the conversations with their tutors. In these conversations, expectations are shared and discussed.

Board of examiners

The central board of examiners is responsible for ensuring all relevant procedures and regulations as described in the Education and Examination Regulations. In addition, assessment policy and plans are observed and acted upon. The board secures the quality of assessments and the final level of students and appoints examiners. The board is organised in three chambers, one for all bachelor's programmes in fine art, one for all bachelor's programmes in music and one for all bachelor's programmes in dance and theatre. The chairs of the chambers form the central board of examiners. And the central board of examiners functions also as a chamber for all master's programmes.

The board reviews the assessment plans and assessment and testing programmes and perform file checks. In 2020 the digital archives of the Corpo-real programme were checked by the board. The programme notes that the feedback was used to be even more precise in assessment documentation and archiving of documents. In addition, a changes has been made in more differentiation between feedback and feedforward text in the assessment forms and the connection

between the assessment criteria and the feedback has been made more specific.

During the site visit, the committee met with representatives of the board of examiners. It was confirmed that the board checks the student files of the programme every two years. As a result of the latest check, the board remarked that the feedback given to students on their final work was rather personal and not always related to the intended learning outcomes (or competences). During the check, the board also reviews the coherence and the alignment between the formative and the summative assessments.

In addition, the board yearly checks the alignment between the programme and the assessments, before the start of a new academic year. It was noted that the board also appoints the examiners and that starting academic year 2021 - 2022, examiners will be appointed for one year. Examiners are expected to have obtained the basic examination qualification and should keep this updated every two years.

The board was consulted in increasing the formative assessments in the Corpo-real programme.

As mentioned before, during the lockdown in the spring of 2020, all education was organised online. In academic year 2020 - 2021 most education could be continued in a reasonable normal manner, with regard to the relevant guidelines. The summative assessments were scheduled 'live' in the programme's LAB in Zwolle. If a student was unable to join a summative assessment for example due to self-quarantine, the presentation was re-scheduled or held online.

Considerations

The committee considers that an adequate system of assessment is in place. The quality assurance of the assessment system is adequate. The measures taken to guarantee the validity, reliability and transparency of the assessments match the formative and subjective assessments within art education. These include using the four-eye principle and assessment criteria when possible.

The board of examiners is pro-active in safeguarding the quality of the assessments. Each year, the board randomly checks the quality of graduation projects. The committee is pleased that examiners are expected to keep their qualifications up to date.

Based on the interviews and examination of the underlying documentation, the committee establishes that the programme **meets this standard**.

Achieved learning outcomes

The committee concludes that graduates of the programme achieve the required master level and intended learning outcomes (or competences). The committee also establishes that the programme has an adequate graduation procedure in place. Based on the student files studied and visiting the graduation exhibition the committee concludes that the achieved level is adequate. The committee considers the level of writing in studied theses to be quite high. Going forward, the physical outcomes in the exhibition of the programme can be further developed. The discussions with students and alumni confirmed the adequate level of the programme; they seem capable of creating their own career path. This was attested by the overview of current practices of alumni.

Standard 11: The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

The programme is completed with the finals track. During this track, the graduation phase, students work on their final project in which the findings and experiences of all programme components are brought together. Students assume the role of an independent functioning designer/artist, who is able to organise and structure their own work process. Students develop their individual research questions and in line with that, develop their graduation themes.

In this phase of the programme, students are responsible for determining the choice of topic and formulating the assignment.

The formulation of the assignment is based on a personal vision and areas of interest as well as ongoing social and professional development. With the formulation of their assignment, students demonstrate their ability to formulate a problem statement. The research conducted in the research paper (see standard 2) will be included in the graduation proposal.

The programme is responsible for specifying the duration and ensuring the assessment of the graduation process, and for inviting visiting critics and appointing the independent experts (external critic) during the final presentation.

Students are coached by a core tutor (weekly consultations) and a guest tutor (on a regular basis).

During the process in semester 3 two visiting critics are invited to visit the students in their studio to reflect on their research and design. These critics speak individually with the students. The programme notes that this stimulates the independence of the students. And provides the critics the freedom to speak about the research without any prior knowledge of the process. Afterwards there will be a short exchange between the head, tutor and critic to assure that their thoughts and advice will be part of next steps in the graduation process.

Once the graduation assignment has been determined and approved, in semester 4 the actual graduation project will continue. The progress of the graduation project is monitored during Expert 1 and 2; two preliminary reviews. During these reviews, the academic results presented by the student are evaluated. The student's tutor, guest tutor and the head are present during the review. The review is planned for the group of graduating students as a whole.

The second review, also functions as a 'green light' meeting. The quality of the research and design presented by the student is assessed in order to determine whether the student may proceed with the graduation phase. The programme notes that the maximum period between the second review and the graduation presentation is designed to facilitate an optimal presentation of the plan.

The thesis upon graduation comprises a report of the graduation including a theory paper. This includes a justification of the choice of topic, the problem statement, the research and design assignment, the theoretical research in the paper and a presentation of the design.

The programme is finalised with the graduation presentation; the final assessment to determine the student's ability and skill. The tutors, the head and the external critic are all involved as examiners. The graduation presentation includes an explanation of the graduation project by the student and a discussion between the examiners and the student.

The external critic has an important role in ensuring the quality of the graduation presentation and the assessment of the student. The external critic determines whether the graduation project has been conducted and evaluated according to the applicable graduation regulation, in terms of procedure as well as content. In addition, the external critic evaluates the graduation level. The external critic is an (interior) architect or designer who is independent, and has not recently worked for the programme.

The programme presented an overview of alumni and their positions. Alumni work as an interior architect, interior designer, designer or researcher in their own business or project or at existing organisations. In addition, alumni have started or finished the two year professional experience programme that allows them to register as an interior architect (see standard 1). One of the alumni was granted the ArtEZ Zwolle Academy prize for excellence and the programme's candidate for Archiprix NL 2021 was assessed excellent during the final exam.

Considerations

The committee concludes that the programme has an adequate graduation procedure in place. In assessing students final work, multiple examiners are involved including an external expert / critic.

The committee reviewed the final work of fifteen students. This included the results of case-study 3, the exam presentation and film, the thesis, the research paper and a representation of the exhibition. Moreover, during the site visit the committee visited the graduation exhibition of the students that recently graduated. The committee concludes that the overall quality of the studied theses is adequate and that graduates achieve the required level. The committee notes that quality of the writing is good. The theses studied by the panel represent the programmes focus on research. The discussions with the students during the graduation exhibition also reflected this focus.

In addition, the themes of the works were quite interesting ranging from inclusion and exclusion to temporary construction in architecture and changing concepts.

As mentioned in standard 1, the programme allows for students to pursue their own interest. And this is reflected in the work presented and confirmed in the conversations the committee had with the students during the graduation exhibition.

Related to the graduation exhibition the committee noted that the detailing and the use of the materials of the works exhibited could receive more care. It was noted by the programme however (see also standard 2), that in the finals and the graduation exhibition students present their knowledge. The work presented should tempt the visitor to read the research. It was remarked that the search for the best format in doing this is an ongoing search. Even though the committee respects this and acknowledges this search, it is also of the opinion that if there is a physical outcome (work), the expectations of that regarding tectonic, spatial and material sensibility should be high. In addition, the committee encourages the programme to further develop its positioning regarding existing ways of presentation within the field of interior architecture.

The meetings with students and alumni during the site-visit confirmed the adequate level of the final work. The students and alumni the committee met with, seem capable of creating their own career path and practice. This was attested by the presented overview of current practices of alumni.

Based on the interviews and examination of the underlying documentation, the committee establishes that the programme **meets this standard**.

Attachments

Attachment 1 Assessment committee

Drs. R.R. (Raoul) van Aalst, voorzitter: independent consultant and trained as a chair

Prof. Jan Kampshoff: tutor at TU Berlin

Elma van Boxel: architect at Zones Urbaines Sensibles

Prof. Peter Thule Kristensen: Head of the Master Programme Spatial Design, University of Copenhagen

Jeroen Steegmans, student member: Master's student UU

The panel was supported by Titia Busing, certified secretary. This panel was presented to NVAO, all members plus the secretary have signed a declaration of independence and confidentiality.

Attachment 2 Program of the assessment

1 July 2021

Time	What
15.45 - 16.00	Arrival of committee in the church
16.00 - 16.30	Key-note introduction of the Corpo-real programme by the head of the programme
16.30 - 18.00	Committee visiting the exhibition and meeting some Corpo-real graduates 2021
19.00 - 21.00	Committee diner with preparational talk in a separate salon

2 July 2021

Time	What
08.30 - 9.00	Arrival of committee
9.00 - 10.15	Block 1: management, tutors and alumni
10.15 - 10.30	Break
10.30 - 11.15	Walk through the LAB with 1 st year student presentations
11.15 - 11.30	Break
11.30 - 12.30	Block 2: tutors, programme coordinator and students
12.30 - 13.45	Lunch walk-in session and checking documents
13.45 - 14.15	Block 3: examination board
14.15 - 14.30	Break
14.30 - 15.30	Block 4: students and alumni
15.30 - 17.00	Internal follow up discussion committee
17.00	Public feedback by the chair / committee

Attachment 3 Documents

- Self-evaluation report
- Corpo-real course briefs
- Corpo-real in times of corona
- Corpo-real language requirements
- Critical review Corpo-real January 2018
- Minutes ArtEZ IA meeting 14 january 2021
- ArtEZ organogram
- Institutional plan: Here at the centre of the world
- Perched on a hyphen Graduate School identity
- Corpo-real study guide 2020 - 2021
- OBK Bachelor profile Fine Art and Design
- OBK Master profile Fine Art and Design
- Corpo-real matrix master competences
- ArtEZ Research Manifest ArtEZ Professorships
- List of literature
- ArtEZ Education Vision
- Corpo-real Pedagogics and assessment
- Cultural awareness workshop content
- Overview enrolments cohort 2021 - 2023
- Corpo-real admissions procedure
- Overview Corpo-real scholarships
- Overview tutors and staff
- ArtEZ recruitment and professionalisation plan
- ArtEZ Housing plan 2018 - 2027
- General overview of talks with students
- Notes talk dossier control EC
- EER master courses 2020 - 2021
- EER Corpo-real 2020 - 2021
- Incoming and outgoing students
- ArtEZ vision on assessment policies
- Corpo-real overview of alumni
- Graduation files of 15 students