

**Sandberg Instituut
Master of Arts in
Fine Art and Design**

*Report of the extended programme assessment
4 and 5 July 2019*

Colophon

Sandberg Instituut
Fred. Roeskestraat 96
1076 ED Amsterdam

Programme: Master of Arts in Fine Art and Design
Location: Amsterdam
Mode of study: Fulltime
Croho-registration: 49114

Assessment committee

René Kloosterman, chair
Rhea Dall, domain expert
Wayne Modest, domain expert
Paul Goodwin, domain expert
Bert Mosselmans, domain expert
Vera van der Burg, student member
Titia Buising, secretary

The committee was presented on 13 December 2018 to the NVAO for approval.

The assessment was conducted under the responsibility of
AeQui VBI
Vlindersingel 220
3544 VM Utrecht
www.AeQui.nl

This document is best printed double sided.

v2

Contents

Colophon	2
Introduction	9
Intended learning outcomes	12
Programme.....	14
Staff	19
Facilities and tutoring.....	21
Quality assurance.....	23
Assessment.....	25
Achieved learning outcomes.....	27
Appendices.....	29
Appendix 1 Assessment of the distinctive feature	30
Appendix 2 Assessment committee	39
Appendix 3 Programme site visit	40
Appendix 4 Studied documents	43

Summary

On 4 and 5 July an AeQui committee assessed the master programme in Fine Art and Design of Sandberg Instituut. The overall judgement of the committee is **positive**; the quality of the programme meets the standards. The programme consists of different standing and temporary programmes and has a duration of two-years.

Intended learning outcomes

The committee concludes that the intended learning outcomes meet the standard. The intended learning outcomes of the programme tie in with (inter)national requirements for (international) fine art and design and are in tune with the demands from the professional field. The committee notes that the standing and the temporary programmes each have their own distinct profile and that the focus on trans-disciplinarity, unlearning and (educational) innovation is very strong. Moreover, there is a common commitment to criticality as a central part of creativity.

The temporary programmes are a bold experiment in mobilising temporality in art education in order to respond to current issues and conditions. This is also reflected in the discussion of important themes such as decolonialisation, diversity and inclusiveness in the courses. The programme has adequate contacts with the professional field.

Programme

The committee assesses that the standards related to the programme are met. The programme proficiently addresses professional and research skills. Self-exploration by students is stimulated and students are actively involved in creating the programme. The courses offer students various disciplinary and interdisciplinary contacts with external tutors/artists. Research is aimed at sustaining students practice. The committee appreciates the development of a plus-trajectory for students aiming to pursue a PhD, as this will cater to the need of some students.

Within the general framework, all courses have their own distinctive character, approach and (strong) identity. The committee noted that the courses interact very little with each other and do not yet benefit from each other's strong assets. Especially the interaction between the standing and the temporary programmes is quite limited.

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. An adequate balance is maintained between individual and group work fitting for the character and goals of the course. Students are challenged to work as a collective and / or to support each other.

Even though the courses are quite different in their approach, all courses truly succeed in creating effective learning communities with a strong focus on self-directed and student-centred learning. The courses, both standing and temporary, are able to create an ongoing conversation with their students about their work and research. The courses are flexible and offer ample room for student led initiatives. The legal enrolment criteria are applicable.

Staff

The committee assesses that the programme meets this standard. The heads, tutors and coordinators are very committed, competent and rigorous. All have their own (international) practice, as artist, designer, researcher, writer, curator, director or any other art and design related practice.

The committee understands the need for temporary contracts to uphold the topicality of the programme. It notes however that this should involve a great awareness of the care it takes to balance this and of the precarity involved for freelance staff. The coordinators have an important and demanding role in the courses. The committee questions whether the appointment of the coordinators matches their responsibilities and workload.

Even though the composition of the staff is quite international, the committee notes that the staff is in general quite white and Euro-American. The committee wonders if this predominantly composition of the staff, does not contradict the school's desire

for diversity, especially in the current climate when questions of representation are becoming increasingly relevant (as part of decolonial and democratising impulses in the school's own education and curricula) and the school's desire to attract students from all over the world. Moreover, the committee wonders whether the current management, heads and teaching staff are sufficiently capable of addressing issues that may emerge from attracting students from across the world where greater demands are being made for more inclusive education.

Facilities

The committee concludes that the standards regarding facilities (standard 7) and tutoring (standard 8) are met. The new building in which Sandberg is housed, offers ample working space for students and the opening hours are very accommodating. In addition, the proximity of the Gerrit Rietveld Academy offers students the possibility of using the academies workshops. Adequate tutoring is available for students. The tutoring ties in with the independence expected from students in a master programme. The committee notes however that the care and support system for students can be improved.

Quality Assurance

The committee assesses that the programme meets this standard. An efficient quality assurance system is in place. The system contains checks and balances to ensure the quality of the programme and the different standing and temporary programmes it comprises. Relevant stakeholders such as students, tutors and the professional field are involved. The committee supports the establishment of the student circle. Students in general feel heard and courses adapt and change due to students feedback. Students have an important role in (re)shaping the courses.

The institute leaves room for students and staff to raise questions in the organisation. The committee notes that initiatives such as the Black Students Union and the Asian Student Union have been initiated by students. The committee encourages the management of the institute to be more mindful of the reasons students started these unions and to ensure that all students (and staff) feel cared for.

As a rule, the programme yearly invites external referents to review the courses and the level of student's graduation work. These reviews are in-depth and critical, and contribute significantly to the ongoing development and quality culture of the programme.

Assessment

The assessment committee concludes that the programme has an adequate system of assessment in place, and that the programme meets this standard. The quality assurance of the assessment system is sufficient. 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, involvement of external jurors and assessment criteria. The examinations board is active in safeguarding the quality of the assessments.

Achieved learning outcomes

The committee assesses that the programme meets this standard. An effective graduation procedure is in place. All courses are finalised with a thesis and a graduation project focusing on students practical work. In assessing students final work, multiple examiners including external examiners are involved.

The work presented by students and alumni during the site-visit, matches the goals and visions of the courses. In addition, the studied theses were of high quality and reflect the programme's principle that the thesis can take different forms. In assessing the end level of the programme and the work of the students, the committee agrees with the external referents. Even though there are differences between the quality of the work in each course, the committee concludes that in general of the studied works and theses are of high quality. The meetings with students and alumni during the site-visit confirmed the high level of the courses and the final work.

In some of the work however, the difference in students background and their (lack of) experience with the chosen medium / form was visible. The committee notes that this might be inherent to an interdisciplinary programme, where students with different backgrounds decide to work in a new medium. The committee is also of the opinion that the criticality

aimed for by the programme is (in general) not yet visible in the final work.

Distinctive feature:

Small scale and intensive education

Intended learning outcomes

The committee assesses this standard positively. It concludes that the intended learning outcomes are aimed at realising an above-average level in one or more academic discipline(s) and/or professional practices in the domain concerned. Education at the master's programme in Fine Art and Design is open for initiatives from students; students structure their study trajectory within the context of the general programme for which they can propose workshops, guests, excursions etc. This allows them to achieve a high level within the area of their own choosing, which is often trans-disciplinary. The distinction between curriculum and what is outside the curriculum is not very strict, so personal attitudes and skills (e.g. organising workshops, presenting, traveling and working in an international environment) are tied closely to both curriculum and extra-curricular activities. This also contributes to broadening and development of related personal attitudes and skills such as critical reflection about broader cultural and societal contexts, effective oral and textual communication, and cooperation with other professionals.

Curriculum Content

The committee assesses this standard positively. It concludes that the curriculum and the extracurricular activities are inextricably connected. As described, the curriculum and extracurricular activities match the level of the programme and reflect the specific focus of each course of the programme. The distinction between curriculum and what is outside the curriculum is not very strict, so personal attitudes and skills (e.g. organising workshops, presenting, traveling and working in an international environment) are tied closely to both curriculum and extra-curricular activities. Heads and tutors organise the setup of the programme and have a decisive vote, but for a large part initiatives and proposals for parts of programme come from the students, these are awarded (or not) after group discussions. Students also participate in workshops set up within other courses: what is a part of the curriculum for

one student, becomes extra-curricular for another. Whereas the external reviewers suggested that more interdepartmental coordination, also initiated by staff and management, would be beneficial, the students did not express similar concerns and were fine with the current state of affairs.

Curriculum Learning Environment

The committee assesses this standard positively. It concludes that a small-scale and intensively designed learning environment is in place. On average the courses have between 15 to 25 students, and the education is very intense. One-on-one contact between student and tutor is at the core of the courses. On average 10% of the students requires an extra year, which is according to the committee not surprising given the challenging set-up of the courses. The courses explicitly require students to find and create their own path and reflect on their (ideas for a) professional practice. Of course, this reflection may result in changing insights about ones practice, sometimes a reset of personal study aims is required, and hence more required time for students to finish their education. Compared to, for instance, liberal arts colleges this number is not excessively high.

Intake

The committee assesses this standard positively. It notes that Sandberg Instituut receives significantly more applications than other art schools. The location of the institute in Amsterdam and its long-standing reputation contribute to this. The selection procedure is intensive and selective: less than 10% of the applicants are admitted. The selection procedure does not only include skills, but also CV, motivation and vision. The selection procedure ensures that motivated and talented students enrol the programme.

Staff: quality and quantity

The committee assesses these standards positively. It concludes that the sufficient and very competent staff is committed, rigorous and capable of realising the small scale and intensive education. All tutors have their own (international) practice, as artist, designer, researcher, writer, curator, director or any other art and design related practice. The dedication and presence of lecturers definitely contributes to

the strong “sense of community” that the committee noticed during the site-visit. The committee is in the meantime of the opinion that providing (new) staff discussing pedagogical insights by heads and tutors, cross departmental, can be beneficial for tutors and students, especially relevant for the temporary programmes, and for working with more diverse groups of students in the future.

Facilities

The committee assesses this standard positively. It concludes that the facilities of all courses involved are satisfactory. The new building in which Sandberg is housed, offers ample working space for students and the opening hours are very accommodating. Centralising all activities in the new building adds to the coherence of the courses and the establishment of a community. The proximity of the Gerrit Rietveld Academy offers students the possibility of using the academies workshops. One part of the new building is less accessible due to the absence of an elevator. The committee recommends the institute to find ways to improve this.

Realised outcomes

The committee assesses this standard positively. It concludes that the programme has an effective graduation procedure in place. All courses are finalised with a thesis and a graduation project focusing on students practical work. In assessing students final work, multiple examiners including external examiners are involved.

The work presented by students and alumni during the site-visit, matches the goals and visions of the courses. In addition, the studied theses were of high quality and reflect the programme’s principle that the thesis can take different forms. The committee concludes that in general the studied works and theses are of high quality. The meetings with students and alumni during the site-visit confirmed the high level of the courses and the final work. This was attested by the presented overview of current national and international practices of alumni.

The committee notes that the drop-out rate varies between 10 – 20% and is overall declining in the last

years. Sandberg Instituut receives more applications than other art schools, and the number of dropouts is comparable to, for instance, with the dropout rates at liberal arts colleges. Sandberg Instituut has a good name and reputation and alumni tend to get good opportunities. The committee is of the opinion that this is directly related to the small-scale and intensive education of the programme.

Recommendations

Nonetheless the positive findings on the quality of the programme, the committee makes some remarks for further development:

- The committee notes that the programme is aware of the necessity to act upon the pedagogical rigour needed in the temporary programmes. The committee notes that especially within the temporary programmes – as they commonly have a stronger focus on group work and research, which requires a specific tutoring, this should be given special attention in the future development of the programmes.
- The committee is of the opinion that the topicality and urgency of the themes addressed in the temporary programmes can be beneficial to the students of the standing courses. The committee therefore challenges the programme to consider the independent position of the temporary programmes.
- The committee noted that one part of the new building is less accessible due to the absence of an elevator. The committee recommends the institute to find ways to improve this.
- The committee supports the institutes current research into students’ needs regarding formal care and support and strongly recommends the institute to act upon the results. In addition, the committee is of the opinion that this should match the diversity of the student body.
- The committee is of the opinion that providing (new) staff with pedagogical insights can be beneficial for tutors and students, especially to assure a consistent quality of the learning environment in the temporary programmes and to assure the school’s adequacy in working with diverse groups of students.

All standards of the NVAO assessment framework are assessed positively, hence the committee awards a **positive** recommendation for the accreditation of the master programme in Fine Art and Design. The committee also assessed whether the programme ties in with the criteria for the distinctive feature regarding Small-scale Intensive Education. All standards / criteria are assessed positively, therefore the committee also awards a **positive** recommendation for awarding the distinctive feature.

On behalf of the entire assessment committee,
Utrecht, October 2019

René Kloosterman
Chair

Titia Buising
Secretary

Overview assessment

The following table shows the assessment for each standard.

Standard	Assessment
1. Intended learning outcomes	Meets the standard
2. Orientation	Meets the standard
3. Content	Meets the standard
4. Learning environment	Meets the standard
5. Intake	Meets the standard
6. Staff	Meets the standard
7. Facilities	Meets the standard
8. Tutoring	Meets the standard
9. Quality assurance	Meets the standard
10 Assessment	Meets the standard
11 Achieved learning outcomes	Meets the standard
Overall	Meets the standard

Introduction

The master programme in Fine Art and Design comprises permanent courses (or departments), temporary programmes and hosted courses. The standing courses aim to deepen the practices of artists, designers and critics. The temporary programmes reflect on specific urgencies in society and the arts and hosted programmes focus on collaboration with other institutes.

The institute

The Gerrit Rietveld Academie offers bachelor's programmes (approximately 700 students) as well as master's programmes (approximately 150 students). The latter are part of the Sandberg Instituut which comprises the main departments of Fine Arts and Design, as well as Interior Architecture.

Each department and temporary programme is led by a course director. The course director is a prominent artist, designer, theorists and curator with international practice, who invites tutors and guests who are also prominent practitioners, able to challenge the students to critically reflect on their profession, their work and their progress.

In recent years, the academy invested in the formation of a community 'in which people can totally disagree with each other'. This has resulted in a new Institution Document (2019 – 2032) as a bases for four-year institution plans. To accomplish this, broad consultation and a bottom up process have been organised. Which also leads to a shared language and a new, sustainable structure for internal conversation that respectfully involves the entire community.

The programme

The master programme in Fine Art and Design comprises four different courses (or departments): Fine Art, Critical Studies, Dirty Art Department and Design.

In addition, the programme offers temporary programmes. The current temporary programmes are Shadow Channel (finishing in 2019), Radical Cut Up (finishing in 2019), Master Design of Experiences (finishing in 2019), The Commoners

Society (started in 2018) and, Challenging Jewellery (also started in 2018). The first hosted programme, Design of Experiences, was offered in collaboration with the University of the Underground.

Temporary programmes aim to relate education at Sandberg to urgent issues and developments in the domain of art and design in its societal context. Temporary programmes also bring impulses from the outside and articulate new urgencies and visions on practice, disciplines and formats of art education.

A temporary programme exists for the duration has a duration of two years full-time, and every year two new temporary programmes are started. The institute receives eight to ten proposals per year for a temporary programme from professionals in the art and design field. Temporary programmes are selected by the director, after consulting a workgroup of staff, heads and students.

All courses offered have a small-scale and intensive character, with 15 to 25 students. The courses are offered in a fulltime modus and have a two-year duration. All courses aim to anticipate on current developments and urgencies in the domain of art and design in its societal context.

The different (standing, temporary and hosted) courses each have their own profile. The standing Critical Studies course for example, aims to offer an open, interdisciplinary environment for the development of an independent research practice and to provide a rigorous grounding in critical theory, research methods and writing techniques.

The standing Design course aims to address the contradictions of our time, by moving between reality and fantasy, chaos and systems, data and dreams. The course responds through design to world issues and aims to question the relationship between practice and politics.

The Dirty Art Department (also standing) strives to develop singular individual and collective practices, distinct from medium or subject, and to give an insight into how to place these practices into the existing contexts of art, design, performance, writing, pizza making, etc. The course's final challenge is to create new context; that is, a transformation of reality. The course has an explicit interdisciplinary character and is open to students from a variety of backgrounds.

The standing Fine Arts course focuses on autonomy and making, while addressing the social and economic roles of art production. Core to the programme are the regular conversations with the main tutors. Guest tutors are invited for seminars and tutorials throughout the year. Studio time alternates with common activities such as workshops, seminars, an annual group exhibition and excursions abroad.

The temporary programme, Challenging Jewellery, focuses on building a persuasive collective. This is defined by the course as both a corporate association and a movement, driven by a common interest in 'team spirit' and the relevance of the silent side of the beauty. The course aims to challenge the subject of jewellery on a fundamental level – how it relates to our present time. It attempts to think big on a small scale, and presumes an ability to understand 'micro-working'.

The interdisciplinary Radical Cut-Up course (also temporary) aims to critically examine and joyfully celebrate the emergence and evolution of the cut-up as a contemporary mode of creativity and a dominant global model of cultural production in the early twenty-first century. The course defines the term 'cut-up' as a mixture or fusion of disparate elements, or the art of carefully crafted juxtaposition. According to the course, the term

'cut-up' is a container for a long list of names and actions, which describes the mixing and reconfiguration of existing materials to produce new outcomes.

The temporary Shadow Channel course positions itself as a utopian platform commissioning, streaming, and distributing counter-narratives created by underrepresented voices, in response to platform capitalism, post-truth politics and the rise of neo-fascism. Students operate as a renegade production studio, running a deep stream narrating the real, playing documentaries, music videos and life feeds in the shadows of the internet. The course aims to locate, study and develop new platforms for making art in the shadows of mainstream media. For the duration of the course, the channel streams from the deep web and from within cinemas, galleries, clubs and festivals across the Netherlands.

The Commoners' Society course (also temporary) aims to look for new ways of living, making, owning, sharing, managing and maintaining. The course also describes this as models for 'a new commoning'. The proposals developed will be manifold, conceptual and hands on, and tested 'on the ground'. By using visual, digital, and performative tools the interdisciplinary course aims to propose a new kind of metropolis that is focused on social interaction and equal opportunities over financial growth and profit.

The Design of Experiences course, a hosted programme in collaboration with the University of the Underground, aims to teach students how to engineer situations, to design experiences and events to best support social dreaming, social actions and power shifts with institutions, companies and governments.

The assessment

Sandberg Instituut assigned AeQui VBI to perform a quality assessment. In close co-operation with AeQui, an independent and competent assessment committee was convened. A

preparatory meeting with representatives from the programme has taken place.

Since the panel was presented to NVAO on 15 December 2018, formally the NVAO Framework 2016 applies to this assessment. It was agreed upon with the programme to use the NVAO framework of 2018 for reporting purposes (so: 'meets the standard' instead of sufficient-good-excellent). The extended programme assessment applies.

The site visit took place on 4 and 5 July in accordance with the programme in appendix 3. Due to time restrictions the panel decided to cancel the meeting with the Board which was planned at the end of the itinerary.

The committee explicitly oriented itself on the cluster of which the programme is part. This took place during the preparatory meeting and the last committee meeting in which the final assessment

took place. Members of the committee have participated in other assessments part of this cluster.

The committee also assessed whether the programme ties in with the criteria for the distinctive feature regarding Small-scale Intensive Education. This is part of appendix 1. Bert Mosselmans was added to the committee for the assessment of this distinctive feature.

The committee assessed in an independent manner. At the conclusion of the assessment, the results were presented to representatives of the programme. The draft version of this report was sent to the programme representatives; their reactions have led to this final version of the report.

Initiated by the programme, a developmental meeting will take place in Spring 2020. The results of this meeting will not influence the assessment written down in this report.

Intended learning outcomes

The committee concludes that the intended learning outcomes have been concretised with regard to content, level and orientation and meet international requirements for (international) fine art and design and are in tune with the demands from the professional field. The programme adheres to the national master profile for Fine Art and Design. Within this framework and the intended learning outcomes, each standing and temporary programme has its own distinct profile. The focus on transdisciplinarity, criticality, unlearning and (educational) innovation is very strong. Moreover, there is a common commitment to criticality as a central part of creativity. The temporary programmes are a bold experiment in mobilising temporality in art education in order to respond to current issues. The programme has ample contacts in the (international) professional field, which contribute to the relevance and topicality of the intended learning outcomes and the programme.

Standard 1: The intended learning outcomes of the programme have been concretised with regard to content, level and orientation; they meet international requirements.

Findings

The intended learning outcomes of the programme are based on the national master profile for Fine Art and Design. This profile, established in 2017 by a workgroup representing Dutch institutes, includes four points of reference that are applicable to all master's programmes in Fine Art and Design to define the master level: context, discipline, research and self-direction. These reference points are used by the programmes to set the characteristics of policies and educational or research practices.

At Sandberg, these points of reference have been translated into the following overarching aims, that apply to all master's programmes:

- The curricula enable students to question and explore the boundaries of their professional, artistic practices.
- For this students learn to research the contemporary dynamics of the disciplines, seen in their broader cultural and societal contexts.
- Students develop an ability to take on strong and articulated positions, and communicate effectively via works, texts and presentations, before a diverse, general or professional, public.

- Students develop new skills, knowledge, and methods to design their creative processes appropriately, or they know when to tune in to skills and knowledge of others, for instance when joining a collective.
- Students operate independently as professional artists, designers, theorists or writers with an experimental and innovative approach.
- Students maintain a sound and sustainable professional practice in a dynamic of changing circumstances.
- Students learn to anticipate critically on demanding, sometimes unsettling contexts.

The academy is currently working on a new research policy, in cooperation with the lectorate on Art and Public Space. This includes exploring a new promotion trajectory, the Creative Doctus (CrD): the academy set up a network of European academies, running similar CrD trajectories, supported by an Erasmus+ programme. This initiative investigates the possibilities of having only artistic work as the outcome of a research trajectory, thus without a written dissertation.

Within the new research policy, new research projects will be positioned in three fields: the city, new materials, new technology & AI. The above mentioned lectorate is related to the first field. The academy aims to start lectorates on the other two fields as well. To stimulate new research

practices in these three fields and a new culture of 'doing research', the academy provides budgets for small scale research and challenges heads, tutors and externals to come up with proposals.

Links with professional practice

Different ways are used to align the programme with the requirements in the professional field. Lecturers, heads, tutors and guests have ample experience in the (international) field of art and design. Staff involved combine their artistic practice and/or curating, writing or research practice with their educational and teaching roles. In addition, all courses organize dialogues with the (inter)national field and the outside world by inviting guest tutors, excursions, lectures, symposia, extra-curricular projects and exhibitions. Formal feedback from external jury members (or 'crits') at midterm and final assessments includes reflection with the head of the course and teaching staff on the relevance for the aims, content and outcome of the course generally. In addition, students are expected to have their own practice.

Moreover, courses have their own manner of interacting with the professional field. For example, the temporary programme Challenging Jewellery has an advisory board, comprising four key figures in the field of jewellery and design. The board provides the course with input based on intergenerational dialogue.

Considerations

Based on interviews and the examination of underlying documentation, the committee

concludes that intended learning outcomes of the programme tie in with (inter)national requirements for (international) fine art and design and are in tune with the demands from the professional field. The committee also notes that the standing and the temporary programmes each have their own distinct profile (see also introduction).

Based on the discussions held during the site visit, the committee concludes that the focus on transdisciplinarity, criticality, unlearning and (educational) innovation is very strong. Moreover, there is a common commitment to criticality as a central part of creativity.

The temporary programmes are a bold experiment in mobilising temporality in art education in order to respond to current issues and conditions. This is also reflected in the discussion of important themes such as decolonialisation, diversity and inclusiveness in the courses.

The committee concludes that the programme has adequate contacts with the professional field, which contribute to the relevance and topicality of the different standing and temporary programmes. Staff involved have ample (international) professional experience; guest lecturers (practising artists, designers, curators and researchers) are invited on a regular base and students are expected to have their own practice.

Based on the above, the committee assesses this meets the standard

Programme

The committee concludes that the programme enables students to realise the intended learning outcomes. Even though the different standing and temporary programmes have a different learning route, the before mentioned intended learning outcomes are shared by and visible in each of the courses. The courses ground students in relation to their practices. Self-exploration by students is stimulated and students are actively involved in creating their own programme. The courses offer students various disciplinary and interdisciplinary contacts with external tutors/artists. The committee noted that the standing and temporary programmes interact very little with each other and do not yet benefit from each other's strong assets. The structure of the learning environment and the small and informal scale of the courses allow for interactive and intensive contact between students and tutors and an individual 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

In all courses professionals (practicing artists, designers, researchers, curators etcetera) provide guest lectures or are involved as a guest tutor. Staff members also bring their own ample experience as practicing (international) artist, designer or researcher and contacts to the programme. In addition, students are expected to bring in their own practice. Moreover, the courses organise dialogues with the (inter)national field and the outside world through excursions, lectures, symposia, extra-curricular projects and exhibitions. These activities are planned with involvement of students and/or alumni, and take place inside and outside the institute, in a local and (inter)national (extended) art context.

At the standing Fine Art course for example professionals from the Dutch art scene are invited in the last two months of the programme, for a series of short studio visits (blind dates) with all graduates. This is to encourage students to speak about their work clearly in a limited amount of time. At the standing Dirty Art department one day masterclasses are held with a guest tutor who gives a lecture and meets with students to respond to their research subjects.

The temporary Shadow Channel course organises monthly multi-day seminar programme of presentations, lectures and workshop by visiting artists.

Research at Sandberg aims at offering students the tools to sustain their own professional practice and to contribute to the development of the profession. According to the institute, the ability to do research in a more linear, outcome focused and methodological manner, is an essential and integral part of the creative process for any artistic practice at master's level. Research is focused at answering questions that are important for creating the work, for example figuring out certain material, substantive or theoretical matters. Research and making are always connected. In addition, research helps students to gain a better picture of their own position and to develop a vision.

Research is addressed in the programme by reading and analysing relevant literature and in the thesis writing trajectory. The latter is elaborated on in standard 11. In addition, research is also brought in relation to practice, as students are expected to elaborate on the relation between theory and practice throughout the programme. And in the final project, where students have to make clear the reciprocity between theory and practice.

The shape of research varies per course and student. This varies from rigorous, almost academic research to translating practice into forms of conceptual explications. In the latter, the theoretical

work can have similar forms to the 'physical' work and the written work is usually experimental.

Students of the standing Fine Arts course write an essay in the first year, on a research topic that is formulated by the essay tutor and explored with students during a seminar and in individual discussions. At the standing Dirty Art department, research can result in different formats such as a report on the practice, a thematic essay, creative writing or any combination of these three. Research at the temporary Shadow Channel course can have the character of theoretically grounded technological research.

In the standing Critical Studies course, students are expected to develop their own research project in the first and second year. The format is flexible, varying from an exhibition, a film, a publication, a live performance, a radio play or a combination of these. All research projects include a written component. The Critical Studies course is currently developing a plus-trajectory for students with an ambition to pursue a PhD, for all courses. This enables students to require the specific research skills and methodological competencies and avoids that the more 'academic' thesis criteria become the only standard for all students.

Considerations

The committee concludes that the programme proficiently addresses professional and research skills. Self-exploration by students is stimulated and students are actively involved in creating their own programme. The courses offer students various disciplinary and interdisciplinary contacts with external tutors/artists. The committee also concludes that research skills are sufficiently being addressed in each course. Research is aimed at sustaining students practice and it's form differs per course and student. The committee appreciates the development of a plus-trajectory for students aiming to pursue an PhD, as this will cater to the need of some students.

Based on the above, the committee assesses this meets the standard.

Content

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

Findings

The programme uses a general framework, in which each course can make their own accentuates. Within the general framework, the programme is divided into four semesters each comprising 30 EC. In the first semester, students are introduced to each other and the programme and start to formulate their individual plan, embark on their self-initiated projects, participate in collective projects and are introduced to tools for studying projects, writing practices and methods of research. In the second semester, students further elaborate and articulate their initial motivation or research question into a plan for their thesis and final project. In the third semester (second year) students of the first and second year attend the same educational activities, work on their plan for their graduation project, and their self-initiated projects, and finalise their thesis. The fourth semester comprises the finalisation of the thesis and the execution of the graduation plan. In addition, students also work on their self-initiated projects.

Within this general structure, courses slightly differentiate. The standing Dirty Art Department for example focuses explicitly on interdisciplinarity and de-disciplining. An important part of the course is the toolbox, in which the results of workshops, student lectures etcetera are collected. The toolbox contributions can also become projects.

The standing Fine Arts course comprises three open modules: Language, Image and Play/Object. The first module is concerned actual language as well as 'language as description' and the languages of what is seen, heard and written. The second module addresses the notion of

representation, time and context in various visual and audio-visual practices. The latter module focuses on contemporary constructions of 'performativity' and object-based productions within a cross-disciplinary, public context.

The structure of the temporary programmes is comparable; however, the focus is slightly different. The temporary programmes focus on one pre-articulated theme or topic in art and society, that aligns the institute to the world. Some temporary programmes function as a collective research group, others as a bundle of individual trajectories focusing on one topic.

In the temporary Challenging Jewellery course, students are expected to organise themselves to become a company. In doing so, students are supported by studio visits in which they can learn from other functioning models of established practitioners.

The first year of temporary Design of Experiences course is organised around briefs, which present a certain topic and assignment to work on. In the second year, students develop design events, products, experiences, political outcomes and experimental actions in collaboration with institutions and experts of their choosing. Students are expected to document both the process and the results.

Several student and initiatives have started such as PUB Radio, where students from different courses collaborate on broadcasting. This has also led to initiatives such as PUB TV and PUB Journal. Students are also engaged in inviting guest tutors and in giving workshops or lectures themselves. PS is an initiative in which publications and exhibitions based on the phenomena, topics, people and activities of the Sandberg Instituut community are developed. In addition, a project with the Dutch National Opera and the University of Amsterdam is organised each year, where students from different departments work together on creating a short opera (for a live audience).

Alumni and students are content with the programme they attended, the site-visit revealed. Alumni however also noted that the feeling of being lost, which they consider to be a kind of common in an art school, was more present in the temporary programmes.

Considerations

The committee concludes that the content of the programme (the standing and temporary programmes) enables students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. During the site-visit, the committee also noted that the literature used in the programme are up-to-date and relevant for a master programme in Fine Art and Design.

The committee concludes that within the general framework, all courses have their own distinctive character, approach and (strong) identity. Based on the above, the committee assesses this meets the standard.

The committee also noted that the courses interact very little with each other and do not yet benefit from each other's strong assets. Especially the interaction between the standing and the temporary programmes seems limited. The committee is of the opinion that the topicality and urgency of the themes addressed in the temporary programmes can be beneficial to the students of the standing courses. The committee therefore challenges the programme to reconsider the relation between the temporary and standing courses.

Learning environment

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

Findings

As mentioned before, all courses have a small-scale character, with 15 to 25 students per course. In the first year, the courses are geared towards students articulating their personal trajectory, starting from their initial motivation. In this

individual trajectory, students are guided by their main tutor. To broaden students context and feed or challenge their individuality, the courses offer several educational formats. For example, regular group meetings with external critics for discussions and informal feedback, thesis writing, visits by guest tutors, lecturers, workshops and studio projects as well as internal and external presentations, screenings and public exhibitions. In addition, reading groups are held, publications are made and excursions and boot camps are organised. In general, most lectures, workshops and seminars etcetera are held in the first semester. After that, students individual and collective practices take in a more central place.

At the beginning of each semester, students are involved in filling in the programme and the invitation of guest tutors and guest lecturers. The execution of the programme and the contribution of the professionals involved is evaluated on a regular basis with students. The head of each course is responsible for the final decisions in these matters.

In the standing Fine Arts course for example, regular conversations of students with their main tutor are at the core of the course. In addition, guest tutors are invited for seminars and tutorials throughout the year, and annual group exhibitions and excursions abroad are organised. Students meet with staff several times per year to discuss common interests that have arisen and that can be addressed by inviting experts. The course offers room for student's initiatives such as group critics, film nights and Monday lunches.

At the standing Critical Studies course, theory, research and writing seminars are held. In addition, students are expected to present their work (in a colloquia) once a year by giving a small seminar. For these seminars an external guest is invited to give feedback.

Students of the (standing) Design course end the first year with at least one self-initiated project, a

research proposal for the second year and a summer reading list. The course offers classes, individual meetings, guest lectures, excursions and bootcamps etcetera. In the second year, students engage in collective events and make choices for collective classes, excursions and other events. Students write their thesis (graduation essay) and a graduation proposal. The final semester starts with an international residency in which students test their graduation proposal in a different reality. The final months are dedicated to graduation project.

The first year of temporary Design of Experiences course consists of weekly theory classes, sports classes, a series of talks and discussions on various topics, evening screenings of documentary films, weekly discussions of one piece of writing and self-directed studies run by students in the form of group discussions.

In addition to the before mentioned monthly seminar programme (see standard 2) the temporary Shadow Channel course comprises weekly classes by the main tutors, monthly classes on topics such as protest and activism in art and film and race, gender and austerity politics.

During the site-visit students and alumni remarked that the more they put in the course, the more they got back from the course. With regards to this it was also noted that for this to work, it is important for students to know what to ask or where to look. And for students without a practical background in art and design, this can be quite challenging. Alumni also remarked that, especially for the temporary programmes, some extra pedagogical rigour could be helpful.

In addition, students remarked that the courses find a fitting balance between structured activities and individual time for students to work on their practice. Students also added that the different departments organise a lecture programme, open for all Sandberg students.

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. The committee notes that the different standing and temporary programmes maintain an adequate balance between individual and group work fitting for the character and goals of the course. Students are challenged to work as a collective and / or to support each other. This is most explicit in the Challenging Jewellery course, where students aim to form a company together.

The committee concludes that the courses are quite different in their approach to match their respective goals. The committee values these differences, since all courses truly succeed in creating effective learning communities with a strong focus on self-directed and student-centred learning. The courses, both standing and temporary, are able to create an ongoing conversation with their students about their work and research. The courses are flexible and offer room for student led initiatives.

Based on the above, the committee assesses this meets the standard.

The committee recommends the programme to be aware of and if necessary act upon the pedagogical rigour needed in the temporary programmes. The committee notes that especially within the temporary programmes - directed towards a very specific subject matter and thus often create a strong focus on group-work - assuring that the skills, needs, and questions of the individual student is being met and developed should be given special attention in the future development of the programmes.

Intake

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

Findings

The legal enrolment criteria apply to the programme and the (temporary) courses it comprises. The programme aims for small scale and intensive education and individual guidance and has an intensive and selective admission procedure in place.

Students are selected by a jury. The jury consists of the head of the course (chair), students, tutors, the coordinator and externals representing the professional field. The jury evaluates the student's digital application, including information about their previous education, current practice, network, body of work, motivation and their possible contribution to the courses 'collective' working ways. A first selection of students is invited for an interview, during which their level of English language, general attitude and ability to learn are checked. After the interview, the programme decides on the admittance of the students.

Since the temporary programmes have a slightly different character and aim for more research as a group, extra care is given to check the expectations of candidates wanting to enrol these courses.

Considerations

The committee concludes that the legal enrolment criteria are applicable to the programme. With and within the different standing and temporary programmes, the programme meets different backgrounds and interests of the students. The intensive and selective selection procedure ensures that motivated students enrol the programme.

Based on the above, the committee assesses this meets the standard.

Staff

Based on the site-visit and the documents studied, the committee concludes that the staff involved in the programme is very competent and approachable. In addition, the composition of the staff reflects the international practice of the different courses and lecturers have ample (international) academic and professional experience in their field. The committee notes however that the staff is quite white and Euro-American oriented. In addition, the committee notes that the afore mentioned criticality towards themes such as decolonialisation, diversity and inclusiveness should also be reflected in the staff involved.

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 core team of a course consist a head, a coordinator and minimally one main tutor. Heads are responsible for the artistic direction of the course, based on their own content related expertise. Staff of the programme, including the heads of the courses, is usually hired on a flexible basis. According to the programme, this ensures that the programme can tune to changing developments by inviting new staff and expertise.

In principle, heads of standing courses are contracted for a period of eight years. Evaluation takes place after three, five and eight year. Leaving heads propose successors to the director. The director is, after consultation of other heads and staff members, responsible for appointing new heads. To safeguard the continuity of the courses, current coordinators stay at least one year when a new head is appointed. Coordinators of standing courses are also appointed for a period of eight years. Coordinators are responsible for facilitating the education and for the administration concerning education and management. A buddy system is available, where more experienced coordinators support new coordinators. Heads and coordinators of temporary programmes are appointed for two or more years.

The institute's and the heads networks are used for recruitment, as well as public job openings. To work at Sandberg, a close connection to the

working field and some educational experiences are a prerequisite. Tutors are appointed for one academic year, with the option of extending one year; evaluations take place halfway through the year. The academy offers PhD trajectories for teaching staff, in cooperation with universities.

Currently, 10 fte teaching staff are involved in the programme (all departments and temporary programmes). This includes heads, (main)tutors, guest lecturers/tutors, medialab, workshops etc., but excludes hours within extracurricular projects in which students take part. All heads and most tutors hold a master's degree, two heads hold a PhD and one is pursuing. In the academic year 2017 – 2018 between 10 and 20 (international) guest lecturers were involved per department. The student – teaching staff (fte) ratio was 15/1 (including guest lecturers and tutors).

All tutors are active in the field of art and design and combine their own practice with teaching.

The site-visit revealed that students and alumni are in general quite content with their tutors. They appreciate the small scale and informal character of the programme, their tutors support and guidance. They also noted however, that not all tutors see teaching as part of their practice and therefore are not always able to effectively communicate with students regarding their needs. The committee learned during the meeting with heads of programmes that there is no pedagogical training for (new) staff and that this also not needed according to the heads involved. The heads value the Unsettling initiative (see also

standard 9), as the activities organised address relevant themes such as diversity and inclusivity.

The site-visit also made clear that the appointment of new staff and the start of new temporary programmes are both fast paced process and that the transparency of these processes can be improved.

Considerations

Based on the interviews conducted during the site visit and the provided information about the lecturers, the committee concludes that tutors are very committed, competent and rigorous. All tutors have their own (international) practice, as artist, designer, researcher, writer, curator, director or any other art and design related practice.

Based on the above, the committee assesses this meets the standard.

The committee understands the need for temporary contracts to uphold the topicality of the programme. It notes however that this should involve a great awareness of the care it takes to balance this and of the precarity involved for freelance staff. The site-visit made clear that the coordinators have an important and demanding role in the courses. The committee questions whether the

appointment of the coordinators reflect their responsibilities and workload.

The committee is additionally of the opinion that providing (new) teaching-staff with pedagogical insights can be beneficial for tutors and students, especially to assure a consistent quality of the learning environment in the temporary programmes and to assure the school's adequacy in working with diverse groups of students.

The composition of staff is international. The committee notes that staff is in general quite white and Euro-American. The committee wonders if this predominant composition of staff does not contradict the school's desire for diversity, especially in the current climate when questions of representation are becoming increasingly relevant (as part of decolonial and democratising impulses in the school's own education and curricula) and the school's desire to attract students from all over the world. Moreover, the committee wonders whether the current management, heads and teaching staff are sufficiently capable of addressing issues that may emerge from attracting students from across the world where greater demands are being made for more inclusive education.

Facilities and tutoring

The committee concludes that an adequate infrastructure for realising the programme is in place. In the new building up-to-date workspaces, materials and educational rooms are available. The committee noted however that one part of the new building is only available by stairs and has therefore limited accessibility. The tutoring of students is adequate and reflects the small and intensive scale of the programme. However, the committee is of the opinion that the care and support system for students can be improved. It supports the institutes current research into students' needs regarding formal care and support. Sufficient facilities are in place to provide students with information about the programme and assessments, etcetera.

Facilities

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

Findings

Since December 2018, the main departments (standing courses) and two temporary programmes are located at the new Sandberg building at the Gerrit Rietveld Academie. Because of educational and content aspects, the other two temporary programmes have remained at their current location elsewhere in the city. The new building offers an open educational environment to stimulate knowledge sharing and to encounter creation as one community without noise and disturbances from each other. In addition, small auditoria for lectures, work meetings and student initiatives as well as consulting rooms, flexible workspaces are available. Students can also use the nearby workshops of the Gerrit Rietveld Academie.

Considerations

The committee concludes that the facilities of all courses involved are satisfactory. The new building in which Sandberg is housed, offers ample working space for students and the opening hours are very accommodating. In addition, the proximity of the Gerrit Rietveld Academy offers students the possibility of using the academies workshops. The committee noted however that one part of the new building is less accessible due to the absence of an elevator. The committee recommends the institute to find ways to improve this.

Based on the above, the committee assesses this meets the standard.

Tutoring

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

Students are primarily guided by their tutors, coordinator and the head of the course. Each head of course is responsible for ensuring that support also extends to the pastoral needs of students. At the beginning of the programme, students usually get assigned a main tutor, who 'has their back' throughout the two years.

At the institutional level, a dean and psychological care are available for all students. During the site visit, it became clear that the current support system does not meet the needs and diversity of the students and that the board, together with Unsettling Sandberg, is presently investigating students' needs in this.

Students and alumni remarked that the level of accessibility is not always transparent for everyone: students and alumni don't know who to contact for what within the institute. Students (and lecturers) are informed about the programme, assessment, timetables etcetera by their tutors, coordinator and the website.

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. Based on the above, the committee assesses this meets the standard.

The committee supports the institutes current research into students' needs regarding formal care and support, and recommends the institute to act upon the results.

Quality assurance

The committee concludes that the programme has an effective quality assurance system in place. The programme and the courses it comprises, are systematically evaluated and relevant stakeholders are involved in the quality assurance process. The committee supports the recently installed student circle. The committee especially emphasises the importance of structural evaluation of the temporary programmes as these are characterized by some sort of fluidity, which can complicate learning from these courses over time. The programme combines the formal system with an informal one, in which students in general feel heard. With regard to valuable student initiatives such as the Black Student Union and the Asian Student Union, the committee encourages the management of the institute to be more mindful of the reasons students started these unions and to ensure that all students (and staff) feel cared for. The committee values the use of external referents in the accreditation process; it shows the programme's criticality towards itself.

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

Heads and coordinators of the courses have a prominent role in quality assurance. Coordinators are the linking pin between head and students and the course and the institute. Coordinators address issues on behalf of the students on an informal and a formal basis. The latter during monthly meetings with staff members and bi-monthly meetings with the director and staff members. Heads and coordinators, often in duo's, address specific problems and formulate solutions in cooperation with tutors and students. Heads of temporary programmes also meet bi-monthly with staff members.

Since the institute doubled in size, the formal quality cycle involving students has changed. Currently, a new student circle is being organised for the standing courses. The student circle operates independently and addresses issues on behalf of all students. The student circle deals with issues facing the students at the level of the students. Instead of deferring to the formal structures of the institution, it hopes to act within the student body. The circle meets twice a month and consist of current students and an alumnus. The meetings concentrate on a single topic and end with a concrete action plan. The focus is on supporting

student led initiatives, promoting cross course dialogue, collating experiences and sentiments that span the institute and adding to the community through programming and thinking about the social life of the institute.

To strengthen internal and external dialogues about the education critical conversations are organised periodically for the standing courses. In these conversations, the head of a course (gives a presentation about aims, progress and results, illustrated by the works made by students over the years. Two external crits are invited to give critical feedback, as they participate in a moderated dialogue between head, staff and public. The result is used for further internal, evaluative conversation, in particular between the director and the head.

For the temporary programmes, regular sittings are held with the group of students, the policy advisor and the director. This ensures that if necessary improvements can be realised immediately, and benefit the remaining duration of the course. Recently, an overall evaluation of the temporary programmes has been held. This has led to a need for strengthening the pedagogical and didactical component of the temporary programmes. In a follow up project, this will be further investigated and evaluated.

The academy organises two-yearly student and employee surveys. Even though the response is

quite low, the open questions provide relevant check for the informal feedback.

Every year the institute invites externals (writers, curators, crits) to visit the graduation shows and write a reflection. In preparing the accreditation and site visit, also external referents were involved (see also standard 11). The external referents attended the courses for consecutive days during the final presentations of students work.

On course level, different (informal) activities are held to receive feedback from students and tutors. At the standing Fine Arts course for example, the head organises a yearly dinner with first year students and Monday lunches are held. The standing Dirty Art department organises two moments per year where tutors, coordinator and head discuss the programme collectively. The standing Critical Studies course organises monthly department lunches, office hours are planned where students can sign up for individual meetings with the head and the coordinator and the head meets with first year students at the end of the first year. At the standing Design course, students meet twice a year with the coordinator in an individual 'coffee talk'.

The self-evaluation report states that the institute recognises the need to improve the cultural diversity and inclusiveness of the organisations and the accessibility of the programmes. With regards to this, several lectures, seminars, workshops and projects, for students and staff. In addition, different student unions have been initiated by students, such as the Black Students Union and the Asian Students Union. Moreover, the Unsettling Rietveld/Sandberg initiative has started as an intra-curricular initiative between and beyond the structure and discourses of the academy to unsettle the entire institute from the roots up.

Unsettling is an initiative of the supervisory board and is a response to issues of diversity and inclusion in the school. The aim is to become more inclusive as a space and to set up protocols that deal with questions around the political positions

the school might take in the world as artists and designers.

Considerations

The committee concludes that an efficient quality assurance system is in place. The system contains checks and balances to ensure the quality of the programme and the different standing and temporary programmes it comprises. Relevant stakeholders such as students, tutors and the professional field are involved. The committee supports the establishment of the student circle.

The committee values that the institute leaves room for students and staff to raise questions in the organisation. The committee notes that initiatives such as the Black Students Union and the Asian Student Union have been initiated by students. The committee encourages the management of the institute to be more mindful of the reasons students started these unions and to ensure that all students (and staff) feel cared for.

The committee notes that the temporary programmes are part of the quality assurance system and evaluation cycle. The committee emphasises the importance of structural evaluation of these programmes as they are characterized by some sort of fluidity, which can complicate learning from these programmes over time.

Based on the discussions during the site-visit, the committee concludes that students in general feel heard and that courses adapt and change due to students feedback. Students have an important role in (re)shaping the courses.

The committee values that, as part of preparing for the site-visit and the accreditation, the programme invited external referents to review the courses and the level of student's graduation work. This leads to high level discussions about the created work.

Based on the above, the committee assesses this meets the standard.

Assessment

The committee concludes that an adequate system of assessment is in place. The intended learning outcomes are at the basis of this system. Adequate measures are taken to guarantee the validity, reliability and transparency of the assessments, by using more eyes (including external jurors) in all formal assessments, that count as graduation or final assessment and by communicating assessment procedures at an early stage. In addition, informal assessments provide students with valuable feedback from their tutors and external critics. The examinations board is active in safeguarding the quality of the assessments.

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

Findings

For each course, the formal, individual assessments take place at the end of each semester. At the end of each semester students present their work to a jury. Student's progress, what goes well or wrong, are discussed as well as what is needed to take next steps. In all courses, the results of the practical projects, research and writing are assessed in an integrated manner. In addition, external experts are involved as jury members. For these assessments, criteria are available that are based on the intended learning outcomes. The assessment criteria include creative capacities, research capacities, the ability to reflect upon oneself critically, capacity to grow and to renew and communication skills. Students receive their feedback in a written form.

When students fail the assessment or receive an 'on condition' and students have a good perspective for re-doing the year, a compensatory plan is drawn up. This is written in consultation between student, head and coordinator. The plan is checked by the examinations board.

In addition to the formal assessments, students receive feedback on their work and progress on a structural bases. This is part of the critical conversations that are held throughout each course, where students discuss their work and progress

with heads, tutors, guest tutors and fellow students.

In the standing Fine Arts course for example, informal moments of assessments range from a discussion with peers through student-led critics, first-year essay presentations or green/red light presentations. The latter aims to give second year students critical feedback in time for their graduation.

At the (standing) Dirty Art Department, the before mentioned assessment criteria are translated into the following criteria: quality and relevance of discourse, quality and relevance of cultural inscription (the world that surrounds the work), quality and relevance of design, quality and relevance of a live show or position in context, quantity of work and danger. The latter is intended to push students to extend themselves and to go outside their boundaries. The latter two criteria are not part of the final assessment / graduation. The department organises so-called checks, where three times per semester and outside of the school ateliers, students show a work in progress to guest tutors and fellow students.

In the assessments of the standing Critical Studies course, students practices are discussed as a research practice. The afore mentioned general assessment criteria have been translated into the following criteria: originality, autonomy, contextual awareness, methodological rigour and critical ability. These criteria are guiding the written feedback students receive.

The Design course introduced an informal assessment to give students the opportunity to experiment with formats and to eventually challenge the format of the formal assessments.

For the formal assessments, students of the temporary Shadow Channel course are expected to organise and to set up a small exhibition presenting their own work autonomously.

For students that fail an assessment or receive an 'on condition', remedial trajectories are available. This is because heads and tutors leave after the two-year programme ends and students have the right to enrol for a third year. For these students an individual plan is made, in cooperation with the student, head of the programme, director and examinations board. The institute appoints a coordinator and students receive a budget for a number of hours of tutoring to finalise their course. The assessment is similar to the regular assessment of the final work and preferably the former head of the temporary programme is involved.

For tutors documents are available regarding for example the setup of assessments, the composition of a jury, the use of student files, the involvement of the examinations board, etcetera. Students are informed about the assessments by their tutors, the head or the coordinator.

Students revealed that in general they are content with the assessments and the feedback they receive from their tutors. They value the discussions with their tutors and the external input and noted that there is ample room for discussions, even in disagreement.

Examinations Board

The examinations board is responsible for all programmes of the Sandberg Instituut. It consists of four members, including an external member. The board approves the jury involved in the assessments that are held at the end of each semester, approves what to do when a student fails or gets

an 'on condition' and regularly visits a selection of first year and final examinations. The latter includes an emphasis on the temporary programmes. The board also yearly checks if students dossiers are complete and the written feedback provided on the assessment forms.

The board recently conducted two surveys concerning the organisation of different parts of the assessments. The results have been discussed with thesis tutors.

During the site visit, the committee met representatives of examinations board. It became clear that the position and planning of the thesis is a recurring topic in the examinations board. The current planning of the thesis, in the third semester, is because students find it hard to work on their thesis while working on their graduation project. Even though the thesis is seen as a contextualisation of students work, students tend to approach the thesis and the graduation project autonomously. The form of the thesis can take different shapes.

Considerations

The committee concludes that an adequate system of assessment is in place. The quality assurance of the assessment system is also sufficient. 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, involvement of external jurors and assessment criteria.

The examinations board is active in safeguarding the quality of the assessments. Each year, the board randomly checks the quality of the student files. Even though the temporary programmes are not represented in the examinations board, the board is involved in the temporary programmes. For example, when students receive an 'on condition' for their assessment.

Based on the above, the committee assesses this meets the standard.

Achieved learning outcomes

Based on the studied documents and the interviews, the committee concludes that graduates of the programme achieve and exceed the required master level and intended learning outcomes. The committee also established that the programme has an adequate graduation procedure in place. Regarding the theses and the graduation projects, the committee supports the evaluations made by the external referents: the work (thesis and graduation project) of students was in general of high level and good quality. It reflected the goals of the specific course. The committee however also noted that some work reflected the difference in students background and their (lack of) experience with the chosen medium / form, which can be inherent to an interdisciplinary course. Based on the work and thesis studied the committee concludes that the achieved level is more than adequate. The discussions with students and alumni confirmed this; they seem very well capable of creating their own career path and practice. 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 graduation phase of the programme (and all standing and temporary programmes included), consists of the graduation project and the thesis. Students start working on their thesis in the third semester. In this period, students also create the plan for their graduation project. Halfway through the second year, a green light assessment takes place.

To support students in writing their thesis, a thesis-writing trajectory is available. This trajectory starts at the end of the second semester, with students formulating their individual research theme or question and ends with the presentation of the thesis. In the standing Fine Arts course for example, a reflection trip (in previous years to the arctic circle or the Isle of Lewis) is organised to stimulate students in their thesis process.

The self-evaluation report noted that students are expected to finalise their thesis in the third semester, so students do not have to work on their thesis and graduation project at the same time. This however not in line with the integral assessment of the graduation phase, where thesis and graduation project / practice are assessed on an

integral bases which allows for compensatory mechanisms between thesis and practice. At some departments (courses) this is solved by introducing a preliminary assessment of the thesis by the end of the third semester and a final assessment of the thesis during the green lights assessment or graduation. This also allows for the graduation to be a re-sit for the thesis in case a student didn't get approval during the green lights assessment.

Students are informed about the graduation phase by their tutors and heads. In addition, information is available on the website. The programme aims to bring the underlying documents (such as assessment guidelines) and information about deadlines and delivery procedures of the thesis and the documentation of the graduation project, to students attention more actively.

The institute and the programme keep in different ways in touch with alumni. The institutes website offers alumni the opportunity to share their current practices, exhibitions, subsidies and prices. In addition, alumni are interviewed for the brochure and the website, to inform future students. The institute and some courses make year-books, with information about alumni. Alumni take part in projects and exhibitions of the institute, work for the departments or are involved in

the courses by providing workshops, lectures or presentations. Alumni are also regularly involved as tutor or coordinator. For alumni of the Dirty Art department for example, the Dirty Art Foundation is available.

To support alumni in setting up a sustainable practice, the institute offers (starting) budgets for alumni and helps to connect them to a network of other (local) institutes, organisations and governmental bodies. These initiatives are currently being developed in light of a broader idea of a third cycle, in which research trajectories, sub organisations and different projects operate under one roof.

The majority of alumni the committee met with during the site visit have a broad practice, combining their practice with teaching and / or commissioned projects. Alumni remarked that the programme did not explicitly prepare them for 'the outside world' after the programme.

Considerations

The committee concludes that the programme has an effective graduation procedure in place. All courses are finalised with a thesis and a graduation project focusing on students work. In assessing students final work, multiple examiners including external examiners are involved.

The committee notes that the work presented by students and alumni during the site-visit, matches the goals and visions of the courses. In addition, the studied theses (fifteen in total) were of high quality and reflect the programme's principle that the thesis can take different forms.

Naturally there are differences between the quality of the works; the committee concludes that in general of the studied works and theses are of high quality. In assessing the end level of the programme and the work of the students, the committee also agrees with the external referents.

The work of the interdisciplinary temporary Radical Cut-up course for example showed the artistic

intent of the students and the chosen materials matched that intent. In addition, the quality of the work focused on feeling and psychological, emotional reactions to the environment.

In the work of the Fine Arts course, students dealt with current and temporary issues and the work reflected the broad scope of the course. The work of the temporary Design of Experiences course was challenging, socially engaged and ambitious. Strong theses were accompanied by strong work. The work of the Critical Studies course reflected themes such as identity, decolonialisation, health and Dutch history. The majority of students presented the final work as a combination of an art work with a lecture, presentation or panel discussion. Work presented in the latter three forms showed most theoretical strength.

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

Based on the above, the committee assesses this meets the standard.

The committee made some additional observations. The art works showed that, even though the theoretical starting points are solid, the craftsmanship has not fully developed accordingly. The committee therefore wonders whether the form of the graduation project should be free or should be subjected to criteria.

In some of the work, the difference in students background and their experience (or: limited experience) with the chosen medium / form was visible. The committee notes that this might be inherent to an interdisciplinary programme, where students with different backgrounds decide to work in a new medium.

The committee is also of the opinion that the criticality aimed for by the programme is recognisable in some of the work, but not yet in all of the final work.

Appendices

Appendix 1 Assessment of the distinctive feature

The programme currently holds the distinctive feature Small-scale Intensive Education; therefore in this assessment the committee conducted a so-called practice-assessment, based on the originally applied framework (2011). The programme's self-evaluation report included a reflection on the different standards regarding the distinctive feature.

Standard A - Intended Learning Outcomes: The objectives and intended learning outcomes are aimed at realising an above-average level in one or more academic discipline(s) and/or professional practices in the domain concerned. In addition, the programme focuses on broadening and development of related personal attitudes and skills.

Findings

The intended learning outcomes of the programme are based on the national master profile for Fine Art and Design. This profile, established in 2017 by a workgroup representing Dutch institutes, includes four points of reference that are applicable to all master's programmes in Fine Art and Design to define the master level: context, discipline, research and self-direction. These reference points are used by the programmes to set the characteristics of policies and educational or research practices.

At Sandberg, these points of reference have been translated into the following overarching aims, that apply to all master's programmes:

- The curricula enable students to question and explore the boundaries of their professional, artistic practices.
- For this students learn to research the contemporary dynamics of the disciplines, seen in their broader cultural and societal contexts.
- Students develop an ability to take on strong and articulated positions, and communicate effectively via works, texts and presentations, before a diverse, general or professional, public.
- Students develop new skills, knowledge, and methods to design their creative processes

appropriately, or they know when to tune in to skills and knowledge of others, for instance when joining a collective.

- Students operate independently as professional artists, designers, theorists or writers with an experimental and innovative approach.
- Students maintain a sound and sustainable professional practice in a dynamic of changing circumstances.
- Students learn to anticipate critically on demanding, sometimes unsettling contexts.

The programme has a strong focus on transdisciplinarity, criticality, unlearning and (educational) innovation. Moreover, there is a common commitment to criticality as a central part of creativity.

Considerations

Based on interviews and the examination of underlying documentation, the committee concludes that the intended learning outcomes are aimed at realising an above-average level in one or more academic discipline(s) and/or professional practices in the domain concerned. Education at the master's programme in Fine Art and Design starts with initiatives from students; students structure their own programme. This allows them to achieve a high level within the area of their own choosing, which is usually interdisciplinary. The distinction between curriculum and what is outside the curriculum is not very strict, so personal attitudes and skills (e.g. organising workshops, presenting, traveling and working in an international environment) are tied closely to both curriculum and extra-curricular activities. This also contributes to broadening and development of related personal attitudes and skills such

as critical reflection about broader cultural and societal contexts, effective oral and textual communication, and cooperation with other professionals.

Based on the above, the committee **positively** assesses this standard.

Standard B - Curriculum Content: The curriculum and the extracurricular activities are inextricably bound. Their contents tie in with the intended level and the broadening as formulated in the intended learning outcomes. Students and staff share responsibility for the organisation of the extracurricular activities.

Findings

In all courses professionals (practicing artists, designers, researchers, curators etcetera) provide guest lectures or are involved as a guest tutor. Staff members also bring their own ample experience as practicing (international) artist, designer or researcher and contacts to the programme. In addition, students are expected to bring in their own practice. Moreover, the courses organise dialogues with the (inter)national field and the outside world through excursions, lectures, symposia, extra-curricular projects and exhibitions. These activities are planned with involvement of students and/or alumni, and take place inside and outside the institute, in a local and (inter)national (extended) art context.

The programme uses a general framework, in which each course can make their own accentuates. Within the general framework, the programme is divided into four semesters each comprising 30 EC. In the first semester, students are introduced to each other and the programme and start to formulate their individual plan, embark on their self-initiated projects, participate in collective projects and are introduced to tools for studying projects, writing practices and methods of research. In the second semester, students further elaborate and articulate their initial motivation or research question into a plan for their thesis and

final project. In the third semester (second year) students of the first and second year attend the same educational activities, work on their plan for their graduation project, their thesis and their self-initiated projects. The fourth semester comprises the finalisation of the thesis and the execution of the graduation plan. In addition, students also work on their self-initiated projects.

Within this general structure, courses slightly differentiate. The standing Dirty Art Department for example focuses explicitly on interdisciplinarity and de-disciplining. An important part of the course is the toolbox, in which the results of workshops, student lectures etcetera are collected. The toolbox contributions can also become projects.

The standing Fine Arts course comprises three open modules: Language, Image and Play/Object. The first module is concerned actual language as well as 'language as description' and the languages of what is seen, heard and written. The second module addresses the notion of representation, time and context in various visual and audio-visual practices. The latter module focuses on contemporary constructions of 'performativity' and object-based productions within a cross-disciplinary, public context.

The structure of the temporary programmes is comparable; however, the focus is slightly different. The temporary programmes focus on one pre-articulated theme or topic in art and society, that aligns the institute to the world. Some temporary programmes function as a collective research group, others as a bundle of individual trajectories focusing on one topic.

In the temporary Challenging Jewellery course, students are expected to organise themselves to become a company. In doing so, students are supported by studio visits in which they can learn from other functioning models of established practitioners.

The first year of temporary Design of Experiences course is organised around briefs, which present a certain topic and assignment to work on. In the second year, students develop design events, products, experiences, political outcomes and experimental actions in collaboration with institutions and experts of their choosing. Students are expected to document both the process and the results.

Several student initiatives have started such as PUB Radio, where students from different courses collaborate on broadcasting. This has also led to initiatives such as PUB TV and PUB Journal. Students are actively engaged in inviting guest tutors and in giving workshops or lectures themselves. PS is an initiative in which publications and exhibitions based on the phenomena, topics, people and activities of the Sandberg Instituut community are developed. In addition, a project with the Dutch National Opera and the University of Amsterdam is organised each year, where students from different departments work together on creating a short opera (for a live audience).

The student circle is a new student group, that deals with issues facing the students at the level of the students. Instead of deferring to the formal structures of the institution, it hopes to act within the student body. The circle meets twice a month and consist of current students and an alumnus. The meetings concentrate on a single topic and end with a concrete action plan. The focus is on supporting student led initiatives, promoting cross course dialogue, collating experiences and sentiments that span the institute and adding to the community through programming and thinking about the social life of the institute.

Considerations

The committee concludes that the curriculum and the extracurricular activities are inextricably connected. The curriculum and extracurricular activities match the level of the programme and reflect the specific focus of each course of the programme.

As in mentioned in Standard A, the distinction between curriculum and what is outside the curriculum is not very strict, so personal attitudes and skills (e.g. organising workshops, presenting, traveling and working in an international environment) are tied closely to both curriculum and extra-curricular activities. Tutors participate, but the initiative comes mainly from students. Students also participate in workshops set up by others: what is a part of the curriculum for one student, becomes extra-curricular for another. Whereas the external reviewers suggested that more inter-departmental coordination, initiated by staff and management, would be beneficial, the students did not express similar concerns and were fine with the current state of affairs.

Based on the above, the committee **positively** assesses this standard.

Standard C - Curriculum Learning Environment:

The didactic concept is based on a challenging learning environment, small-scale and intensively designed education and a learning community of students and lecturers. The small-scale character and intensity of the education are evidenced by the degree of participation and preparation expected from the students. The organisation of the programme is aimed at students having a nominal study progress, including extracurricular activities.

Findings

All courses have a small-scale character, with 15 to 25 students per course. In the first year, the courses are geared towards students articulating their personal trajectory, starting from their initial motivation. In this individual trajectory, students are guided by their main tutor. To broaden students context and feed or challenge their individuality, the courses offer several educational formats. For example, regular group meetings with external critics for discussions and informal feedback, thesis writing, visits by guest tutors, lecturers, workshops and studio projects as well as internal and external presentations, screenings and public exhibitions. In addition, reading groups are

held, publications are made and excursions and boot camps are organised. In general, most lectures, workshops and seminars etcetera are held in the first semester. After that, students individual and collective practices take in a more central place.

At the beginning of each semester, students are involved in filling in the programme and the invitation of guest tutors and guest lecturers. The execution of the programme and the contribution of the professionals involved is evaluated on a regular basis with students. The head of each course is responsible for the final decisions in these matters.

In the standing Fine Arts course for example, regular conversations of students with their main tutor are at the core of the course. In addition, guest tutors are invited for seminars and tutorials throughout the year, and annual group exhibitions and excursions abroad are organised. Students meet with staff several times per year to discuss common interests that have arisen and that can be addressed by inviting experts. The course offers room for student's initiatives such as group crits, film nights and Monday lunches.

At the standing Critical Studies course, theory, research and writing seminars are held. In addition, students are expected to present their work (in a colloquia) once a year by giving a small seminar. For these seminars an external guest is invited to give feedback.

Students of the (standing) Design course end the first year with at least one self-initiated project, a research proposal for the second year and a summer reading list. The course offers classes, individual meetings, guest lectures, excursions and bootcamps etcetera. In the second year, students engage in collective events and make choices for collective classes, excursions and other events. Students write their thesis (graduation essay) and a graduation proposal. The final semester starts with an international residency in which students

test their graduation proposal in a different reality. The final months are dedicated to graduation project.

The first year of temporary Design of Experiences course consists of weekly theory classes, sports classes, a series of talks and discussions on various topics, evening screenings of documentary films, weekly discussions of one piece of writing and self-directed studies run by students in the form of group discussions.

In addition to a monthly seminar programme the temporary Shadow Channel course comprises weekly classes by the main tutors, monthly classes on topics such as protest and activism in art and film and race, gender and austerity politics.

During the site-visit students and alumni remarked that the more they put in the course, the more they got back from the course. With regards to this it was also noted that for this to work, it is important for students to know what to ask or where to look. And for students without a background in art and design, this can be quite challenging. Alumni also remarked that, especially for the temporary programmes, some pedagogical rigour could be helpful.

In addition, students remarked that the courses find a fitting balance between structured activities and individual time for students to work on their practice. Students also added that the different departments organise a lecture programme, open for all Sandberg students.

Considerations

The committee concludes that a small-scale and intensively designed learning environment is in place. On average the courses have about 20 students, and the education is very intense. One-on-one contact between student and tutor is at the core of the courses. On average 10% of the students requires an extra year, which is according to the committee not surprising given the set-up of the courses. The courses explicitly require

students to find and create their own path and practice. Of course, this may result in changing insights and hence more required time for students to finish their education. Compared to, for instance, liberal arts colleges this number is not excessively high.

Based on the above, the committee **positively** assesses this standard.

Standard D- Intake: The programme uses an adequate selection procedure aimed at the intake of motivated and academically and/or professionally talented students, with suitability for and interest in the small-scale and intensive educational concept combined with extracurricular activities being part of the criteria.

Findings

The programme aims for small scale and intensive education and individual guidance and has an intensive and selective admission procedure in place.

Students are selected by a jury. The jury consists of the head of the course (chair), students, tutors, the coordinator and externals representing the professional field. The jury evaluates the student's digital application, including information about their previous education, current practice, network, body of work, motivation and their possible contribution to the courses 'collective' working ways. A first selection of students is invited for an interview, during which their level of English language, general attitude and ability to learn are checked. After the interview, the programme decides on the admittance of the students.

Since the temporary programmes have a slightly different character and aim for more research as a group, extra care is given to check the expectations of candidates wanting to enrol these courses.

Considerations

The committee notes that Sandberg Instituut receives significantly more applications than other

art schools. The location of the institute in Amsterdam and its long-standing reputation contribute to this. The selection procedure is intensive and selective: less than 10% of the applicants are admitted. The selection procedure does not only include skills, but also motivation and vision. The selection procedure ensures that motivated and talented students enrol the programme.

Based on the above, the committee **positively** assesses this standard.

Standard E – Quality of staff: The staff demonstrably command the specific expertise and skills required to achieve the objectives of small-scale and intensive education. The programme actively monitors that teachers hold the required qualifications and, if necessary, ensures that teachers are trained in these aspects.

Findings

The core team of a course consist a head, a coordinator and minimally one main tutor. Heads are responsible for the artistic direction of the course, based on their own content related expertise. Staff of the programme, including the heads of the courses, is usually hired on a flexible basis. According to the programme, this ensures that the programme can tune to changing developments by inviting new staff and expertise.

In principle, heads of standing courses are contracted for a period of eight years. Evaluation takes place after three, five and eight year. Leaving heads propose successors to the director. The director is, after consultation of other heads and staff members, responsible for appointing new heads. To safeguard the continuity of the courses, current coordinators stay at least one year when a new head is appointed. Coordinators of standing courses are also appointed for a period of eight years. Coordinators are responsible for facilitating the education and for the administration concerning education and management. A buddy system is available, where more experienced coordinators support new coordinators. Heads and

coordinators of temporary programmes are appointed for two or more years.

All heads and most tutors hold a master's degree, two heads hold a PhD and one is pursuing.

The site-visit revealed that students and alumni are in general quite content with their tutors. They appreciate the small scale and informal character of the programme, their tutors support and guidance. They also noted however, that not all tutors see teaching as part of their practice and therefore are not always able to effectively communicate with students regarding their needs. The committee learned during the meeting with heads of programmes that there is no pedagogical training for (new) staff and that this also not needed according to the heads involved. The heads value the Unsettling initiative, as the activities organised address relevant themes such as diversity and inclusivity.

Considerations

The committee concludes that the very competent staff is committed, rigorous and capable of realising the small scale and intensive education. All tutors have their own (international) practice, as artist, designer, researcher, writer, curator, director or any other art and design related practice.

The site-visit made clear that heads of programmes do not see a need for pedagogical training of staff. The committee is however of the opinion that providing (new) staff with pedagogical insights can be beneficial for tutors and students, especially in the temporary programmes and in working with diverse groups of students.

Based on the above, the committee **positively** assesses this standard.

Standard F – Quantity of staff: The number of staff is sufficient in terms of providing small-scale and intensive education, substantiating close

contact between staff and students, and providing individual counselling to students outside the educational context.

Findings

The core team of a course consist a head, a coordinator and minimally one main tutor. Heads are responsible for the artistic direction of the course. Staff of the programme, including the heads of the courses, is usually hired on a flexible basis. According to the programme, this ensures that the programme can tune to changing developments by inviting new staff and expertise.

In principle, heads of standing courses are contracted for a period of eight years. To safeguard the continuity of the courses, current coordinators stay at least one year when a new head is appointed. Coordinators of standing courses are also appointed for a period of eight years. Heads and coordinators of temporary programmes are appointed for two or more years.

Currently, 10 fte teaching staff are involved in the programme (all departments and temporary programmes). This includes heads, (main)tutors, guest lecturers/tutors, medialab, workshops etc., but excludes hours within extracurricular projects in which students take part. In the academic year 2017 – 2018 between 10 and 20 (international) guest lecturers were involved per department. The student – teaching staff (fte) ratio was 15/1 (including guest lecturers and tutors).

The site-visit revealed that students and alumni are in general quite content with the amount of tutors and the amount of time the staff spends with students. Students and staff appreciate the small scale and informal character of the programme, support and guidance.

Considerations

The committee concludes that staff is sufficient and is committed, rigorous and capable of realising the small scale and intensive education. The dedication and presence of lecturers definitely

contributes to the strong “sense of community” that the committee noticed during the site-visit.

Based on the above, the committee **positively** assesses this standard.

Standard G - Facilities: The programme has its own infrastructure with facilities for small-scale and intensive education and common extracurricular social activities.

Findings

Since December 2018, the main departments (standing courses) and two temporary programmes are located at the new Sandberg building at the Gerrit Rietveld Academie. Because of educational and content aspects, the other two temporary programmes have remained at their current location elsewhere in the city.

The new building offers an open educational environment to stimulate knowledge sharing and to encounter creation as one community without noise and disturbances from each other. In addition, small auditoria for lectures, work meetings and student initiatives as well as consulting rooms, flexible workspaces are available. Students can also use the nearby workshops of the Gerrit Rietveld Academie.

Considerations

The committee concludes that the facilities of all courses involved are satisfactory. The new building in which Sandberg is housed, offers ample working space for students and the opening hours are very accommodating. Centralising all activities in the new building adds to the coherence of the courses and the establishment of a community.

In addition, the proximity of the Gerrit Rietveld Academy offers students the possibility of using the academies workshops. The committee noted however that one part of the new building is less accessible due to the absence of an elevator. The committee recommends the institute to find ways to improve this.

Based on the above, the committee **positively** assesses this standard.

Standard H - Realised Learning Outcomes: The contents and the level of the tests and the final projects are in line with the level and the broadening as formulated in the intended learning outcomes. Graduates are admitted to demanding postgraduate programmes and/or jobs. The success rates are substantially higher than with other relevant programmes that have not been granted the distinctive feature, and at least comparable with other relevant programmes that do have the distinctive feature.

Findings

The graduation phase of the programme (and all standing and temporary programmes included), consists of the graduation project and the thesis. Students start working on their thesis in the third semester. In this period, students also create the plan for their graduation project. Halfway through the second year, a green light assessment takes place.

To support students in writing their thesis, a thesis-writing trajectory is available. This trajectory starts at the end of the second semester, with students formulating their individual research theme or question and ends with the presentation of the thesis. In the standing Fine Arts course for example, a reflection trip (in previous years to the arctic circle or the Isle of Lewis) is organised to stimulate students in their thesis process.

Students are informed about the graduation phase by their tutors and heads. In addition, information is available on the website.

The institute and the programme keep in different ways in touch with alumni. The institutes website offers alumni the opportunity to share their current practices, exhibitions, subsidies and prices. In addition, alumni are interviewed for the brochure and the website, to inform future

students. The institute and some courses make yearbooks, with information about alumni. Alumni take part in projects and exhibitions of the institute, work for the departments or are involved in the courses by providing workshops, lectures or presentations. Alumni are also regularly involved as tutor or coordinator. For alumni of the Dirty Art department for example, the Dirty Art Foundation is available.

To support alumni in setting up a sustainable practice, the institute offers (starting) budgets for alumni and helps to connect them to a network of other (local) institutes, organisations and governmental bodies. These initiatives are currently being developed in light of a broader idea of a third cycle, in which research trajectories, sub organisations and different projects operate under one roof.

The majority of alumni the committee met with during the site visit have a broad practice, combining their practice with teaching and / or commissioned projects.

Considerations

The committee concludes that the programme has an effective graduation procedure in place. All courses are finalised with a thesis and a graduation project focusing on students work. In assessing students final work, multiple examiners including external examiners are involved.

The committee notes that the work presented by students and alumni during the site-visit, matches the goals and visions of the courses. In addition, the studied theses were of high quality and reflect the programme's principle that the thesis can take different forms.

In assessing the end level of the programme and the work of the students, the committee agrees with the external referents. Even though there are differences between the quality of the work in each course, the committee concludes that in general of the studied works and theses are of

high quality. The work of the interdisciplinary temporary Radical Cut-up course for example showed the artistic intent of the students and the chosen materials matched that intent. In addition, the quality of the work focused on feeling and psychological, emotional reactions to the environment.

In the work of the Fine Arts course, students dealt with current and temporary issues and the work reflected the broad scope of the course. The work of the temporary Design of Experiences course was challenging, socially engaged and ambitious. Strong theses were accompanied by strong work. The work of the Critical Studies course reflected themes such as identity, decolonialisation, health and Dutch history. The majority of the final work was created in an art work and not in the form of a lecture, presentation or panel discussion. Work presented in the latter three forms however showed most theoretical strength. The art works showed that, even though the theoretical starting points are solid, the craftsmanship has not fully developed accordingly. The committee therefore wonders whether the form of the graduation project should be free or subjected to criteria.

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

The committee notes that the drop-out rate is 10 – 20% and is declining. It is however difficult to compare this rate since Sandberg Instituut is the only institute that requested and received the special feature. Sandberg Instituut however receives significantly more applications than other art schools, and the number of dropouts is comparable to, for instance, the dropout number at liberal arts colleges. Sandberg Instituut has a good name and reputation and alumni tend to get good opportunities. The committee is of the

opinion that this is directly related to the small-scale and intensive education of the programme.

Based on the above, the committee **positively** assesses this standard.

Appendix 2 Assessment committee

Naam panellid	Korte functiebeschrijving van de panelleden (1-3 zinnen)
Ir. R.S. Kloosterman Prof. P. Goodwin	René Kloosterman zit met regelmaat visitaties voor Paul Goodwin is currently Chair of Contemporary Art and Urbanism, University of the Arts London; before he was a.o. lecturer at the Chelsea College of Art and design.
Prof.dr. W. Modest	Wayne Modest is Professor of Material Culture and Critical Heritage Studies, Faculty of Humanities, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, and Head of the Research Center for Material Culture, National Museum of World Cultures, the Netherlands.
R. Dall PhD	Rhea Dall is Director, UKS (Unge Kunstneres Samfund / Young Artists' Society), Oslo.
Prof.dr. B.M. Mosselmans	Bert Mosselmans is assistant professor, associate professor and professor in economics and philosophy, Roosevelt Academy and University College Roosevelt, Middelburg
V. van der Burg BSc	Vera van der Burg studeert M Design aan de Design Academy Eindhoven

Appendix 3 Programme site visit

#	when	who	Content / re- marks
Day 1: 4 July			
9.15-9.30			
1	Welcome panel		
9.30- 11.00			
2	Panel prepares		
11.00-12.00			
3	Welcome and General introduction	Open for all	
12.00-12.45			
4	tour		
12.45-13.30			
5	Lunch and Arrival of external reviewers	Open for all	
13.30-14.30			
6	TABLE Conversation with reviewers		
14.30-14.45			
7	break		
14.45-15.15			
8	Presenting selection of special projects		
	5 minutes changement		
15.20-16.10			
9	TABLE Student involvement (policy and program- ming)		
16.10 -16.45			

10	Break, panel retreats for internal discussion		
16.45-17.00			
11	feedback day 1, looking ahead for day 2		Preparing day 2
17.00 end day 1			

dag 2: July 5			
9.30-10.00			
12	welcome		
10.00-11.00			
13	TABLE Inclusive and diverse education, precarity		
11.00-12.00			
14	TABLE Research (and art education)		
12.00-12.45			
15	Lunch and panel retreats for internal discussion		
12.45-13.30			
16	Programming education		
5 minutes changement			
13.35-14.15			
17	TABLE Temporary Programmes		
14.15-14.30			
18	Break		
14.30-15.15			
19	TABLE Assessment and results		
5 minutes changement			
15.20-16.00			
20	TABLE Heads of Main Departments]	

16.00-16.45			
21	TABLE Executive Board Rietveld Academie	This meeting was cancelled by the panel due to time re- strictions	
5 minutes changement			
16.45-17.30			
22	TABLE Results and Alumni		
17.30-18.30			
23	Panel retreats, initial feedback, preliminary result of visitation	All are welcome 18.30	

Appendix 4 Studied documents

- Sandberg Instituut Institutional Report
- Reflections per course:
 - SBD Critical Studies
 - SBD DAD
 - SBD Design
 - SBD Fine Arts
 - SBD MBD
 - SBD RCU
 - SBD ShadowChannel
 - SBD SIS
- Notes to future students (various courses)
- Student chapter and alumni quotes (various courses)
- Commissioned critique reports
- 15 graduate works and reports