

BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME
ARTS, CULTURE AND MEDIA
FACULTY OF ARTS
UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN

QANU
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

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

Project number: Q0721

© 2020 QANU

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



CONTENTS

REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME ARTS, CULTURE AND MEDIA OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME.....	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION.....	5
COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	5
WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	6
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	9
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENTS.....	11
APPENDICES	21
APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES	23
APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM	25
APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT	26
APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL	27

This report was finalised on 2 March 2020.



REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME ARTS, CULTURE AND MEDIA OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN

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

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

Bachelor's programme Arts, Culture and Media

Name of the programme:	Arts, Culture and Media (Kunsten, Cultuur en Media)
CROHO number:	50629
Level of the programme:	bachelor's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	180 EC
Specialisations or tracks:	Kunsten, Cultuur en Media (Dutch) Arts, Culture and Media (English)
Location:	Groningen
Mode of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	Dutch, English
Submission deadline NVAO:	01/05/2020

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

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

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

COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The NVAO has approved the composition of the panel on 28 January 2019. The panel that assessed the bachelor's programme Arts, Culture and Media consisted of:

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

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



WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

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

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

Panel members

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

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

- Dr. J.W. (Jan Willem) Honig [referent Taal- en cultuurstudies Universiteit Utrecht]
- Prof. dr. D. (Dominiek) Sandra [referent Taal- en cultuurstudies Universiteit Utrecht]
- Dr. K.E. (Kim) Knibbe [referent Taal- en cultuurstudies Universiteit Utrecht]

Preparation

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

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

Before the site visit to the University of Groningen, QANU received the self-evaluation reports of the programmes and sent these to the panel. A thesis selection was made by the panel's chair and the project manager. The selection consisted of 15 theses and their assessment forms for each programme, based on a provided list of graduates between September 2017 and September 2018. A variety of topics and tracks and a diversity of examiners were included in the selection. The project manager and panel chair assured that the distribution of grades in the selection matched the distribution of grades of all available theses.

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

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

Site visit

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

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

Consistency and calibration

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

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

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

Report

After the site visit, the secretary (Jesseka Batteau) wrote a draft report based on the panel's findings and submitted it to the project manager for peer assessment. Subsequently, the secretary sent the



report to the panel. After processing the panel members' feedback, the project manager sent the draft report to the Faculty in order to have it checked for factual irregularities. The project manager discussed the ensuing comments with the panel's chair and changes were implemented accordingly. The report was then finalised and sent to the Faculty of Arts and University Board.

Definition of judgements standards

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

Generic quality

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

Meets the standard

The programme meets the generic quality standard.

Partially meets the standard

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

Does not meet the standard

The programme does not meet the generic quality standard.

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

Positive

The programme meets all the standards.

Conditionally positive

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

Negative

In the following situations:

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

SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

The panel believes that the chosen profile of the programme is clear, distinctive, and relevant to the ongoing developments in the contemporary field, given its multi- and interdisciplinary focus, its professional orientation through two professional profiles and the opportunity students have in specialising in two art disciplines. The panel does recommend clarifying the use of the terms multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary in its profile, in order to make clear to (prospective) students what they stand for, how they are achieved and how they relate to each other. It appreciates the wide range of perspectives students are offered and the attention paid to the historical, critical, social and psychological/cognitive perspectives on art and its embedded situation. According to the panel, the profile has been translated adequately into the intended learning outcomes, which convey the goals of the programme in a precise and concise manner. The outcomes align with the professional and research field and match national and international requirements, thus reflecting the academic level of the bachelor's programme. The panel encourages the programme to further emphasise its multi- and interdisciplinary focus and application of professional skills in its learning outcomes.

The panel concludes that the curriculum and the teaching-learning environment of the bachelor's programme are designed and implemented in such a way that students are able to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The design of the programme is well thought out and clear and therefore conducive to its feasibility. Students are able to take responsibility for their own learning trajectory by choosing between two specialisations and five art disciplines. The panel appreciates the wide range of subjects and different routes offered within the curriculum and encourages the programme to investigate in what way it could increase the possibilities for more flexible, individualised study trajectories within a given art discipline.

The panel is pleased to observe that students receive the support and guidance they need, thanks to the solid mentoring system and the small scale, informal atmosphere within the programme. The parallel English and Dutch tracks generally function to everyone's satisfaction and the panel supports the choice for both trajectories. The panel underwrites the intentions of the programme to incorporate the Dutch course 'Inleiding Kunstwerelden' into the English variant and recommends that the programme keeps a close watch on the feasibility and execution of the Dutch track when it comes to the availability of Dutch-speaking staff members.

The programme makes use of a wide range of teaching methods – which include various activating and innovative approaches – suited to the goals of the courses and the learning trajectory of the students. Students and staff have great appreciation for the advantages of a diverse and vibrant international class room, as the panel learned during the site visit. The panel is positive about the quality of the teaching and support staff. It praises their expertise, international orientation, their commitment to students and the efforts put into the continuing improvement of the programme.

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

The panel approves of the form, variety and build-up of the assessments throughout the three years of the programme, which are aligned with the goals of the courses per year and which demand more knowledge, insight, conceptual thinking and practical skills as the student progresses. The



programme adheres to the four-eyes principle in the design of its assessments as well as in the assessment of the end product, the thesis. The panel approved the assessments of the theses it studied, which overall correctly addressed the weaknesses and strengths of the thesis in question. One thesis, which the panel judged to be insufficient, resulted in a pass. The panel would encourage the programme to think about how it instrumentalises the assessment form and to be consistent in its approach to the evaluation process and procedure. Furthermore, the panel urges the programme to make the weighing of the research and writing process versus the end product in the final grade more transparent and clear, and to introduce its interdisciplinary and profession-oriented profile explicitly into the assessment criteria of the thesis. In relation to this the panel recommends to ensure that the quality of the end product always meets the expected bachelor's level, and that the role of the second assessor is clear cut and that there is always an independent assessor (a person who is not involved in the process) involved in the thesis assessment.

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

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

Bachelor's programme Arts, Culture and Media

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

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

Date: 2 March 2020

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

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

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

Findings

The profile of the bachelor's programme Arts, Culture and Media at the University of Groningen is characterised by a multi- and interdisciplinary focus on the functioning of the arts in Western societies in the broadest sense, offering students historical, philosophical and critical as well as sociological and cognitive perspectives on the role of arts in the lives of individuals, social groups and societies. A specific quality of the programme is that it combines a broad approach of arts with profession-oriented profiles and specialisations in two art disciplines. Students can choose out of the following disciplines: music, theatre, film, literature or visual art. The professional profiles offered by the programme are: (a) the critical analysis of contemporary (developments in the) arts in culture (Analysis and Criticism) or (b) the impact of policy, management, entrepreneurship, and marketing on the way art functions in society (Arts, Policy, and Cultural Entrepreneurship). Currently, the programme offers a Dutch and an English track. Since the previous site visit, the programme has gone from being a solely Dutch-taught curriculum to a curriculum with two tracks, one in English and one in Dutch. The new programme with its two tracks, which also incorporates a wider range of European perspectives, was introduced in 2015 and is currently in its fourth year.

The panel is positive about the professional orientation of the programme and its combination of disciplinary specialisation and a multi- and interdisciplinary profile, which it considers clear, distinctive and relevant with regard to recent developments in the domains of art, culture and media. The panel does recommend clarifying the use of the terms multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary in its profile, in order to make clear to (prospective) students what they stand for, how they are achieved and how they relate to each other. It appreciates the self-reflective attitude of the staff members in their thinking about the programme's profile, its short- and long-term goals. It observes, based on conversations during the site visit, that students share this vision of the programme. The panel understands the practical and academic advantages of a both Dutch and English-taught curriculum and supports this choice, though it encourages the programme-makers to continue thinking about its long-term goals and their implementation when it comes to teaching in Dutch.

Intended learning outcomes

The bachelor's programme aims to prepare students for professional roles at an academic level in the field of arts, culture and media. Its goal is to train students to use, assess and conduct supervised scholarly research into the role of arts in society. Students completing the programme will have a solid knowledge of and a broad-minded perspective on the arts and the necessary tools to contribute meaningfully to the art world, whether in criticism, education, programming, management or marketing. Their academic skills and domain-specific knowledge will allow them to successfully apply for a relevant master's or research master's programme at the University of Groningen or other (inter)national universities.

The learning outcomes of the programme (cf. appendix 1) are derived from the five Dublin descriptors – in the documentation for the site visit, the panel was presented with a clear overview of the relationship between this international standard and the learning outcomes formulated by the programme. In addition, the programme corresponds to the international standard set out in several relevant subject benchmarks in the UK Quality Code of Higher Education. The panel observes that the intended learning outcomes are well-chosen and clearly formulated, detailed and specific, forming a good translation of the programme's academic orientation and distinctive profile. It recognises the separate qualifications for the two professional profiles (A7 and A8). The panel appreciates that the



programme has taken the advice of the previous assessment committee to heart and made efforts to reformulate its learning outcomes in such a way that they are not over-ambitious and more in line with what students can be expected to learn in a three-year bachelor programme. Building on this recommendation, the current panel would advise the programme to use the term 'comprehensive' rather than 'thorough' in A6. Though students gain a broad perspective on the arts and zoom in on two art disciplines, the knowledge gained is of a different nature than that which is acquired in a monodisciplinary bachelor's programme in the arts. Furthermore, the panel encourages the programme to make its multi- and interdisciplinarity and professional orientation more explicit in its intended learning outcomes, highlighting the dynamics between different disciplines and domains as well as specifying the practical application of the two professional profiles.

Considerations

The panel believes that the chosen profile of the programme is clear, distinctive, and relevant to the ongoing developments in the contemporary field, given its multi- and interdisciplinary focus, its professional orientation through two professional profiles and the opportunity students have in specialising in two art disciplines. The panel does recommend clarifying the use of the terms multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary in its profile, in order to make clear to (prospective) students what they stand for, how they are achieved and how they relate to each other. It appreciates the wide range of perspectives students are offered and the attention paid to the historical, critical, social and psychological/cognitive perspectives on art and its embedded situation. According to the panel, the profile has been translated adequately into the intended learning outcomes, which convey the goals of the programme in a precise and concise manner. The outcomes align with the professional and research field and match national and international requirements, thus reflecting the academic level of the bachelor's programme. The panel encourages the programme to further emphasise its multi- and interdisciplinary focus and application of professional skills in its learning outcomes.

Conclusion

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

Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

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

Findings

Curriculum

The bachelor's programme Arts, Culture and Media (180 EC) has two tracks, a Dutch- and English-spoken trajectory. Each year, around 90-110 students enroll in the programme, 70-75% of whom are international students. In the programme, students study the function and role of art in society from various multi- and interdisciplinary perspectives, and are trained to critically engage with historical, theoretical, cognitive/psychological and socio-cultural approaches to the arts. In the first year (B1), students follow integrated courses and are introduced to various theoretical and methodological perspectives on the arts (40 EC). In the second semester, students choose two art disciplines of which they follow two courses of 5 EC each (total of 20 EC). Students choose from music, theatre or film, which are taught by the ACM-department, and can also choose to follow courses in contemporary visual arts or literature, which are taught by other departments of the faculty. The second year (B2) expands on the insight and knowledge gained in B1, further developing different approaches and methodologies within the context of the two profession-oriented specialisations. Analysis and Criticism (AC) or Arts, Policy and Cultural Entrepreneurship (APCE). The integrated, profession-oriented courses add up to 20 EC, the disciplinary courses add up to 40 EC. The third year (B3), is devoted to the minor (30 EC), profession-oriented courses (10 EC), a course in which students apply their practical skills to their discipline of choice (10 EC) and the bachelor's thesis (10 EC). Students in the English and Dutch track follow the same curriculum, except for the

course 'Inleiding Kunstwerelden' in B1, which is taught in Dutch and focusses on the Dutch cultural infrastructure. Students of the English track take the 'Introduction to Audiovisual Arts B' course instead. See appendix 2 for an overview of the curriculum.

The panel discussed the curriculum with management, staff and students and alumni and concludes that the current programme is carefully designed, with a cohesive structure and good build-up in which the complexity of conceptual and critical thinking, and the skills needed to bring these insights into practice, increase as the student progresses through the programme. The panel is positive about the design of the programme, which offers a wide range of approaches, a specialised professional orientation as well as comprehensive knowledge of two art disciplines, which actively encourage students to engage with the connections between multi- and interdisciplinary perspectives and their art domain of interest. The panel concludes that the programme indeed teaches what it aims to teach, allowing students to acquire the intended learning outcomes at the expected level. Furthermore, the panel recognises the programme's multi- and interdisciplinary profile throughout the curriculum and concludes that there is a productive dynamic between the integrated courses and the disciplinary courses. It supports the programme's aim to incorporate the course 'Inleiding Kunstwerelden' into the English track as the panel considers the course to be relevant to international students studying in the Netherlands too. Students the panel spoke to confirmed that they would like to gain more insight into and become more acquainted with the workings of the Dutch art domains.

The panel appreciates the way academic and practical skills are taught within the programme. Both are integrated within the different courses and incorporated into the learning outcomes of each module, developing cumulatively throughout the three years of the programme. The panel appreciates the variety of skills students are trained in (including critical reading, academic and scholarly writing, oral presentation, argumentation, discussion, hermeneutical and empirical research methods, writing professional documents, and project management), and is pleased to note that there is a separate course on quantitative and qualitative methods. The students the panel spoke to confirmed that they are offered ample opportunity to practice their research skills in the courses and feel that the programme prepares them well for the thesis trajectory in the final year.

Almost all lectures are taught in English; some are also available in Dutch. For the larger course units, seminars in Dutch are available. Moreover, students of the Dutch language track can do their final assignments/exams for course units in Dutch if they wish so. These can also be written in Dutch if the topic dictates this and the first supervisor can accommodate supervision in the language. The panel supports the choice for both tracks; the English track enhances the international accessibility and scope of the programme and matches the international perspective in the arts, culture and media sectors around the Western world, while the Dutch track has advantages with regard to the influx of Dutch students and the training of students for the professional sectors in the Netherlands. The panel recommends that it make clear to the students how the two tracks differ and overlap, so that they know what to expect when they enroll.

Professional orientation

The panel is pleased to see that the bachelor's programme actively invests in its relationship with the professional field, offering students different contexts and venues in which they can train their professional skills and competencies. There is a structural collaboration with the art and culture domain, both locally, regionally and (inter)nationally (one example is the Boekman Stichting, Netherlands study and documentation centre for the arts, culture and related policies). Guest lecturers are invited on a regular basis, and each year offers excursions and field trips in which students are able to train different professional skills. During their first semester, students are made familiar with the institutional infrastructure of Dutch cultural life, contacts that are further extended upon during the second-year arts course units. In the final semester of the programme, the profession-oriented profile AC offers an introduction to current forms of arts criticism in the course 'Evaluating the Arts'. Likewise, the profession-oriented profile APCE enhances the employability of the students by preparing them to analyse the practical questions cultural managers face on a daily basis. The course 'Arts in Practice' (B3) is aimed at training students' skills in the conception,



planning, organisation and marketing of an art event in music or theatre, or a longer, group-based piece of audiovisual film research. Finally, students can choose the career minor in order to further develop their professional skills via an internship in a relevant professional setting.

Student-centred learning

The programme allows students to shape their own educational experience by choosing their two art disciplines in the second semester of B1 and a profession-oriented specialisation in the first semester of B2. Once the choice is made for the specialisation and art disciplines the study routes are fixed. In B3, students choose one of the minors (30 EC) which can be followed within the faculty or other faculties of University of Groningen. The minor can also be used for an international exchange with the Erasmus partners of the university, something which the programme encourages students to do. Finally, in the bachelor's thesis students can delve into a specific topic within their professional specialisation and chosen art disciplines. The students the panel spoke to are generally satisfied with the options they have, though some did find it difficult that there are limited options for choice within a chosen study route. In its conversations with the students during the site visit, the panel learned that some students would like to have more information on the electives in advance and may be interested in choosing their own courses within a given art discipline according to their own interests and goals. The panel thinks this might be an attractive and viable option for future students and would encourage the programme to investigate if a more individualised study trajectory per student is desirable, and if so, feasible.

Feasibility and guidance

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

Following the recommendations of the accreditation committee in 2013, the programme has taken active measures to increase graduation rates. It has intensified its preparatory trajectory for prospective students, introducing, among other things, special 'matching' sessions to ensure that the goals of the programme and the student's expectations are in accordance with one another. In addition, the bachelor's thesis trajectory has been improved with regard to deadlines and planning. During the site visit, the panel learned from students that they are content with the information, guidance and support they receive and are satisfied with how the programme is organised. Students and alumni are pleased with the availability and approachability of staff members, and highly value the personal and informal atmosphere created within the programme by teaching and supporting staff. There is an appreciation of the diversity of the international classroom in the English track, which according to all involved has given a large qualitative boost to the level of the courses. Overall, students are well aware of what their choices are and feel the programme does a good job in informing them about the different specialisations and study trajectories of the art disciplines on offer. The panel thinks the programme has good structures in place for managing the expectations of the students and encourages it to continue its investment in these measures, specifically with regard to international students.

Though the panel understands and underwrites the choice for an English and Dutch track, it learned from the student chapter and its conversations with students during the site visit that the programme cannot always facilitate and support the Dutch-taught variant to their satisfaction, since it is dependent on teachers who are proficient in Dutch and have expert knowledge of the Dutch art, culture and media domains. The panel advises the programme to monitor the Dutch trajectory closely

and to think about what measures are necessary to retain this track in the long term, if this is indeed the programme's ambition. Another observation made by the students during the site visit, was that there was sometimes a difference between the art discipline courses taught by the ACM department (music, theatre, film) and those taught by other departments (literature, visual arts) with regard to their alignment with the integrated courses. The programme has already taken measures to ensure that the necessary subjects are addressed in the non-departmental courses and that this is communicated clearly to all involved.

Teaching methods

The panel is positive about the application of the teaching methods in the programme, which are small scale, varied and suited to the goals of the courses. In line with its educational approach, the programme deploys two modes of teaching and learning: knowledge transfer through lecturing and skill building in interactive seminar groups. Lectures are given to a larger group of students, whereas in seminars students are divided into smaller groups of circa 20 students. They come together on a weekly basis, and work on shared assignments under supervision of their lecturer(s). The programme offers many excursions and field trips in which students are able to study art *in situ*, meet and speak with artists and professionals working in the field of art, culture and media, give presentations on site and participate in discussions. The panel was pleased to learn that teaching in the programme is enhanced by the diversity of the students and a vibrant international classroom. The diverse backgrounds of the international students are actively deployed in in-class projects and discussions, enriching the content of the programme. It recommends that the programme ensure that students are informed of the reasons for and build-up of the various excursions, since some students seemed to be unaware in what way they contribute to the curriculum.

Teaching staff

The panel observes that the programme is taught by a professionally diverse, dedicated and highly qualified team of lecturers, the composition of which reflects its international orientation and the broad approach of art, culture and media. Staff members have different cultural and geographical backgrounds, represent a wide range of scholarly and methodological traditions and have good professional (inter)national networks which they employ to the benefit of the curriculum. All permanent staff members have many years of teaching experience and meet the UTQ requirements, and the programme pays special attention to English proficiency of non-native speakers.

The panel appreciates the strong coherence within the team and the dedication and commitment demonstrated by staff members in ongoing improvement and fine tuning of the curriculum. It values the open and critical manner in which the team collectively reflects on the relationship between the different domains and the developments in the art and culture sector at large. It appreciates the good collaboration between the staff members, as co-teachers, as well as between staff members of ACM and AH team when it comes to sharing expertise and courses. This is confirmed by the experience of the students and alumni the panel spoke to, who praise the knowledge, didactical skills, commitment and accessibility of staff members.

Staff members indicated that the work load is high, given the many administrative duties and growing numbers of international students; pressures that are having a negative effect on the humanities departments at other universities as well. The panel is pleased to hear that the Faculty has taken a number of measures to alleviate the work load of its staff by decreasing administrative tasks and increasing the hours allotted to teaching. It has enabled the programme to employ temporary staff to support permanent staff members in their different tasks.

Considerations

The panel concludes that the curriculum and the teaching-learning environment of the bachelor's programme are designed and implemented in such a way that students are able to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The design of the programme is well thought out and clear and therefore conducive to its feasibility. Students are able to take responsibility for their own learning trajectory by choosing between two specialisations and five art disciplines. The panel appreciates the wide



range of subjects and different routes offered within the curriculum and encourages the programme to investigate in what way it could increase the possibilities for more flexible, individualised study trajectories within a given art discipline.

The panel is pleased to observe that students receive the support and guidance they need, thanks to the solid mentoring system and the small scale, informal atmosphere within the programme. The parallel English and Dutch tracks generally function to everyone's satisfaction and the panel supports the choice for both trajectories. The panel underwrites the intentions of the programme to incorporate the Dutch course 'Inleiding Kunstwerelden' into the English variant and recommends that the programme keeps a close watch on the feasibility and execution of the Dutch track when it comes to the availability of Dutch-speaking staff members.

The programme makes use of a wide range of teaching methods – which include various activating and innovative approaches – suited to the goals of the courses and the learning trajectory of the students. Students and staff have great appreciation for the advantages of a diverse and vibrant international class room, as the panel learned during the site visit. The panel is positive about the quality of the teaching and support staff. It praises their expertise, international orientation, their commitment to students and the efforts put into the continuing improvement of the programme.

Conclusion

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

Standard 3: Student assessment

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

Findings

Assessment policy and recent developments

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

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

Assessment system and procedures

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

The programme makes use of the four-eyes principle in the design of its assessments and the assessment matrices and rubrics, as well as in the assessment of the bachelor's thesis. The panel also observed that the variation and complexity of the assessments develop as the programme progresses. In B1, when the programme focuses on acquiring basic knowledge and understanding, written exams, with both essay and multiple-choice questions, take an important place, besides written assignments and oral presentations. As the balance of teaching shifts to applying knowledge and understanding and making judgements in B2, the programme implements more challenging and integrated forms of assessment, such as longer papers and group or individual presentations. Assessment focuses on the ability to analyse case studies and to collect and evaluate the appropriate literature and/or sources. At the same time, more focus is placed on assessing the ability to present research outcomes in a clear and well-structured manner and on creating awareness of academic codes of behaviour and the ethics regarding the use and identification of the work and insights of others. Finally, the types of assessment in B3 are based on the students' relative independence and the advanced competency in academic and professional skills. These competencies are tested through practical assessments (for example in the course Arts in Practice) to execute research and writing in accordance with the academic standards in the bachelor's thesis.

The content and goals of the assessments are clear to students, the panel observes. Each course has a syllabus with all the necessary information. It describes all assignments in detail and specifies how and when each component is assessed. Furthermore, the programme has devised a matrix which shows to what extent and at what level courses test the intended learning outcomes: some outcomes are acquired earlier on in the programme, whereas others build up towards the final year and the thesis. In its conversations with the students, the panel could establish that they are content with the quality and transparency of the assessment system deployed by the programme.

Thesis assessment

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

Overall, the panel was satisfied with the quality of the fifteen thesis assessments it studied, which provided sufficient information on the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis in question and addressed the relevant criteria in a suitable manner. The panel judged one thesis to be of insufficient quality (cf. standard 4). Though the commentary in the assessment form was very critical, the student nevertheless received a pass. The panel also deduced from the assessment form that the student had received relatively little guidance during the thesis trajectory. In order to avoid this happening again in the future, the panel advises the programme to differentiate between process and product – and to explicate how this is weighed in the final grade – in the assessment procedure and forms. For example, the supervisor may take into account the intellectual and personal development of the student during the research process and the writing. Furthermore, though the programme has clearly described the role of the supervisor and second assessor in its syllabus and assessment form, the panel observed that the role of the latter is not always as clear cut, as he/she



is sometimes involved as an additional expert/specialist to advise students who have chosen an interdisciplinary subject that exceeds the expertise of the primary supervisor. The panel supports the interdisciplinary orientation of the programme, but would recommend that the programme take measures in order to ensure that there is always an independent assessor (in the sense of someone who is not involved in the process) involved in the assessment of the final result – if a project requires two expert supervisors, this would mean involving an additional assessor to establish the final grade. Furthermore, the panel encourages the programme to reflect on the role of the assessment form and to be consistent in the implementation of this choice, deciding on whether it is simply an evaluation of the student's written report or intended as an instrument in the learning process the student. Finally, given the interdisciplinary and profession-oriented profile of the curriculum, the panel advises the programme to explicitly refer to these aspects in the assessment forms of the final products.

Examination board

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

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

Considerations

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

The panel approves of the form, variety and build-up of the assessments throughout the three years of the programme, which are aligned with the goals of the courses per year and which demand more knowledge, insight, conceptual thinking and practical skills as the student progresses. The programme adheres to the four-eyes principle in the design of its assessments as well as in the assessment of the end product, the thesis. The panel approved the assessments of the theses it studied, which overall correctly addressed the weaknesses and strengths of the thesis in question. One thesis, which the panel judged to be insufficient, resulted in a pass. The panel would encourage

the programme to think about how it instrumentalises the assessment form and to be consistent in its approach to the evaluation process and procedure. Furthermore, the panel urges the programme to make the weighing of the research and writing process versus the end product in the final grade more transparent and clear, and to introduce its interdisciplinary and profession-oriented profile explicitly into the assessment criteria of the thesis. In relation to this the panel recommends to ensure that the quality of the end product always meets the expected bachelor's level, and that the role of the second assessor is clear cut and that there is always an independent assessor (a person who is not involved in the process) involved in the thesis assessment.

Conclusion

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

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

Thesis quality

The bachelor's thesis is the final project of the ACM bachelor's programme. The panel has read 15 bachelor theses to gain insight into the end level of the programme. Overall, the panel is quite positive about the level of the theses. The selection includes many good, and in some cases, rather excellent and original, examples of research, which according to the panel are based on well-chosen subjects relevant to current questions and developments in the academic field. In many cases, the panel spoke positively about the originality and relevance of the research questions, the thorough application of research methodologies and the critical-productive use of secondary literature. The panel was pleased with the structure and good writing of various theses and it was pleased to observe that it could identify the focus on interdisciplinarity in some of the theses it had studied.

With regard to the theses that received lower grades, the panel agreed with the assessments given by the examiners. In these cases, the lower grading had often to do with one or more aspects of the theses, such as the quality of writing, the text structure, the use of terminology and literature and the distinction between interpretation and factual analysis. Nevertheless, though these theses were of lesser quality, they all had various redeeming qualities – original subject, good research questions, well written, good structure and use of literature, for example – thus ensuring that they rightly received a pass for the final assignment.

As mentioned under standard 3, one of the theses read in preparation of the site visit did not meet the standard of an academic bachelor's thesis according to the panel. The panel considered various aspects of the thesis to be weak, such as the formulation of the research question, the use of methodology, and the application of concepts and theories. The panel deduced from the assessment form that in this case there had been relatively little supervision and guidance during the bachelor's thesis trajectory. However, given the on average good quality of the other theses studied, and its conversations with representatives of the programme, the panel is satisfied that this one thesis is an exception and that the programme has a solid supervision and assessment structure in place to ensure that current and future students indeed achieve the intended end level as defined by the learning outcomes.

Alumni success

The panel found that very few alumni of the bachelor's programme (intend to) enter the job market directly after graduation; the majority enrol in a master's programme. On the basis of the documentation that the panel studied and its conversations with students, alumni and representatives of the working field (Advisory Board), it concludes that graduates of the programme do not encounter adjustment problems in the continuation of their studies, either in Groningen or



elsewhere. Graduates of the programme have direct access to four tracks in the master's degree programme in *Arts and Culture* in Groningen, the research master's programmes *Arts, Media and Literary Studies* and *Cultural Leadership*, and can also enroll in similar research master's and master's degree programmes offered by the Faculty of Arts or other faculties/universities.

The programme indicated that though it uses several instruments to receive feedback, create an alumni community and keep sight of its graduates, it remains difficult to stay in touch with international graduates. For this reason, the programme has conducted a survey in 2018 among its alumni in preparation of the visitation. The outcomes show that the majority of students (65%) successfully continued their education after the bachelor's programme. About 80% of the alumni indicated that their current work is in line, or more or less in line, with the ACM curriculum. The programme is in the process of finding new ways to keep monitoring its alumni, particularly since the student body is becoming increasingly international. The panel supports these ambitions and thinks these efforts can contribute to improving the connection between the bachelor's programme, the demands of the professional field and the requirements of master's programmes both in the Netherlands and abroad.

Considerations

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

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Arts, Culture and Media: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'meets the standard'

GENERAL CONCLUSION

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

Conclusion

The panel assesses the *bachelor's programme Arts, Culture and Media* as 'positive'.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

Learning outcomes of the Bachelor's programme in Arts, Culture and Media

Description of the Bachelor's level in accordance with the Dublin descriptors	Learning outcomes of the degree programme. Bachelor's graduates have:
<p>A. Knowledge and understanding: Graduates have demonstrated knowledge and understanding in a field of study that builds upon and exceeds their secondary education, and is typically at a level that, whilst supported by advanced textbooks, includes some aspects that will be informed by knowledge of the forefront of their field of study.</p>	<p>A1. understanding of the content and structure of the academic field covered by the degree programme, broad-based knowledge and understanding of a number of influential theoretical and methodological approaches to the arts and art worlds, and the ability to critically reflect on these</p> <p>A2. demonstrable general knowledge of the historical developments of the arts, in relation to technological developments and economic-political and sociocultural history</p> <p>A3. basic knowledge of the histories of thought on the arts and their functions</p> <p>A4. general knowledge and understanding of the structure of art worlds, and how the arts function today</p> <p>A5. basic understanding of art as a form of cognition</p> <p>A6. thorough knowledge and understanding of the nature (analysis, history, theory) and the social functioning of at least one of the following three art forms: film, theatre or music, as well as one of the following five art forms: film, theatre, music, literature or modern and contemporary visual art</p> <p>A7. [A&C] thorough knowledge and understanding of current critical discourses on arts and media, in particular at the interfaces of different art forms</p> <p>A8. [APCE] understanding of the influence that organization (policy, management of institutions, entrepreneurship) of art worlds has on how the arts function</p>
<p>B. Applying knowledge and understanding: Graduates are able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner that indicates a professional approach to their job or profession, and have competences typically demonstrated through devising and sustaining arguments and solving problems within their field of study.</p>	<p>B1. the ability, based on their acquired knowledge, to describe and analyse a practical case study</p> <p>B2. the ability to conduct literature and source research to answer a certain question by gathering, processing and analysing information</p> <p>B3. the ability to work with others, possibly with different cultural backgrounds</p>
<p>C. Making judgements: Graduates have the ability to gather and interpret relevant data (usually within their field of study) to form judgements that include reflection on relevant social, academic or ethical issues.</p>	<p>C1. sufficient overview and understanding of the results, concepts and methods of the academic field to be able to recognize academic problems and determine their academic and social relevance</p> <p>C2. the ability to critically examine research and research results in their chosen art discipline and form an opinion of them</p>



<p>D. Communication / academic ethics Graduates are able to communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences.</p>	<p>D1. the ability to present the results of research in a clear and well-argued manner, in correct Dutch and/or English, both orally and in writing as well as audiovisually, to specialist and non-specialist audiences</p> <p>D2. familiarity with the academic codes of behaviour/ethics regarding references to and use of the work and insights of others</p>
<p>E. Learning skills Graduates have those learning skills that are necessary for students to continue to undertake further study with a high degree of autonomy.</p>	<p>E1. the ability to follow academic literature and debates in their field in efficient and effective ways</p> <p>E2. sufficient command of English to properly be able to follow the academic literature and debates in their field.</p>

APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Year / Sem.		Integrated courses (40 ECTS), Specialization (30 ECTS), Minor (30 ECTS), and Thesis (10 ECTS)				Art Disciplines (Studenten kiezen twee disciplines, elk 30 ECTS) 70 ECTS				
		Arts	Sociology	Theory and philosophy	MUSIC	FILM	THEATRE	Van deze twee kunstdisciplines kiezen studenten er maximaal één.		
Year 1	Sem Ia Week 1-10	Introduction to Audiovisual Arts A (5)	Sociology of the Arts I (5)	Hist. and Theory of Arts, Culture and Media A (5)						
	Sem Ib Week 11-20		Sociology of the Arts II (5)		Hist. and Theory of Arts, Culture and Media B (5)					
	Sem Ila Week 21-30			Philosophy of Art (5)	Music I A (5)	Film I A (5)	Theatre I A (5)	[Contemporary Visual Art I (10)]	[Literature I (10)]	
	Sem Ilb Week 31-40			Arts and Cognition (5)	Music I B (5)	Film I B (5)	Theatre I B (5)			
	Year 2			Profession-Oriented Specialization: Arts, Policy and Cultural Entrepreneurship	Profession-Oriented Specialization: Analysis & Criticism					
		Sem Ia Week 1-10		Quantitative and Qualitative Methods (5)	Mediality to Inter-mediality (10)					
Sem Ib Week 11-20			Arts, Policy and Education (5)				Music II (10)	Film II (10)	Theatre II (10)	[Contemporary Visual Art II (10)]
Sem Ila Week 21-30				Narrativity across Media (10)						
Sem Ilb Week 30-40			Cultural Entrepreneurship I (10)			Music III (10)	Film III (10)	Theatre III (10)	[Contemporary Visual Art III (10)]	[Literature III (10)]
Year 3		Sem Ia Week 1-10	Minor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Career Minor • Educational Minor • University Minor • Minor Abroad • Faculty of Arts Minor (30) 							
	Sem Ib Week 11-20									
	Sem Ila Week 21-30			Cultural Entrepreneurship II (10)	Evaluating the Arts (5)	Arts in Practice (10)				
Sem Ilb Week 31-40	BA Thesis (10)	Music/Film/Theatre: Advanced Seminar (5)								



APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

DAG 1 Donderdag 4 april 2019

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

DAG 2 Vrijdag 5 april 2019

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

APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

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

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

- Self-evaluation report of the Bachelor Art, Culture and Media, including Student Chapter.
- Education policy University of Groningen
- Strategic plan University of Groningen 2015-2020
- Strategic Plan Faculty of Arts 2016-2020
- Vision for Education Faculty of Arts 2018
- Overview organisation Faculty of Arts
- Overview committees Bachelor Art, Culture and Media
- Overview advisory boards Faculty of Arts
- Overview staff members (expertise, qualifications and FTE)
- Overview partner universities
- Matrix relating course units to intended learning outcomes
- Matrix of achieved level intended outcomes per course
- Annual report Advisory Board (2018)
- Assessment Policy University of Groningen
- Teaching and Examination Regulations Faculty of Arts
- Assessment Plan Bachelor Art, Culture and Media
- Bachelor's thesis manual
- Bachelor's thesis assessment form
- Memo on bachelor's thesis assessment dd 28 september 2018
- Annual reports Examination Board
- Annual reports Programme Committee
- Number of students 2013-2018
- Course materials of the following courses (including exams and model answers):
 - Gesch. en theorie van kunsten & media
 - Arts, Policy and Education
 - Mediality to Inter-Mediality
 - Arts in Practice
 - Ba-scriptie Kunsten, Cultuur en Media

