

Assessment report
Limited Framework Programme Assessment

Master Conservation and Restoration of Culture Heritage

University of Amsterdam

Contents of the report

1. Executive summary	2
2. Programme administrative information	5
3. Findings, considerations and assessments per standard.....	6
3.1 Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes.....	6
3.2 Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	9
3.3 Standard 3: Student assessment.....	12
3.4 Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	14
4. Overview of assessments.....	15
5. Recommendations	16
Appendix: Assessment process	17

1. Executive summary

In this executive summary, the panel presents the main considerations which led to the assessment of the quality of the Master Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Heritage of University of Amsterdam. The programme was assessed according to the standards of the limited framework, as laid down in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands.

The panel regards the organisation of the programme to be appropriate. Programme management and staff are very committed to the programme.

Programme management adequately responded to the recommendations of the previous external assessment panel.

The programme has ambitious, high quality objectives. These have been adequately translated into the programme intended learning outcomes, which meet the master level. The range of specialisations offered is impressive. The flexibility in starting or ending specialisations in response to professional field trends is regarded by the panel as valuable.

The programme is embedded well in national and international networks in this field and maintains close relations with other institutions and programmes in the field.

The panel appreciates the programme training students for positions in the professional field, at the same time acknowledging students of the conservation specialisations will have to take the follow-up Advanced Professional Programme to become fully trained conservators.

The panel approves of both the English name of the programme and English as the language of instruction. The reasons given by programme management and the Faculty Board to emphasise the international profile of the programme, to attract an international student body and to enable graduates to operate in this international field are valid.

The panel is pleased to note the number of incoming students to be at 25 to 30 students per year. The bachelor programmes required for students to enrol are appropriate for this programme. The very thorough selection procedures of incoming students allow to admit students, who have the talents to complete this programme. The conservation and restoration minor prepares very well for this programme, although international students may not be in the position to take the minor.

The programme intended learning outcomes are adequately covered in the curriculum. The panel regards the programme to be strong in theoretical and practical education in this field. Humanities and natural sciences are both covered adequately. Students are clearly introduced to academic research. The panel is pleased to see ethical issues being addressed. The specialisations obviously allow students to specialise, but students are also given the chance to specialise further within the specialisations. The panel regards the coherence of the curriculum appropriate and praises the alignment of science modules and object-based practical modules.

The lecturers in the programme are qualified and committed teachers. The panel is positive about the proportion of BKO-certified lecturers and welcomes the numbers continuing to rise in the coming years. The panel finds the proportion of staff with PhDs adequate and approves of programme management's plans to raise these numbers further. The panel regards the research efforts by staff to be up to standard and advises to continue in this sense. The panel notes the appreciation of students for their lecturers.

The educational concept and teaching methods allow for intensive education and match the combination of theoretical and practical education, typical for the programme. The large part of face-to-face education promotes effective learning by students. The study guidance is up standard. The panel especially welcomes the availability of confidential counsellors. The panel is pleased to note the favourable student success rates of the programme.

The panel compliments the programme on the excellent facilities. The panel regards other institutes in this field being housed in the Studio Building to be very important, since this allows for frequent exchanges with them.

The examinations and assessment rules and regulations of the programme are in line with Faculty and University guidelines. The position and responsibilities of the Faculty Examinations Board are up to standard.

The measures taken by programme management and the Examinations Board to ensure the quality of the examinations and assessments are satisfactory. The panel suggests to improve the information provision to students and to publish grades in a timely manner.

The examination methods correspond to the course goals and show appropriate variety. The panel appreciates teams of examiners in the specialisations assessing the practical assignments.

The panel is positive about the scheduling, supervision and assessment procedures for the Master thesis. The panel notes, however, supervision processes may differ across supervisors. Therefore, the panel proposes to introduce more objective schedules for these processes in terms of hours allotted. The panel praises the extensive and detailed thesis assessments by the examiners.

The course examinations are very thorough. The Master theses definitely match the intended learning outcomes. None of the theses submitted to the panel were found to be unsatisfactory. The grades given by the examiners mirror the theses' qualities. The panel is impressed by the performances of students in their theses. Some theses are brilliant and would be publishable.

The panel which conducted the assessment of the Master Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Heritage of University of Amsterdam assesses this programme to meet the standards of the limited framework, as laid down in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands, judging the programme to be positive. Therefore, the panel recommends NVAO to accredit this programme.

Rotterdam, 3 February 2020

Prof. E.M. Moormann PhD
(panel chair)

W. Vercouteren MSc
(panel secretary)

2. Programme administrative information

Name programme in CROHO: Master Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Heritage
Orientation, level programme: Academic Master
Grade: MSc
Number of credits: 120 EC
Specialisations: Book and Paper
Contemporary Art
Glass and Ceramics
Historic Interiors
Metals
Paintings
Photography
Textiles
Wood and Furniture
Technical Art History
Location: Amsterdam
Mode of study: Fulltime (language of instruction: English)
Registration in CROHO: 21PK-60335
Name of institution: University of Amsterdam
Status of institution: Government-funded University
Institution's quality assurance: Approved

3. Findings, considerations and assessments per standard

3.1 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 Master Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Heritage of University of Amsterdam is a two-year master programme (120 EC) in the conservation and restoration field.

The programme is one of the master programmes of the Faculty of Humanities of University of Amsterdam, being part of the Graduate School of Humanities of the Faculty. The programme is managed by the management team, being composed of, among others, the programme chair, programme director and coordinators of this master programme and the Advanced Professional Programme. Most of these positions are filled by academic staff. Support staff include the assistant programme manager, programme coordinator, amanuensis and secretarial office. The lecturers in the programme are employed at the Department of Arts & Culture of the Faculty. The Programme Committee, being composed of lecturers and students, advises programme management on the quality of the programme. The Graduate School of Humanities Examinations Board has the authority to ensure the quality of the examinations and assessments of this programme and the other master programmes of the Faculty.

The programme offers ten specialisations. These are nine conservation specialisations and the Technical Art History specialisation. For each of the specialisations, peer advisory groups, being composed of professional field representatives, have been installed. These assure the contents of and teaching in these specialisations are in line with current insights and trends in the field. The range of the specialisations is monitored by programme management and evolves over the years, depending upon trends in the programme field and labour market perspectives. New specialisations are added to the spectrum or (parts of) specialisations are removed.

The objectives of the programme are to educate students to understand conservation and restoration of cultural heritage field as a whole and their own specialisation in particular and to do analytical and diagnostic research on cultural heritage objects in order to make well-founded conservation decisions. The objectives of the Technical Art History specialisation are to train students in studying the materials, techniques, production methods and degradation processes of cultural heritage objects including from the maker's perspective.

The programme objectives have been translated into the programme intended learning outcomes. These include, as the main elements, insight in key theories and research methods in this field, knowing how to study academic literature, derive research questions and draft research plans, to do independent research in this field, to develop practical skills, to be aware of ethical issues, and to communicate about the field orally and in writing. Programme management showed the intended learning outcomes to match the Dublin descriptors for master programmes.

The programme is unique in the Netherlands, as no similar programmes are offered in universities or art academies. Around the world, comparable programmes are taught at universities, as well as in professional graduate schools, art academies, independent institutes or universities of applied sciences.

The programme is member of a wide range of national and international network organisations in this field. The programme also maintains close relations with research partners and educational programmes in the field both in the Netherlands and abroad.

Students in the conservation tracks are trained to take up positions as managers, researchers or consultants in this field. Nearly all graduates of the programme, however, proceed to the University of Amsterdam Advanced Professional Programme in Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Heritage. They do so to develop their technical and practical skills further in order to work as fully skilled conservators. Students of the Technical Art History specialisation are trained to become technical art historians or to proceed to PhD positions. They do not enrol in the Advanced Professional Programme.

Since 2015, the programme name and the language of instruction of the programme are both English. The main reasons to offer the programme in the English language are to promote the international profile of the programme, to allow access to international students and, thereby, to create a more internationally diverse student group. The programme language is in line with the Faculty of Humanities language policy, which aims for bilingual education and favours programmes both in Dutch or English.

The panel was informed about the recommendations regarding the programme by the previous external assessment panel, six years ago as well as about the steps programme management has taken to follow up on these recommendations.

Considerations

The panel regards the organisation of the programme to be appropriate. Programme management and staff are very committed to the programme.

The panel notes programme management adequately responded to the recommendations of the previous external assessment panel. The recommendations were followed up on by programme management.

The range of specialisations offered in the programme is impressive. The panel considers the flexibility of the programme in starting or adjusting specialisations in response to professional field trends as valuable.

The programme objectives are ambitious and of high quality. The academic and research objectives of the programme meet master programme requirements. The programme objectives have been adequately translated into the programme intended learning outcomes. The intended learning outcomes meet the master level. The objectives and intended learning outcomes of the Technical Art History specialisation are up to standard as well.

The panel welcomes the programme to be well-embedded in national and international networks in this field and to maintain close relations with other institutions and programmes in the field.

The panel appreciates the programme training students for positions in the professional field, acknowledging at the same time that students of the conservation specialisations will have to take the Advanced Professional Programme to become fully trained conservators.

The panel approves of both the English name of the programme and English as the language of instruction of the programme, as the panel regards the reasons given by programme management and the Faculty Board to emphasise the international profile of the programme, to attract an international student body and to enable graduates to operate in this international field to be valid.

Assessment of this standard

These considerations have led the assessment panel to assess the programme to meet standard 1, Intended learning outcomes.

3.2 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

The specialisations are offered in alternating years. Each year, half of the specialisations are offered. The number of students entering the programme is about 25 to 30 students per year. The intake figures rose gradually since 2015. The number of applicants is far more than the number of places available. The proportion of international students is about 10 % to 20 %. The admission requirements for the programme are academic bachelor degrees in humanities or in natural sciences, preferably having taken the minor in conservation and restoration or similar education. Students are also to give proof of their proficiency in English. Students with higher professional education bachelor degrees are to take the Graduate School of Humanities pre-master programme. The Faculty Admissions Office assists programme management in evaluating international diplomas. The admission procedures include firstly, the screening of applications, including results of online tests and secondly, the entry exam week in Amsterdam. In this week, motivation, manual skills and talent for the specialisation are evaluated in practical tests and interviews. Maximum twelve applicants per specialisation are invited to this week. Students for the Technical Art History specialisation do not have to attend the full entry exam week, but only the interview session.

Programme management presented the programme assessment matrix, demonstrating the intended learning outcomes of the programme to be addressed in the programme curriculum. The curriculum of the conservation specialisations is composed of specialisation-specific object-based practical modules (66 EC), specialist restoration modules (12 EC), science modules (18 EC), one elective (6 EC), and the Master thesis (18 EC). Object-based practical modules are practice-oriented courses, allowing students to understand, compare and evaluate research methods and techniques from humanities and physical sciences and to apply these in practical conservation treatment. The specialist restoration modules are interdisciplinary and address topics such as preventive conservation and the use of art technological resources. The science modules cover natural science aspects of conservation of cultural or art objects. The elective is free, but should be relevant for the specialisation. The Master thesis focuses on the diagnostic research which precedes conservation decisions. Programme management has taken steps to align the science modules and the object-based practical modules. The theory presented in the science modules has been updated to better match the applications in the object-based practical modules. The curriculum of the Technical Art History specialisation consists of specialisation-specific modules (36 EC), art technological source research modules (12 EC), science modules (24 EC), humanities electives (18 EC), field work (12 EC), and the Master thesis (18 EC). All modules of all specialisations are updated every year.

Academic staff for the Master and Advanced Professional Programme is about 16.7 fte (fulltime equivalents), being composed of 14.9 fte of permanent staff and 1.8 fte of guest lecturers. In addition, about 2.9 fte of support staff is working for the programmes. Permanent staff comprises two full professors, one in the conservation and restoration field and one in the area of conservation

science. In addition, professors by special appointment lecture in the programme. Most staff members are appointed for teaching, are members of professional organisations in their specialisations, and often have part-time positions in the professional field. Most of these have research time (15 % of their fte appointment). Where possible, they carry out research in the areas of specialisation offered in the programme. Guest lecturers are renowned conservators, or otherwise experts in related fields. Nearly 50 % of the lecturers have obtained their PhDs. The last years, the proportion of PhDs rose considerably. Programme management wants to proceed along this path. Nearly 75 % of the staff members are BKO-certified (BKO is University Teaching Qualification) or SKO-certified (SKO is Senior University Teaching Qualification). Another 20 % of them are in the process of obtaining the BKO certificate. The lecturers' work load is demanding but manageable. Students appreciate the lecturers' teaching.

The programme educational concept is geared towards intensive, student-activating teaching and learning. The student-to-staff ratio is about 4.9 (81 students and 16.7 fte of lecturers), which allows for small-scale education and student-centred learning. Student groups are maximum seven students in the conservation specialisations or eight students in the Technical Art History specialisation. The object-based practical modules are offered per specialisation, whereas the specialist restoration and science modules are joint courses. Teaching methods include (guest) lectures, practical training, workshops, and self-study. The balance of theory and practice is very important in the programme. Teaching methods are directed to reach and preserve this balance. The number of hours of face-to-face education is high. Nearly 50 % of the study load of the object-based practical modules are contact hours. Students are intensively guided by lecturers, supervisors, specialisation coordinators or programme coordinators. In case of tensions between students and lecturers or personal problems, students can refer to the study advisor, the student dean or one of the Faculty confidential counsellors. Within the programme, a tutoring system has been set up to offer assistance in these instances. Students experience the study load as being high. They, however, would not want to lower the programme standards. The student success rates of the programme are very favourable. Over 95 % of the students complete the programme within two years. The drop-out rates are very low.

Material facilities are obviously very important for the programme. The conservation studios for all specialisations are housed in the Studio Building, opposite the Rijksmuseum. These studios meet the conservation and restoration teaching and learning requirements. A number of Dutch institutes in the field of conservation and restoration are housed in this building as well. This allows students and lecturers to attend guest lectures and workshops by staff of these institutes and to work closely with them in object-based research.

Considerations

The panel is pleased to note the number of incoming students to be at 25 to 30 students per year. The bachelor programmes required for students to enrol are appropriate for this programme. The very thorough selection procedures of incoming students allow to admit students, who have the talents to complete this programme. The panel regards the conservation and restoration minor to prepare very well for this programme, acknowledging international students may not be in the position to take the minor.

The intended learning outcomes of the programme are appropriately and evenly covered in the programme curriculum. The panel considers the programme to be strong both in theoretical and in practical education in this field. The panel notes both humanities and natural sciences to be covered adequately in the curriculum. Students are clearly introduced to academic research in their field. The panel is pleased to see ethical issues being addressed appropriately in the curriculum. The specialisations obviously allow students to specialise, but students are also given the chance to specialise further within the specialisations. The panel regards the coherence of the curriculum appropriate and praises the alignment of science modules and object-based practical modules.

The lecturers in the programme are regarded by the panel to be qualified and committed teachers. The panel is positive about the proportion of BKO-certified lecturers and welcomes the numbers continuing to rise in the coming years. The panel finds the proportion of staff with PhDs adequate, given the specific character of the programme and the importance of field experience among staff. The panel approves of programme management's intentions to raise these numbers further. The panel regards the research efforts by staff to be up to standard and encourages programme management to continue in this sense. The panel notes the appreciation of students for their lecturers.

The educational concept and teaching methods of the programme allow for intensive education and match the combination of theoretical and practical education, typical for the programme. The large part of face-to-face education is welcomed by the panel, as this promotes effective learning by students. The panel regards the study guidance to be up to standard and especially welcomes the availability of confidential counsellors. The panel is pleased to note the favourable student success rates of the programme.

The panel compliments the programme on the excellent facilities, both the Studio Building itself and the material facilities in this building. The panel regards other institutes in this field being housed in the Studio Building to be very important, since this allows for frequent exchanges with them.

Assessment of this standard

These considerations have led the assessment panel to assess the programme to meet standard 2, Teaching-learning environment.

3.3 Standard 3: Student assessment

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

Findings

The programme examination and assessment rules and regulations are derived from the Faculty of Humanities Assessment Policy Framework, which is aligned with the University of Amsterdam assessment policy. The Faculty assessment principles and rules include the alignment of intended learning outcomes, course goals and examination forms in the assessment matrix, transparency about assessment by communicating the course goals and the examination methods timely to students, and quality control of examinations.

As has been indicated, the Graduate School of Humanities Examinations Board has the authority to monitor the quality of examination and assessment processes and products of this programme. For this and the other programmes, delegates within the programme inform the Examinations Board about programme-specific aspects regarding the examinations and assessments.

Examination methods in the object-based practical modules are written assignments, practical assignments or oral presentations. The weight of the practical assignments in the final grades increases over the semesters from 30 % to 60 %. The weight of the written assignments in the object-based practical modules decreases over the semesters. Written assignments are, among others, papers, lab reports, treatment proposals or literature assessments. They test students' skills in academic reasoning and in academic research. The examination methods in the joint courses include written examinations, reports, papers, posters, portfolios and oral presentations. Students' work is individually assessed. Practical assignments are assessed by teams of examiners of the specialisation concerned.

The Master thesis guidelines, regulations, deadlines and assessment forms are made available to students before the start of the Master thesis process. In the beginning of the Master thesis projects, students meet with both professors and their supervisor to draft the project proposal. During the process, supervisor and student meet regularly to discuss the progress made. The supervisor comments on the thesis chapters. The final version of the Master thesis is assessed and graded by two examiners, the supervisor and the second, independent examiner. Second examiners are conservators from other specialisations or conservation scientists from the programme. The professor in conservation science reads all theses from the science perspective, without being a formal examiner in this respect. The first and second examiner determine the final mark upon discussion. In case of significant differences in judgements between the examiners, a third examiner is asked to assess the thesis.

Programme management and the Examinations Board have taken measures to promote the validity, reliability and transparency of examinations and assessments. Examiners are appointed by the Examinations Board. The programme intended learning outcomes, the course goals and the examination methods are linked in the programme assessment matrix. The Examinations Board

checks the programme Teaching and Examination Regulations and the programme assessment matrix. Assessment dossiers are in place for courses, containing documentation on examinations and assessments. Students are informed about the course goals, examination methods and grading schemes. Students indicate this information to be somewhat unclear and relatively late. Grades are published relatively late as well, so students say.

Considerations

The panel approves of the examinations and assessment rules and regulations of the programme, these being in line with Faculty and University guidelines. The position and responsibilities of the Faculty Examinations Board are up to standard.

The panel regards the examination methods to correspond to the course goals and course contents and to show appropriate variety. The panel appreciates teams of examiners in the specialisations assessing the practical assignments of students.

The panel is positive about the scheduling, supervision and assessment procedures for the Master thesis. The panel notes, however, supervision processes may differ across supervisors. Therefore, the panel proposes to introduce more objective schedules for these processes in terms of hours allotted. The panel praises the extensive and detailed thesis assessments by the examiners. These assessments contain concrete points of further improvements.

The measures taken by programme management and the Examinations Board to ensure the quality of the examinations and assessments are considered by the panel to be satisfactory. The measures promote the validity, reliability and transparency of the examinations and assessments. The panel suggests to improve the information provision to students and to schedule sessions for students on where to find essential information. In the panel's opinion, programme management should assure grades being published in a timely manner.

Assessment of this standard

These considerations have led the assessment panel to assess the programme to meet standard 3, Student assessment.

3.4 Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

The panel studied the examinations of a number of courses of the programme.

In addition, the panel reviewed fifteen Master theses of the last two years. In their theses, students are to demonstrate being able to do object-related analytical and diagnostic research to prepare for the conservation intervention. Cooperation with conservation scientists is very often required to understand and interpret degradation phenomena. Ethical considerations may be part of Master theses. Some students become co-authors of publications derived from their theses. In the Technical Art History specialisation theses, the emphasis on practical application tends to be stronger, as graduates of this specialisation enter the labour market directly.

Graduates of the programme who have taken one of the conservation specialisations are qualified for positions as consultants, managers or researchers in the field of cultural heritage. By far the most graduates, however, proceed to the Advanced Professional Programme to be trained on advanced level and to become fully skilled conservators. When having taken the Technical Art History specialisation, programme graduates find employment as specialists in the technical art history field. These graduates may work as educators or technical art historians. They may also proceed to PhD trajectories.

Considerations

The course examinations, which the panel reviewed, are very thorough.

The panel assesses the submitted fifteen Master theses to definitely match the intended learning outcomes. No theses were found by the panel to be unsatisfactory. The grades given by the examiners mirror the theses' qualities. The panel is impressed by the performances of students in their theses. Some theses are brilliant and might lead to publications. The theses address relevant subjects, which are researched thoroughly. The interpretation of science analyses and the reflection upon the analyses' outcomes are handled well. The theses are generally well written.

The panel welcomes the programme preparing students to enter the labour market for positions in this field. This in particular applies to graduates of the Technical Art History specialisation. The panel acknowledges the graduates of the conservation specialisations being required to continue in the Advanced Professional Programme to work as fully trained conservators.

Assessment of this standard

These considerations have led the assessment panel to assess the programme to meet standard 4, Achieved learning outcomes.

4. Overview of assessments

Standard	Assessment
Standard 1. Intended learning outcomes	Standard met
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	Standard met
Standard 3: Student assessment	Standard met
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	Standard met
Programme	Positive

5. Recommendations

In this report, a number of recommendations by the panel have been listed. For the sake of clarity, these have been brought together below.

- To further promote the research done by staff.
- To introduce more objective schedules for Master thesis supervision processes in the programme in terms of hours allotted.
- To improve the information provision to students and to schedule sessions for students on where to find essential information.
- To assure timely publication of grades of examinations and assignments.

Appendix: Assessment process

The evaluation agency Certiked VBI received the request by University of Amsterdam to support the limited framework programme assessment process for the Master Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Heritage of this University. The objective of the programme assessment process was to assess whether the programme would conform to the standards of the limited framework, as laid down in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands of September 2018 (officially published in *Staatscourant* 2019 no. 3198, on 29 January 2019).

Having conferred with management of the Master Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Heritage of University of Amsterdam, Certiked invited candidate panel members to sit on the assessment panel. The panel members agreed to do so. The panel composition was as follows:

- Prof. E.M. Moormann PhD, Professor Classical Archaeology, Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands (panel chair);
- Prof. I. Brückle PhD, Professor, Head of Study Programme Conservation of Works of Art on Paper, Archives and Library Materials, State Academy of Art and Design Stuttgart, Germany (panel member);
- R. Featherstone ACR, Director of the Hamilton Kerr Institute, University of Cambridge, Assistant Director Conservation, Fitzwilliam Museum, United Kingdom (panel member);
- M. Reuss MA, Conservator, National Museum of World Cultures, Leiden, the Netherlands (panel member);
- I. Corbeek BSc, Student Master Anthropology and Development Studies, Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands (student member).

For Certiked, P.M. Esveld MA was present during the site visit as an observer. W. Vercouteren MSc of Certiked served as the process coordinator and secretary in the assessment process.

All panel members and the secretary confirmed in writing being impartial with regard to the programme to be assessed as well as observing the rules of confidentiality. Having obtained the authorisation by the University, Certiked requested the approval of NVAO of the proposed panel to conduct the assessment. NVAO have given their approval.

To prepare the assessment process, the process coordinator convened with management of the programme to discuss the outline of the self-assessment report, the subjects to be addressed in this report and the site visit schedule. In addition, the planning of the activities in preparation of the site visit were discussed. In the course of the process preparing for the site visit, programme management and the Certiked process coordinator regularly had contact to fine-tune the process. The activities prior to the site visit were performed as planned. Programme management approved of the site visit schedule.

Well in advance of the site visit date, programme management sent the list of Master theses of graduates of the programme of the most recent years. Acting on behalf of the assessment panel, the process coordinator selected fifteen Master theses from this list. The grade distribution in the

selection was ensured to conform to the grade distribution in the list, sent by programme management. All of the specialisations of the programme were adequately covered in the selection.

The panel chair and panel members were sent the self-assessment report of the programme. The self-assessment report addressed the standards of the NVAO Assessment framework. In this report, the student chapter was included. The appendices to the self-assessment report comprised the programme Teaching and Examination Regulations (OER), assessment matrix, curriculum overview, student and alumni survey, and resumes of staff. The Faculty report on external assessments was included as well. In addition, the expert panel members were forwarded a number of Master theses of programme graduates, these being part of the selection made by the process coordinator. The panel members were also sent the Trained Eye document of the Certiked evaluation agency, this document being the elaboration of the NVAO Assessment framework.

A number of weeks before the site visit date, the assessment panel chair and the process coordinator met to discuss the self-assessment report provided by programme management, the procedures regarding the assessment process and the site visit schedule. In this meeting, the profile of panel chairs of NVAO was discussed as well. The panel chair was informed about the competencies, listed in the profile. The meeting between the panel chair and the process coordinator served as the briefing for panel chairs, as meant in the NVAO profile of panel chairs.

Prior to the date of the site visit, all panel members sent in their preliminary findings, based on the self-assessment report and the final projects studied, and submitted a number of questions to be put to the programme representatives on the day of the site visit. The panel secretary summarised this information, compiling a list of questions, which served as a starting point for the discussions with the programme representatives during the site visit.

Shortly before the site visit date, the complete panel met to go over the preliminary findings concerning the quality of the programme. During this meeting, these findings of the panel members, including those about the final projects were discussed. The procedures to be adopted during the site visit, including the questions to be put to the programme representatives on the basis of the list compiled, were discussed as well.

On 3 December 2019 and 4 December 2019, the panel conducted the site visit at the University of Amsterdam campus. The site visit schedule was in accordance with the planned schedule. The schedule was as follows.

First day, 3 December 2019

- 09.00 – 12.00 Internal deliberations panel (closed session)
- 12.00 – 12.45 Faculty Board representatives and programme director
- 12.45 – 13.45 Panel lunch (closed session)
- 13.45 – 15.00 Programme director, programme coordinators, study advisor, senior teaching staff
- 15.00 – 16.45 Guided tour Studio Building
- 16.45 – 17.30 Students, Programme Committee student member, and alumni
- 17.30 – 18.00 Open office hours

Second day, 4 December 2019

- 09.00 – 09.45 Arrival panel
- 09.45 – 10.30 Examinations Board representatives
- 10.30 – 11.30 Staff members and final project examiners
- 11.30 – 14.00 Internal deliberations panel (closed session)
- 14.00 – 14.15 Presentation by panel chair of main findings to programme representatives
- 14.30 – 15.30 Development dialogue between panel and programme management

Open office hours were communicated timely by programme management to employees, lecturers and students. No persons presented themselves during these open office hours. On the day of the site visit, the panel was given the opportunity to study Faculty of Humanities policy documents, Programme Committee annual reports, Examinations Board annual reports, course material of courses, examinations of courses, student portfolios, and overview of student success rates.

In a closed session at the end of the site visit, the panel considered the findings, weighed the considerations and arrived at conclusions with regard to the quality of the programme. At the end of the site visit, the panel chair presented a broad outline of the findings, considerations, conclusions and recommendations to programme representatives.

Clearly separated from the process of the programme assessment, the assessment panel members and programme representatives met to conduct the development dialogue, with the objective to discuss future developments of the programme.

The assessment draft report was finalised by the secretary, having taken into account the findings and considerations of the panel. The draft report was sent to the panel members, who studied it and made a number of changes. Thereupon, the secretary edited the final report. This report was presented to programme management to be corrected for factual inaccuracies. Programme management was given two weeks to respond. Having been corrected for the factual inaccuracies, the Certiked bureau sent the report to the University Board to accompany their request for re-accreditation of this programme.