

The logo for AeQui, featuring the letters 'AeQui' in a purple, sans-serif font. The letters are partially enclosed by a light blue, hand-drawn style oval that loops around the 'e' and 'Q'.

PO Box 5050
NL-3502 JB Utrecht
+31 30 87 820 87
www.AeQui.nl
info@AeQui.nl

**Master of Interior Architecture
Sandberg Instituut
Gerrit Rietveld Academie**

*Report of the extensive programme assessment
9 and 10 June 2022*

Utrecht, The Netherlands
September 2022
www.AeQui.nl
Assessment Agency for Higher Education

Colophon

Programme

M Interieurarchitectuur

Sandberg Instituut

Gerrit Rietveld Academie

Location: Amsterdam

Mode of study: fulltime

Croho/ISAT: 49238

Result of institutional assessment: not applied for

Committee

Raoul van Aalst, chair

David Hamers, domain expert

Rainer Hehl, domain expert

Elma van Boxel, domain expert

Dylan Vianen, domain expert (Special Feature)

Evelien Kanters, student

Jesseka Batteau, secretary

The committee was presented to the NVAO for approval.

The assessment was conducted under responsibility of:

AeQui VBI

PO Box 5050

3502 JB Utrecht

The Netherlands

www.AeQui.nl

This document is best printed in duplex

Table of contents

Colophon	2
Table of contents	3
Summary	4
Introduction	8
Intended learning outcomes	10
Curriculum	13
Staff	19
Services and facilities.....	21
Quality assurance.....	23
Assessment.....	25
Achieved learning outcomes.....	27
Distinctive Feature small scale and intensive education	29
Attachments.....	37
Attachment 1 Assessment committee.....	38
Attachment 2 Program of the assessment	39
Attachment 3 Documents	39

Summary

On 9 and 10 July 2022 an assessment committee of AeQui visited the Master of Interior Architecture of the Sandberg Instituut of the Gerrit Rietveld Academie in Amsterdam. The master's programme, also referred to as the 'Studio for Immediate Spaces' (SIS) is a small scale, full-time, two-year English-taught master's course that culminates in the attainment of a Master's degree (MA) in Interior Architecture, amounting to 120 EC. Each year, 10 to 12 talented and motivated students are selected to join the programme. The programme is structured by four semesters of each 30 EC and consists of individual and collective projects, lectures, excursions, workshops, screenings, public exhibitions, and is supported by a research line. Students play an important role in the design, content and execution of the programme. The programme explicitly questions the frameworks and boundaries structuring the discipline and the profession of interior architecture, and aims to equip students with the necessary knowledge, tools and attitude to develop their individual spatial practice, position themselves as innovators and critically engage with a wide range of (art) disciplines and domains. In 2015, the programme has received the distinctive feature 'Small Scale and Intensive Education'.

Intended learning outcomes

The intended learning outcomes of the programme are concretised with regard to the content, level, and orientation and meet the (inter)national qualifications for a Master of Interior Architecture. Within this framework, the programme is unique in its aim to redefine the role of the spatial designer as an autonomous, creative actor who is able to intervene in and critically engage with the boundaries and frameworks structuring the discipline and the profession. The programme has ample contacts in the (international) professional field, which contribute to the relevance and topicality of the intended learning outcomes and the programme. The committee judges that the intended learning outcomes **meets the standard**.

Curriculum

The committee concludes that the content, orientation and structure of the programme's curriculum enables students to realize the intended learning outcomes. During the four semesters, students attend workshops, lectures and classes, go on excursions, receive group and individual tutoring as well as peer-review, while at the same time following an individual study trajectory consisting of projects. Although the structure of the programme is fixed, its content is tailored to respond to urgent issues and the shifting requirements of the professional field. Theory and writing are used as sources of reflection and action and are considered integral to the spatial practice of the student. Students are actively involved in the design the content and form of the

curriculum. The programme works together with expert guest tutors in the development of its content and the courses offer students various disciplinary and interdisciplinary contacts with external artists/designers/(interior) architects. The structure of the learning environment and the small and informal scale of the educational formats allow for interactive and intensive contact between students and tutors and an individual approach. Given the careful selection of qualified students with very different backgrounds, the programme is able to create cohorts in which differences between students form a productive basis for collaboration, experimentation and exploration. The committee is very impressed with the programme's ability to create an environment of intimacy and synergy, fostering a culture of criticality as well as a sense of interconnectedness, communality and mutual respect.

Staff

The committee characterizes the staff, both (guest) tutors and (guest) lecturers, as highly qualified and competent educators, with strong professional networks and thriving practices in a broad range of (inter)national fields, including (interior) architecture, design, urbanism, curating, and the arts. The composition of the staff reflects the international and interdisciplinary orientation of the programme. The relationship of tutors with the students is one of professional equality, supporting and challenging students to venture beyond the familiar in the exploration and development of their artistic identity.

Facilities

The committee is impressed with the accommodation and material facilities of the programme. The set-up is fully aligned with the aims and goals of the programme to create an open, flexible and stimulating learning environment for its students, which stimulates collaboration, experimentation and critical thinking. The availability of the workshops of the Rietveld Academie is a great advantage. Sufficient facilities are in place to provide students with information about the programme and assessments, and all other relevant information. The committee concludes that students receive the necessary guidance and tutoring during the programme, based on their individual goals and needs.

Quality assurance

The committee concludes that the programme has an effective quality assurance system in place. The programme is systematically evaluated, and relevant stakeholders are involved in the quality assurance process. The programme combines a formal evaluation system with an informal one which ensures that students have the opportunity to give feedback within the different educational settings. Overall, the programme fosters an open atmosphere of sharing and discussion between students, tutors, and other staff members.

Assessment

The programme has an adequate system of assessment in place, based on the 8 intended learning outcomes ('abilities') that the programme has formulated. Adequate measures are taken to guarantee the validity, reliability and transparency of the assessments, by the application of the four-eyes principles, including external jurors, in all formal assessments, by communicating assessment procedures at an early stage and explicitly discussing the criteria and goals of the assessments. In addition, informal assessments provide students with valuable feedback from their peers, tutors and external critics. The Examinations Board is active in safeguarding the quality of the assessments.

Achieved learning outcomes

Based on the studied documents and the interviews, the committee concludes that graduates of the pro-

gramme achieve and even exceed the required master level and intended learning outcomes. The committee supports the evaluations made by the external referents: the work (thesis and graduation project) of students is of a high level and quality. The committee concludes that the end products demonstrate a high level of maturity and criticality as well as a mastery of the technical aspects of the making process, with great social engagement and the ability to productively position the work in its spatial, physical context. The discussions with students and alumni confirmed this; they seem quite capable of creating their own career path and practice. The current practices of alumni are proof of their success and independence.

Recommendations

Next to these positive findings, the committee also has several recommendations for the further improvement of the programme:

- The committee highly appreciates the experimental drive of the programme, but also recommends that the programme, through critical dialogue, work towards a shared concept of spatiality, establishing which core competencies and expertise can serve as the points of departure for the development of Interior Architecture as discipline and profession.
- Though the committee values the emphasis on student agency and autonomy, the committee recommends that the programme offer students clearer, more defined, structures and points of departure to 'bounce off of'.
- With regard to research, theory and writing, the committee thinks that the programme could benefit from stronger connections with the existing lectoraten of the Rietveld Academie.
- The committee encourages the programme to invest in the further development of a shared pedagogical vision.
- The committee concludes that the composition of the staff members is quite diverse with regard to gender, discipline and international background, but would like to encourage the programme to find ways to also make sure that the team is also inclusive and representative when

it comes to (non-Western) cultural backgrounds and ethnicities.

- With regard to the valuable student initiatives such as the Student Circle and the different student unions, the committee stimulates the institute continue to invest in the issues raised by these platforms, and to ensure that all students and staff feel heard and cared for.
- The committee recommends that the programme invest in building bridges between the art-domain and other societal domains.

Distinctive Feature

In 2015 the programme was awarded a distinctive feature for small scale and intensive education. The committee concludes that the programme indeed meets in practice the standards for this distinctive feature, based on the level of its ambitions, the intensive interaction and collaboration between students and tutors, the programme's ability to create a productive and challenging learning community, as well as an atmosphere of intimacy and synergy, fostering a culture of criticality and mutual respect.

There is an effective admissions procedure in place which leads to the selection of talented, motivated students who are able to thrive in the Sandberg environment. The committee concludes that the programme is taught by a strong team of very competent staff members, all of whom have their own professional practices and are committed, rigorous and capable of realizing small scale and intensive teaching the programme is aiming for. The individual and group tutoring is very effective and aligns with what is expected of small scale and intensive education. The end level of students is high, reflecting a strong vision on the discipline and profession, and demonstrating criticality and independence.

The committee encourages the programme to invest in the further development of a shared pedagogical vision.

Based on these results and observations, the committee concludes that the programme **meets all the criteria** formulated for the distinctive feature 'small scale and intensive education 2018' assessment in practice. Therefore, the overall judgement of the committee is **positive**.

All standards of the NVAO assessment framework are assessed positively, hence the committee has arrived at a **positive** recommendation for the accreditation of the master's programme in Interior Architecture. The committee also assessed whether the programme ties in with the criteria for the distinctive feature regarding 'Small Scale and Intensive Education'. All standards / criteria are assessed positively, therefore the committee also gives a **positive** recommendation with regard to the distinctive feature.

On behalf of the entire assessment committee,
Utrecht, September 2022,

Raoul van Aalst
Chair

Jesseka Batteau
Secretary

Overview

The judgements per standard are presented in the table below.

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

Small Scale and Intensive Education	Judgement
A. Intended learning outcomes	<i>Meets the standard</i>
B. Programme: contents	<i>Meets the standard</i>
C. Programme: learning environment	<i>Meets the standard</i>
D. Intake	<i>Meets the standard</i>
E. Staff	<i>Meets the standard</i>
F. Facilities	<i>Meets the standard</i>
G. Achieved learning outcomes	<i>Meets the standard</i>
Overall judgement	Positive

Introduction

This report describes the outcome of the assessment of the Master of Interior Architecture, the 'Studio for Immediate Spaces' of the Sandberg Institute on 9 and 10 June 2022. The Sandberg Institute offers the master's programmes of the Rietveld Academie as well as two-year temporary programmes. The mission of the Rietveld Academie is to educate and support talented young people in such a way that they are able to operate independently in the field of visual arts and design. The Sandberg Instituut strives to deliver students who can position themselves self-critically in within the art domain and become sources of social and artistic transformation, not only redefining their field and disciplinary boundaries, but also challenging received ways of working and living.

The institute

The Sandberg Instituut is the post-graduate department of the Gerrit Rietveld Academie Amsterdam, University for Applied Sciences. The institute was founded in 1995 out of an independent foundation for post-academic art education. Since then, it has developed four professional master programmes: Fine Arts, Design, Critical Studies and Interior Architectural and Design.

The master programmes of the Sandberg Instituut stimulate young designers and artists to develop and reflect on their work in relation to the complex societal challenges and the shifting parameters of their own artistic discipline. Whereas the bachelor programmes of the Rietveld Academy are aimed at the acquisition of necessary skills and the formation of an artistic identity, the master programmes start from the assumption that the students are already autonomous, skilled and critical artists/designers/(interior)architects. Students at the Sandberg Institute are expected to be highly motivated to deepen the content of their work; they must be ready to explore, re-articulate and even reinvent their artistic identities in response to the developments in their discipline and the social, cultural and economic forces that it is subject to.

All courses offered at the institute have a small-scale and intensive character, with 15 to 25 students. The courses are offered in full-time modus and have a two-year duration. All courses aim to

anticipate on current developments and urgencies in the do-main of art and design in its societal context.

The programme

The master's programme in Interior Architecture, is a small scale, full-time, two-year English taught master's course that culminates in the attainment of a master's degree in Interior Architecture (MIA), amounting to 120 EC. 10 to 12 students are accepted each year, so the programme has a total of approximately 20 attending students.

The programme was first developed in 2009 and started in 2010. In 2012, the programme reformulated its goals and position, changing its name to 'Studio for Immediate Spaces' (SIS).

While the master's programme Interior Architecture was in first instance aimed at creating concrete connections with art education and the artistic field, it has gradually evolved as a department that questions the frameworks and boundaries structuring the discipline and the profession itself. It aims to equip students with the necessary knowledge, tools and attitude to develop their individual spatial practice, position themselves as innovators and critically engage with a wide range of (art) disciplines and domains.

All master's programmes of Sandberg have a similar set-up, consisting of four semesters of each 30 EC. Year 1 starts with an introduction for all students, followed by the formulation of an individual plan for the two years that culminate in a thesis and final project at the end of year 2. The programme consists of individual and collective

projects, lectures, excursions, workshops, screenings, public exhibitions, and is supported by a research line. Students play an important role in the design, content and execution of the programme; at the beginning of each semester the student body and the heads together decide on what kinds of work forms and teaching will be deployed.

English as language of instruction

The programme is taught in English. According to the committee this choice is well-founded given the international scope of the discipline and profession of Interior Architecture, the international background of many of the tutors, lecturers and guest teachers as well as the very diverse international backgrounds of the students selected for the course. This enables the programme to align itself with leading practices and theories around the world which are at the forefront of the discipline of Interior Architecture.

The assessment

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

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

The site visit was carried out on 9 and 10 June 2022 according to the programme presented in attachment 2. During the site visit, the committee also visited the graduation show of the programme, presenting the work of the student cohort 2020-2022. The committee has carried out its

assessment in relation to, and in consideration of, the cluster of programmes in which this programme is placed. The contextualisation of the programme within its cluster was conducted by the complete committee during the preliminary meeting and the final deliberations. The knowledge required for this was present in (part of) the committee.

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

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

Distinctive Feature

As part of the programme assessment, the committee has also assessed the distinctive feature "Small Scale and Intensive Education" which the programme received in the course of 2013 and 2015. The current assessment in practice of the distinctive feature was conducted as an integral part of the assessment of the educational programme. The distinctive feature consists of specific criteria, determined by a separate NVAO protocol 2018, which are discussed in the section following the evaluation of the educational programme. The committee included one member, Dylan Vianen, with expertise pertaining to the feature in question.

Development dialogue

Finally, a development dialogue will be planned in the following months at the initiative of the programme. The results of this development dialogue will have no influence on the assessment presented in this report.

Intended learning outcomes

The committee judges that the programme **meets the criteria for this standard**. The intended learning outcomes of the programme are concretised with regard to the content, level, and orientation and indeed meet the (inter)national qualifications for a Master of Interior Architecture. Within this framework, the programme is unique in its aim to redefine the role of the spatial designer as an autonomous, creative actor who is able to intervene in and critically engage with the boundaries and frameworks structuring the discipline and the profession. The committee observes that the philosophy and expectations of the programme are as relevant and as they are ambitious, conveying an explorative and experimental orientation, as well as a focus on trans/inter/non-disciplinarity, criticality, research and self-reflective positioning within the arts and society at large. The programme has ample contacts in the (international) professional field, which contribute to the relevance and topicality of the intended learning outcomes and the programme. The committee highly appreciates the experimental drive of the programme, but also recommends that the programme, through critical dialogue, work towards a shared concept of spatiality, establishing which core competencies and expertise can serve as the points of departure for the development of Interior Architecture as discipline and profession.

Intended learning outcomes

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

Findings

The master's programme of Interior Architecture is aimed at exploring spatiality and spatial practice in the broadest sense, and explicitly challenges traditional understandings of Interior Architecture as discipline and profession. Students are trained to become independent and critical spatial practitioners of the future and are expected to investigate/explore/incorporate/transcend various artistic disciplines and perspectives in their spatial practices.

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

These reference points are used by the programmes to set the characteristics of policies and educational or research practices.

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

- The curricula enable students to question and explore the boundaries of their professional, artistic practices.
- Students learn to research the contemporary dynamics of the disciplines, seen in their broader cultural and societal contexts.
- Students develop an ability to take on strong and articulated positions, and communicate effectively via works, texts and presentations, before a diverse, general or professional, public.
- Students develop new skills, knowledge, and methods to design their creative processes appropriately, or they know when to tune in to skills and knowledge of others, for instance when joining a collective.
- Students operate independently as professional artists, designers, theorists or writers with an experimental and innovative approach.

- Students maintain a sound and sustainable professional practice in a dynamic of changing circumstances.
- Students learn to anticipate critically on demanding, sometimes unsettling contexts.

These principles have been translated into the following generic competencies for all master's programmes: ability to create; ability to reflect critically; ability to grow and innovate; ability to organise; ability to communicate; contextual awareness; ability to collaborate; investigative ability.

In turn, the programme has specified these 8 competencies for the domain of Interior Architecture: awareness of spatial context; awareness of artistic context; depth of research; ability to communicate; technical execution; ability to organise; participation. These criteria are assessed and evaluated in an integrated manner throughout the course.

The profile, aims and ambitions of the Sandberg master's programme in Interior Design are conveyed in its title: "Studio for Immediate Spaces (SIS)". With this title, the programme highlights its focus on the immediate relationship between person and space, which distinguishes interior architecture from architecture, but also for the 'immediate' approach of the challenges that the field is facing. In this sense, the programme aims to offer an alternative take on the field of interior architecture. It views the learning environment as a space for debate, opening up new terrains and allowing for the development of independent practices. There is a strong emphasis on exploration, experimentation, investigative research and artistic autonomy, with an interest in what Interior Architecture could be and become. As the self-evaluation report describes, Interior Architecture can be: "a creative practice between architecture, design and art, a spatial practice that works with and in contexts, a critical practice that rather reframes the existing than builds always new, deeply concerned with the social, political, economic and ecological urgencies of present times."

Connection with the professional field

The programme ensures that its intended learning outcomes are aligned with the requirements of the professional field in various ways. Lecturers, heads, tutors and guests have ample experience in the (international) field of interior architecture, art and design. Staff involved combine their professional/artistic and/or curating, writing or research practice with their educational and teaching roles. Because the course involves practicing artists and designers in the curriculum, SIS is able to respond swiftly to new developments and issues in the field.

In addition, the programme ensures the dialogue with the (inter)national field and the outside world by inviting guest tutors, organizing excursions, lectures, symposia, as well as extra-curricular projects and exhibitions. These are often planned with involvement of students and/or alumni, and take place inside and outside the institute, in a local and (inter)national art context. Next to this there is feedback from external jury members at intake, midterm and final assessments. They evaluate the work and progress of the candidates or the students from that perspective on the future practice, and reflect with the head and teaching staff on the relevance for the aims, content and outcome of the course for these generally. At the graduation shows a group of externals is also invited to join a tour as 'crits' along the exhibition spaces in the city, and articulate their findings.

Considerations

Based on interviews and the examination of underlying documentation, the committee concludes that intended learning outcomes of the programme tie in with (inter)national requirements for a master's programme in Interior Architecture and are in tune with, and even exceed, the demands from the professional field. The committee observes that the philosophy and expectations of the programme are as relevant as they are ambitious, conveying an explorative and experimental orientation, as well as a focus on trans/inter/non-disciplinarity, criticality, research

and self-reflective positioning within the arts and society at large.

Based on the discussions it had during the site visit, the committee concludes that the ambitions and aims of the programme are widely shared by all involved: students, staff, teachers, alumni and the professional field, and that the relevant parties are involved in keeping the profile and learning outcomes of the programme up-to-date. The programme maintains a strong network within the professional field and discipline, staff involved have ample expertise in relevant domains and (international) professional experience; guest lecturers (practising artists, designers, curators and researchers) are invited on a regular base and students are actively involved to contribute to the content and structure of the programme.

The committee highly appreciates the experimental drive of the programme, and is very positive about the fact that Sandberg offers a space and community which critically examines and reworks established frameworks and structures. It also concludes that this critically questioning and experimentation is conducted in a careful, conscious and precise manner. At the same time, it

recommends that the programme not shy away from arriving at a shared concept of spatiality and, through critical dialogue, establish which core competencies and expertise can serve as the points of departure for the further development of Interior Architecture as discipline and profession. Being at the forefront of a discipline also requires maintaining a connection to the formal structures in place, even while critically questioning these. Becoming too 'fluid' has the risk of losing recognizable contours, which in turn can be used to elude critique. Taking up a clear position, offering definition and resistance, will help students to develop their own autonomous position within the profession, help them to connect with other relevant domains and fields, and expand their practice beyond traditional disciplinary boundaries.

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

Curriculum

The committee concludes that the content, orientation and structure of the programme's curriculum enables students to realize the intended learning outcomes. During the four semesters, students attend workshops, lectures and classes, go on excursions, receive group and individual tutoring as well as peer-reviews, while at the same time following an individual study trajectory consisting of projects. Although the structure of the programme is fixed, its content is tailored to respond to urgent issues and the shifting requirements of the professional field. Theory and writing are used as sources of reflection and action and are considered integral to the spatial practice of the student. Students are actively involved in the design the content and form of the curriculum.

The programme works together with expert guest tutors in the development of its content and the courses offer students various disciplinary and interdisciplinary contacts with external tutors/artists/designers/(interior) architects. Therefore, students already forge qualitative networks and participate in discussions on the development of the field. The structure of the learning environment and the small and informal scale of the courses allow for interactive and intensive contact between students and tutors and an individual approach. Given the careful selection of qualified students with very different backgrounds, the programme is able to create cohorts in which differences between students form a productive basis for collaboration, experimentation and exploration. The committee is very impressed with the programme's ability to create an environment of intimacy and synergy, fostering a culture of criticality as well as a sense of interconnectedness, communality and mutual respect.

Though it values the emphasis on student agency and autonomy, the committee recommends that the programme offer students a clearer, more defined, structures and points of departure to 'bounce off of'. Furthermore, the committee would like to encourage the programme to develop a pedagogy which fosters self-learning, agency and autonomy in a more structural and tangible manner. Regarding research, theory and writing, the committee thinks that the programme could benefit from stronger connections with the existing lectoraten of the Rietveld Academie.

Orientation

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

Findings

The programme ensures that students are well prepared as critical and professional spatial practitioners. All staff members, tutors and (guest) lecturers are themselves practicing artists, designers, researchers, curators and (interior) architects. Furthermore, students are expected to bring in their own practice, and connect their projects in the programme to their professional development. The dialogue with the (inter)national field and the out-side world takes place through excursions, lectures, symposia, extra-curricular projects and exhibitions. These activities are planned with involvement of students and/or alumni, and take

place inside and outside the institute, in a local and (inter)national (extended) art/design/architectural context. The programme supports and challenges students to develop their own methods, while exploring the boundaries of the profession and reinventing the frameworks and definitions informing the field of interior architecture

Research orientation

Research, critical-analytical thinking and self-reflection are central to all programmes at the Sandberg Instituut. Through research, students develop the necessary tools to sustain their own professional practice and to contribute to the development of the profession. Research is defined broadly and includes research for and through (artistic) practice as well as the development of a professional position and vision in relation to the

own discipline and wider artistic, disciplinary and social contexts. Students are expected to find their own methods of carrying out research, which is always closely connected to finding their own form of writing, presenting and producing. In addition, research helps students to gain a better picture of their own position within the discipline and profession and to develop a strong vision.

Throughout the two years of the programme, students follow a research and thesis-writing trajectory which includes lectures, the reading of literature, workshops, masterclasses and a year-long seminar aimed at developing writing as a critical methodology or tool that is connected to, or interwoven with, the artistic practice.

The thesis-project starts at the end of the first year with the student's formulation of an individual research theme (or question) and ends after semester three with the presentation of the thesis, which is then brought in relation to the final project in the second year.

Importantly, students are expected to elaborate on the relation between theory and practice throughout the programme. And in the final project, students must have to make clear how theory and practice inform each other.

From 2017 onwards, the Rietveld Academie has focused on three areas of research: The City, Artificial intelligence (AI) and Materials. A fourth research theme was initiated in 2021: Critical Inquiry, which is more closely connected to the master's programmes of Rietveld and directed by the head of the department Critical Studies.

Considerations

The committee concludes that the programme addresses the necessary professional and research skills for a student to thrive as an innovating spatial practitioner in the professional field. Criticality analysis, self-reflection, exploration and experimentation is stimulated, and students are actively involved in creating their own programme. The courses offer students a wide range of disciplinary and interdisciplinary contacts with

artists/architects/designers as guest tutors and lecturers.

The committee observes that research, theory and writing are integral to programme and strongly connected to the artistic practice of students. It recommends the programme to strengthen its relation with the existing lectoraten of the Rietveld Academie. The connection with and input from a research department (i.e. City) specialized in the discipline could help to further develop methodologies and tools for research within the context of art/design/architecture in general with a specific focus on what is needed within the domain of Interior Architecture.

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

Contents

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

Findings

All Sandberg programmes follow a general set-up and framework, with enough room for each course to make its own choices with regard to emphasis and focus. The programmes are small-scale and flexible, incorporating different approaches and practices from a wide range of fields and disciplines. In this way the Sandberg Instituut seeks to create an ideal environment for the innovation of professional practices.

Like the other Sandberg programmes, the SIS programme is divided into four semesters of 30 EC each. In the first semester, students are introduced to each other and the programme and start to formulate their individual plan, embark on their self-initiated projects, participate in collective projects and are introduced to tools for studying projects, writing practices and methods of research. In the second semester, students further elaborate and articulate their initial motivation or research question into a plan for their thesis and

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

Throughout, the SIS programme consists of two spheres: projects and course work. Students develop projects as individuals or in small groups. For their projects, they are supported to work on their individual practices through individual and group tutoring and peer-to-peer reviews. Project work includes two written (first year paper, thesis paper) and four executed (first and third semester assessment, 1st year final project, graduation) instances. While the projects for the first year are understood as explorations where the students are encouraged to experiment, the second year is to work on sharpening students' individual/collective practices. In the course, the students are introduced to topics, themes, methods by the teachers that might or might not impact on students' individual practices. Course work ranges from excursions to exercises, from readings and discussions to lectures and visits and are developed by the teachers individually. The programme is set up for the students to roughly spend 2/3 of their study time with their projects and about 1/3 with the course program. Generally, the first months are more focused on input, the second half of the academic year gives more room to work on individual projects toward the first-year assessment show or the graduation show.

In its conversations with alumni and students the committee learned that, overall, students are content with the programme and the expertise and experience that (guest) teachers and tutors bring to the table. The active involvement of students in the design and content of the programme is highly appreciated, though it can also lead to more discussion and uncertainty for students.

There was a notable difference between what first years and second year students experience: first year students sometime feel a bit lost when it comes to the structure and what is expected of them, whereas second year students already show a great degree of confidence in their professional and artistic, displaying an awareness of what they need to develop their practice. Alumni noted that this feeling of being lost is something that is part of following a programme within an art context, and actually contributed to their further growth as professionals who can challenge the field.

Considerations

According to the committee, the programme enables students to fully realize and integrate the intended learning qualifications. The committee qualifies the programme as innovative and trans/inter/multidisciplinary with a high level of criticality and productivity. The SIS programme cultivates an atmosphere and learning environment in which students are challenged to question and rethink existing definitions and practices and to influence the profession starting through innovative practices. It is also very positive about the design of the theory programme in which students are taught to integrate theoretical/critical reflection and writing as part of their design practices.

The committee does see some room for improvement when it comes to offering students a stronger, more defined structure and points of departure when it comes to an understanding of spatiality as well as a reflection on the tools and methodologies that are thought to be foundational to the discipline of Interior Architecture. The first-year students indicated that they were in need of a 'surface to bounce off of', so as to have a starting point for the development of their own autonomous practice. A more pronounced positioning of the programme, even if temporary or 'in-flux', will contribute to the further growth of both students and the course, according to the committee.

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

Structure

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

Considerations

The SIS programme has a small-scale character, with a total of around enrolled 20 students. In the first year, the courses are geared towards students articulating their personal trajectory, starting from their initial motivation. In the individual trajectory, students are guided by their main tutor. To broaden students' context and feed or challenge their individuality, the courses offer several educational formats. For example, regular group meetings with external critics for discussions and informal feedback, thesis writing, visits by guest tutors, lecturers, workshops and studio projects as well as internal and external presentations, screenings, readings and public exhibitions. Other teaching forms include a series of seminars with different topics, reading groups, working on a publication, excursions and boot camps. As described above, the emphasis on course work shifts during the year, with most lectures, workshops and seminars etcetera are held in the first and third semester. In the second half of the year, students individual and collective practices take in a more central place.

Importantly, the programme puts great emphasis on shared projects, interconnectedness and communality, both between students as well as between students and tutors/teachers. Community thinking, non-hierarchical peer-learning, and reciprocity is central to the whole programme and is evident in the manner in which students, alumni and tutors/lecturers describe how the programme actually works. It is also displayed in how the course is designed through common projects, activities, excursions, workshops, etc etc.

Response to Covid19

The programme was able to respond in a most fitting fashion to the lockdown and restrictive measures due to world-wide pandemic. It made sure to monitor and take care of students and staff dealing with challenges (with regard to personal issues, study, work, housing, travel and family), while also flexibly managing safe access to the building by allocating specific days to avoid too many people present at the same time. Hybrid/online meetings were held when necessary. Extra budget and tutoring were made available so that the delayed graduation show could take place after the summer (rather than before the summer).

That the situation could also lead to new approaches and ways of working is evident from the fact that the programme sought alternative venues to conduct teaching and projects, for example by challenging students to make work on location at a laundromat, or to execute work in empty Airbnb's.

Findings

The committee concludes that the structure of the learning environment and the small and informal scale of the programme allow for a strong pedagogical context in which communality, reciprocity and collaborative practices is made possible. The committee notes that the programme maintains an adequate balance between individual and group work fitting for the character and goals of the course. Students

are offered a highly challenging and inspiring learning environment in which they can question, explore and reinvent, while also developing their own unique signatures as spatial practioners. Students are challenged to work as a collective and to support each other, and are actively involved in the design of the course. As became clear during the site visit, students highly appreciate the agency and autonomy that they are given, and at the same time speak highly of the sense of community, the feeling of interconnectedness they have as part of the SIS programme.

This is a great quality which the programme can capitalize on.

Also, the committee is very impressed with the inventive and conceptual manner in which programme responded to the restrictions of Covid19. Dealing with the pandemic in an artistic manner, while also applying approaches, methods and tools of Interior Architecture is a shining example of how a small-scale programme is able to flexibly and insightfully respond to urgent societal challenges.

The committee would like to encourage the programme to develop both pedagogy and didactics which foster self-learning, agency and autonomy in a more structural and tangible manner, both for the short term and the long term. At the moment, the programme's educational philosophy is for the most part implicit and needs to be made more explicit so that (guest) tutors, lecturers and students are aware of its underlying principles and methods of application.

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

Incoming students

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

Findings

For its intake the programme has an intensive and selective admission procedure in place which is aimed at selecting talented students with an interest and/or background in spatial practices. It applies the legally required enrolment criteria.

The prospective students may have very different disciplinary and professional backgrounds, and the programme looks to compose a cohort of students who will work closely together and benefit from each other's knowledge, experience and expertise, whether this be in design, interior architecture, art, music or otherwise.

Students are selected by a jury. The jury consists of the head of the course (chair), students, tutors,

the coordinator and an external jury member representing the professional field. The jury looks at the digital applications, with information about their former education, their current practice, their networks, their body of work, capacities and motivation and how the candidates may contribute to the collective approach to working and learning at Sandberg. A first selection of students is invited for interviews (live or digital). During the interviews, the jury makes sure to assess the English language level, general attitude and the candidate's ability to learn and develop.

The programme also makes sure to inform students carefully about what they can expect during the course, especially with regard to the challenging study environment, the expectation that they actively contribute to the programme, know how to ask for the input and expertise they need, and the importance of self-learning and peer-learning.

In its conversations with students and alumni the committee learned that though first-year students do need some time to adjust to the demands of the programme on their self-guidance and independence, they all indicated that they specifically chose SIS because of its experimental approach and the fact that they could develop their spatial interests and practices in close interaction with fellow students, tutors and (guest)teachers. When speaking to the second-year students and alumni it became clear that the SIS learning environment indeed met their expectations: they were able to freely develop their artistic practices and arrive at new positions, insights and ways of working precisely because of the way the programme is set up: small-scale, intensive, challenging and multi/inter/postdisciplinary with a strong emphasis on the artistic autonomy of the spatial practitioner.

Considerations

The committee concludes that the admission procedures of the programme fulfil the legal requirements and ensure the selection of students whose qualifications, expertise and attitude are aligned with the design and content of the course, the

learning environment and its educational philosophy. The committee praises the manner in which the programme strives to compile cohorts which are diverse, inclusive as well as multidisciplinary, allowing for a fruitful interaction between multiple perspectives and ways of working.

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

Staff

Based on the site-visit and the documents studied, the committee characterizes the staff, both (guest) tutors and (guest) lecturers, as highly qualified and competent educators, with strong professional networks and thriving practices in a broad range of (inter)national fields, including (interior) architecture, design, urbanism, curating, and the arts. The composition of the staff reflects the international and interdisciplinary orientation of the programme. The relationship of tutors with the students is one of professional equality, supporting and challenging students to venture beyond the familiar in the exploration and development of their artistic identity. The committee stimulates the programme to work towards a more diverse staff composition. Finally, the committee would also like to emphasize the importance of discussing and developing a shared pedagogical vision, even if this is applied differently by each tutor in varying contexts.

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

Findings

SIS is managed by two programme heads (each 1,5 days a week) in collaboration with the programme coordinator (2 days a week). At present, the programme has four core tutors. The heads at Sandberg Instituut are appointed for 8 years and give artistic direction to the education of the departments, informed by their own practices, expertise and professional experience. The heads are asked to propose a successor in the seventh year of their appointment. The new head is decided upon by the director, in close consultation with the other heads and staff members. The coordinator works in close collaboration with the department head and plays a pivotal role at the department. Together they facilitate the education and manage the necessary administration.

At the moment, the programme has 4 core tutors for education who instruct students on practical and theoretical aspects (a total of 12 days a month). All current heads and core tutors have a master's degree, 2 have a PhD and one is pursuing a doctorate.

The core tutors are joined by a substantial number of guest tutors, 2 per month, who also provide practical and theory classes as well as workshops. All tutors and guest tutors have a close connection to the field and educational experience. Tutors are most often engaged as freelancer for the

period of one academic year, with the option of extension for a year. Tutors and staff are practitioners who work at the intersections of many fields including art history, editing, urbanism, criticism, architecture, arts, publishing, and design. Students are free to decide from whom they wish to receive guidance.

The programme is taught in English. Good English proficiency is a condition for staff and (guest) tutors to be hired at the institute.

Considerations

According to the committee, the programme's staff, tutors and guest tutors are highly qualified and experienced practitioners in wide range of artistic fields. All have a flourishing practice in their own field, whether this be as a designer, urbanist, artist, curator, art historian, architect of interior architect. The committee observes that the tutors and guest tutors are able to inspire, support and challenge the students, employing different strategies and approaches.

The committee concludes that the composition of the staff members is quite diverse with regard to gender, discipline and international background, but would like to encourage the programme to find ways to also make sure that the team is also inclusive when it comes to the representation of non-Western backgrounds and ethnicities.

Finally, the committee would also like to emphasize the importance of discussing and developing

a shared pedagogical vision, even if this is applied differently by each tutor in varying contexts. The employment of substantiated pedagogical insights can be beneficial for both tutors and students, especially when working with diverse groups of students and when advocating a 'fluid' post-disciplinary attitude towards methodologies and professional habits and traditions. In this context, the committee appreciates the instalment of the Tutor Circle which is a good tool for the development of a shared pedagogical discourse.

The staff has an adequate command of the English language, according to students, alumni and the committee.

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

Services and facilities

The committee is impressed with the accommodation and material facilities of the programme. The set-up is fully aligned with the aims and goals of the programme to create an open, flexible and stimulating learning environment for its students, which stimulates collaboration, experimentation and critical thinking. The availability of the workshops of the Rietveld Academie is a great advantage. Sufficient facilities are in place to provide students with information about the programme and assessments, and all other relevant information. The committee concludes that students receive the necessary guidance and tutoring during the programme, based on their own goals and needs. It encourages the programme to ensure good availability of tutors and to make sure both students and tutors know how the tutoring is organised.

Accommodation and infrastructure

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

Findings

In January 2019 Sandberg Instituut returned to the lot of Gerrit Rietveld Academie, two temporary programmes remain located elsewhere, due to educational and content related aspects. From 2016-2019 the Sandberg Instituut was temporarily located in the west of Amsterdam while the new building was realized, and the existing buildings and facilities were renovated and improved. The temporary location provided more square meters and a different architectural quality, which enabled the programme to try out new working situations and formats. These practices were continued in the new housing, including the realization of an open educational environment to stimulate sharing, creating and learning as one community. The current set-up of the building includes small auditoria for lectures, work meetings and student initiatives such as movie nights and consulting rooms, that can also be used as flexible working spaces. There is a front office to support students if they have any questions or issues they would like to discuss. The Sandberg Instituut has various other facilities at its disposal, such as a communal kitchen, a media lab, an artist's shop with supplies and a library with around 11,000 titles in its collection.

The building is in the direct vicinity of the Gerrit Rietveld Academie where the bachelor courses are taught. Sandberg Instituut students can make use of well-equipped working spaces in their own building and the workshops at the Rietveld Academie, where they can employ a diverse range of materials and techniques during regular opening hours (book binding, CAD CAM, photography, glass, graphic design, wood, ceramic, metal, fashion, jewelry, textile, typography, weaving and screen printing). The staff encourages exchange and cross-pollination between the various working spaces; an important principle is that every workspace should be accessible to every student from all departments.

Students are also stimulated to take initiative and organize events themselves. Facilities and budgets are available for this. Because the graduation show was delayed due to the restrictions of Covid19, Sandberg made budget available for extra tutoring so that students could continue their preparations for the presentation of their graduation work in an exhibition that was planned over the summer (in October).

Considerations

The committee is impressed with the accommodation and material facilities of the programme. The set-up is fully aligned with the aims and goals of the programme to create an open, flexible and stimulating learning environment for its students, which stimulates collaboration, experimentation

and critical thinking. The availability of the workshops of the Rietveld Academie is a great advantage. Sufficient facilities are in place to provide students with information about the programme and assessments, and all other relevant information

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

Tutoring and student information

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

Findings

Students are primarily guided by their tutors, the coordinator and the head of the course. Each head is responsible for ensuring that support also extends to the pastoral needs of students. At the beginning of the programme, students are matched with a main tutor who will guide them throughout two years. At the institutional level, a counsellor and psychological care are available for all students.

Tutor-student and peer-to-peer coaching is an integral and fundamental part of the master's programmes at the Sandberg Instituut. Through the intensive studios, the many group workshops and lectures and the regular group presentations in the programme, the students are always able to discuss problems and issues they might be encountering with tutors and/or the whole group. Students are expected to take an interest in each other's work and to be in continuous dialogue with fellow students, staff, tutors and guest teachers about the directions they are exploring. In this manner, the programme creates a close-knit learning community involving both students and staff.

The programme makes sure to inform its students about what is expected and regularly asks its students about the workload and the feasibility of the curriculum. Every year, the students are informed by means of a hand-out about the details of the annual programme, the assessment procedures, the working methods used, and the facilities. This handout is a key feature of the three-day introduction workshop at the start of the academic year. It includes an explanation of the purpose of the programme, the ideas informing the studios and the choice of lecturer.

During the site visit, students and alumni indicated that they are very satisfied with the way the support system is set up, and highly value the programme's approach to support, care and learning as integral to each other.

The committee also observed that students are not always aware of how of the much time the tutors are available for guidance and that they therefore sometimes hesitate to contact them. Students indicated that they would appreciate more continuity in this respect.

Considerations

The committee concludes that students receive the necessary guidance and tutoring during the programme, based on their own goals and needs. The nature of this guidance ties in with the independence expected from students following a master's programme. The programme succeeds in creating a culture of shared learning and support, due to the close-knit student body and the design of the curriculum. However, more clarity on the availability of the individual tutors would be desirable.

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

Quality assurance

The committee concludes that the programme has an effective quality assurance system in place. The programme is systematically evaluated and relevant stakeholders are involved in the quality assurance process. The programme combines a formal evaluation system with an informal one which ensures that students have the opportunity to give feedback within the different educational settings. With regard to the valuable student initiatives such as the Student Circle and the different student unions, the committee encourages the institute continue to invest in the issues raised by these platforms, and to ensure that all students and staff feel heard and cared for.

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

Findings

Heads and coordinators of the courses have a prominent role in quality assurance. The coordinators at Sandberg are the bridge between head and students, the programme and the institute. They are pivotal for addressing issues, also on behalf of the students. They do so informally on a day-to-day basis, but also formally during monthly meetings with staff members and bi-monthly meetings with the director and staff members.

Students are also structurally consulted with regard to the quality of the programme. Staff members of Sandberg Instituut sit with a representative group of students of each course to talk about the feedback of students on a list of topics. After the meeting the policy advisor communicates the findings to the director and the head.

Students the committee spoke to indicated that a lot of their feedback has led to adjustments and changes in the programme, and that they do feel they can address issues openly with head, coordinator and tutors.

Furthermore, the academy organises two-yearly student and employee surveys. Even though the response is quite low, the open questions provide relevant information with regard to how students experience the programme.

The external perspective of the professional field on the programme is organised through feedback from external jury members at intake, mid-term and final assessments. They evaluate the work and progress of the candidates or the students from that perspective on the future practice, and reflect with the head and teaching staff on the relevance for the aims, content and outcome of the course for these generally. Every year, the institute invites externals (writers, curators, critics) to visit the graduation shows and write a reflection.

Since the institute doubled in size, the formal quality cycle involving students has changed. To ensure that the student voices are heard and urgent issues addressed, Sandberg Instituut supported the appointment of the Student Circle. The Student Circle operates independently and addresses issues on behalf of all students. The Student Circle deals with issues facing the students. Instead of deferring to the formal structures of the institution, it hopes to act within the student body. The circle meets twice a month and consists of current students and alumni. The meetings concentrate on a single topic and end with a concrete action plan. The focus is on supporting student-led initiatives, promoting dialogue across programmes, gaining insight in experiences of students from the different programmes and contributing to the social life of the institute.

The committee learned in conversation with the different student representative bodies that there

is room for improvement with regard to diversity and inclusivity at the Sandberg Instituut. Student platforms and unions, such as the Student Circle as well as the Black Student Union and the Asian Student Union, played an active role in addressing important societal issues regarding gender equality, sexual identity, discrimination, and the representation of non-Western perspectives within the institution. Sandberg has supported these initiatives with funding and facilities, and has developed policies as well as an intercurricular programme based on the wishes and needs of the students.

The student representatives the committee spoke to indicated that they think that the Institute should continue to improve the cultural diversity and inclusiveness of the organisation and the accessibility of the programmes. They also would like Sandberg to proactively encourage a shift in culture as an institute, which not only includes staff and tutors, but also the supporting and administrative staff.

Considerations

The committee concludes that an efficient quality assurance system is in place. The system contains formal and informal checks and balances to ensure the quality of the programme. Relevant

stake-holders such as students, tutors and the professional field are involved. Based on the discussions during the site-visit, the committee concludes that students in general feel heard and that courses adapt and change due to students' feedback. Students have an important role in (re)shaping the courses. The committee values that the institute leaves room for students and staff to raise questions in the organisation.

The committee is happy to note that Sandberg Instituut responded quickly to issues raised by students regarding diversity, representation and inclusivity, incorporating these insights and needs into its policy and supporting the initiatives with funding. The committee encourages the programme and institute to continue on this path, to be mindful of the issues raised and to keep investing in a culture of diversity and inclusivity, ensuring that all students and staff feel heard and cared for.

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

Assessment

The committee concludes that an adequate system of assessment is in place, based on the 8 intended learning outcomes ('abilities') that the programme has formulated. Adequate measures are taken to guarantee the validity, reliability and transparency of the assessments, by the application of the four-eyes principles, including external jurors in all formal assessments, by communicating assessment procedures at an early stage and explicitly discussing the criteria and goals of the assessments. In addition, informal assessments provide students with valuable feedback from their peers, tutors and external critics. The programme's assessments are also used to generate dialogue between students, fellow-students, staff and guest-lecturers about the relevance and objectivity of the assessment criteria. The Examinations Board is active in safeguarding the quality of the assessments.

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

Findings

The main principles of the Sandberg Instituut's assessment policy are described in a document based on the formal framework: the Course and Examinations Regulations. The application of these regulations for SIS is set out in the hand-out that students receive at the start of the year. This is used to explain the assessment methods at the introduction workshop at the start of the academic year. After each first semester of the study year, the design and goals of the assessments is one of the issues discussed with the heads, the students and the relevant teachers. The assessments are based on the eight qualifications or 'abilities' and external experts are involved as jury members for all formal semester assessments.

At the end of each semester, the programme assesses the results achieved by students in all the study components. In all courses, the results of the practical projects, research and writing are assessed in an integrated manner. The students give a presentation, display and explain their work and plans. During the *first semester assessment* in year one, the key aspects are active participation, positioning in the study programme, and the relationship to the varied and broadbased courses on offer. At the *final first-year assessment*, the student's potential for graduating is assessed; whether or not the student will be able to carry out a research project independently on the basis

of a plan, which will lead to a thesis and a graduation project (practical work). If a student fails an assessment or a 'passes on condition' and there is a good perspective for re-doing the year, a compensatory plan is written in consultation between head, coordinator and student. The Examinations Board is always informed and checks if this remedial plan is indeed fitting, fair and feasible.

The *third semester assessment* in year two concerns the thesis and also reviews all study results until then 'as a whole', and assesses the progress the student has made in view of the graduation. If there is any doubt about whether the student will be able to graduate, a plan of improvement is drawn up. Second-year students receive a 'green light' assessment preceding the actual graduation. The programme decides whether the results of the project are suitable for assessment at the time of graduation. Students are sometimes advised to defer their graduation until after the final, public exhibition.

In the *final semester assessment*, the student's practical and theoretical final project is assessed by a jury, which also includes one or two external members. This takes place in conjunction with a public exhibition. The members interrogate the candidate and form an opinion of various components. The jury then deliberates whether the student indeed meets the required standard. The chairman of the jury (the head of the study programme) formulates the joint findings and con-

clusion. Second-year students who fail their graduation may be offered a resit for the assessment. In this case, a plan is made in which the student and the programme formulate what aspects need more work and improvement.

In addition to the formal assessments, students receive feedback on their work and progress on a structural basis. This is part of the ongoing critical conversations that are held throughout each course, where students discuss their work and progress with heads, tutors, guest tutors and fellow students. In its conversations with students the committee learned that they are generally quite content with the assessments and the feedback they receive from their tutors and external critics. They value the discussions with their tutors and the external input and noted that there is ample room for discussions, and the programme is prepared to change things if students put forward a convincing argument.

Assessments during Covid-19

In the period 2020-2021 the programme dealt with assessments in a flexible manner: some assessments were done online, to help students who were abroad. Because of the restrictive measures students could sometimes not complete their practical work as they intended. The programme allowed some students who had suffered difficult circumstances to present both theoretical and practical work that was still 'in process' accompanied by a plan for completion.

Examination Board

The examinations board is responsible for all programmes of the Sandberg Instituut. It consists of four members, including an external member. The board approves the jury involved in the assessments that are held at the end of each semester,

approves what to do when a student fails or receives an 'on condition' and regularly visits a selection of first year and final examinations. The secretary of the Examination Board advises the head, coordinator and jury on the set up of the assessments and on the use of the forms. Each year the examination committee verifies the student's dossiers to see if these are complete and whether tutors provide good written feedback. The Examinations Board of Sandberg Instituut recently conducted two surveys on the ways each of the departments at the Sandberg Instituut organize the different parts of their assessments. These were used to rearticulate protocols, adaptation in the Course and Exam Regulations and a new Sandberg Instituut general thesis guideline.

Considerations

The committee concludes that the programme has an adequate assessment system in place. The quality assurance of the assessment system is also sufficient. The measures taken to guarantee the validity, re-liability and transparency of the assessments match the formative and subjective assessments within art education. These include using the four-eye principle, involvement of external jurors and the use of assessment criteria specific to art education. Furthermore, informal (peer)review and critical reflection on the student's work is integral to the programme as a whole. The design, criteria and goals of the assessments are also the subject of critical discussion between heads, tutors and students. The Examinations Board is active in safeguarding the quality of the assessments.

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

Achieved learning outcomes

Based on the studied documents and the interviews, the committee concludes that graduates of the programme achieve and even exceed the required master level and intended learning outcomes. The committee supports the evaluations made by the external referents: the work (thesis and graduation project) of students is of a high level and quality. The committee concludes that the end products demonstrate a high level of maturity and criticality as well as a mastery of the technical aspects of the making process, with great social engagement and the ability to productively position the work in its spatial, physical context. The discussions with students and alumni confirmed this; they seem very well capable of creating their own career path and practice. The programme actively invests in its alumni and the current practices of alumni are proof of their success and independence. The committee recommends that the programme also invest in building bridges between the art-domain and other societal domains.

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

Findings

The graduation phase of the programme consists of the graduation project and the thesis. Students start working on their thesis in the third semester. In this period, students also create the plan for their graduation project. Halfway through the second year, a green light assessment takes place. Students follow a thesis-writing trajectory which starts at the end of the second semester, with students formulating their individual research theme or question and ends with the presentation of the thesis. Students are expected to finalize their thesis in the third semester, so that they have time to work on their graduation project in the fourth semester. They present their graduation plan to fellow students, heads and tutors so specific tutoring and advice can be given individually. In addition, information is available on the website. The final assessment in the fourth semester concerns both thesis and product/practice and allows for compensation between the two components. Because the thesis is completed in the third semester this can lead to an undesired separation of theory and practice. To remedy this dilemma, the programme is investigating ways to ensure that both aspects are assessed in an integral manner, for example by introducing a preliminary assessment of the thesis in the third semester, which is

followed up by a final assessment of both components during graduation, including a defence to the committee of examiners.

The evaluation committee reviewed 15 theses and graduation projects from the past two academic years. During the site visit, it also attended the current graduation show of the department (cohort 2020-2022). According to the committee, these theses and graduation projects were reflective, critical and articulate, addressing a wide range of issues while also demonstrating technical skills and a mastery of design methods and approaches. The committee observed that the level and societal engagement had become even stronger over the past years. Overall, and despite some differences in quality, both the theses and graduation projects displayed good theoretical and practical skills and demonstrated that SIS graduates are fully equipped to inhabit an independent position within the professional field.

Alumni

The programme and the Sandberg Instituut actively invest in their alumni community and does this in various ways. The Instituut has set up a Sandberg' working group, that especially focuses on following formal requirements and particulars of the workfield(s) to be able support alumni from outside the EU who wish to stay in the Netherlands. The Sandberg Instituut website has devel-

oped a tool/inventory for alumni to share information on their current practices, exhibitions, subsidies and prices of living and working. This input will be used for the further development of the alumni policy. Furthermore, alumni are interviewed for the Open Brochure and the website texts informing new applicants about Sandberg Instituut and the courses.

Many alumni are still closely connected to the institute, and work on and off for the departments or take part in projects and exhibitions Sandberg Instituut is organizing. SIS also recently organised a first of a series of meetings with alumni. The second meeting will focus on how alumni can be involved in (research) projects that the department, and the lectorate City wish to develop together with the societal stakeholders in the city of Amsterdam.

The discussions with students and alumni confirmed this; they are often still closely connected to the institute and seem very well capable of creating their own career path and practice. The current practices of alumni are proof of their success and independence. The alumni survey shows that many international students stay in Amsterdam and establish artist/designers collectives like 'Fabulous Futures' (working cross-disciplinary), others successfully apply for 'start-subsidies', like at Stimuleringsfonds CI, they continue studies at Master or PhD programmes, and acquire assignments individually.

Considerations

The committee concludes that the programme has an effective graduation procedure in place. The course's high starting level, the personal guidance and peer-to-peer support and small scale enhance its success rate. The committee notes that the theses and a graduation project work match the goals and visions of the programme and that the level and quality of the end works is high. The committee concludes that the end products demonstrate a high level of maturity and criticality as well as a mastery of the technical aspects of the making process, with great social engagement and the ability to productively position the work in its spatial, physical

context. Following the observations of the external experts, the committee concludes that students indeed achieve and even exceed the required master level and intended learning outcomes.

That the programme succeeds in training independent, capable and critical spatial practitioners is confirmed by the careers of the alumni of the programme. The committee is positive about the way the programme as well as the Sandberg Instituut invest in its alumni, continues to support them in different ways after graduation and actively seeking their input for the improvement of the programme. It does however encourage the programme to think of ways to also connect with the other fields than the artistic, building bridges from the art-world to other societal domains.

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

Distinctive Feature small scale and intensive education

As part of the programme assessment, the committee has assessed the distinctive feature "Small Scale and Intensive Education" which the programme received in the course of 2013 and 2015. The assessment of the distinctive feature was in practice and conducted as an integral part of the assessment of the educational programme.

In the following, the findings and conclusions in the previous section on the NVAO-standards for the assessment of the educational programmes form the starting point for a further elaboration on the elements relevant to the distinctive feature "Small Scale and Intensive Education".

The committee concludes that the programme indeed delivers on its small scale and intensive education ambitions in the period under review. The intended learning outcomes are ambitious and aimed at an above average level in the domain of interior architecture. The programme's explicit aim is to train students to move beyond the disciplinary boundaries and to contribute to the development of the profession in an innovative, critical and reflective manner. In the programme, intra- and extra-curricular activities are tightly interwoven and students and tutors are actively involved in the design of the course. The programme has created an environment in which studio's, lectures, seminars, readings, screenings, excursions and projects, whether at the initiative of students or that of tutors, all contribute to the development and broadening of the skills and competencies of the students. Students and alumni describe the programme is very intense and demanding, yet feasible because of the one-on-one tutoring, the different educational formats in which they receive feedback, support and input from tutors, guest tutors and peers. The programme has an effective admission procedure in place which ensures that the students enrolling are quite talented, with the right skills and attitude to flourish in the challenging learning environment. The committee concludes that the programme is taught by a strong team of very competent staff members, all of whom have their own professional practices and who are committed and capable of offering the type of teaching and guidance necessary within small scale and intensive educational environment. The individual and group tutoring is very effective and aligns with what is expected of small scale and intensive education. The committee would like to encourage the programme to ensure that both students and tutors are aware of what to expect/offer when it comes to guidance and one-on-one tutoring and also stimulates the development of a shared pedagogical vision. The facilities enable creative encounter, collaboration as well as community learning and building. The theses and final works exceed the average level and quality when it comes to experimentation, criticality, technical execution and social engagement. All in all, the programme proves itself to be a place where students can grow, mature and develop their professional practices in such a way that they are indeed able contribute to the development of the profession of Interior Architecture in exciting new ways.

The SIS programme **meets all the criteria** of the Distinctive Feature 'Small scale and Intensive Education'. Therefore, the overall judgement of the committee is **positive**.

Findings

Standard A – Intended learning outcomes

The objectives and intended learning outcomes are geared towards achieving an aboveaverage level in one

or more academic disciplines and/or professional practice(s) in the relevant domain. In addition, the programme focuses on broadening and a corresponding development of personal attitudes and skills.

The master's programme of Interior Architecture is aimed at exploring spatiality and spatial practice in the broadest sense, and challenges traditional understandings of Interior Architecture as discipline and profession. Students are trained to become independent and critical spatial practitioners of the future and are expected to investigate/explore/incorporate/transcend various artistic disciplines and perspectives in their spatial practices.

The intended learning outcomes of the programme are based on the national master profile for Fine Art and Design (including Interior Architecture). This profile, established in 2017 by a workgroup representing Dutch institutes, includes four points of reference that are applicable to all Dutch master's programmes in Fine Art and Design (including Interior Architecture) to define the master level: context, discipline, research and self-direction.

The committee observes that the programme has translated these generic criteria into 8 intended learning outcomes that are aimed at realizing an above-average level in the domain of Interior Architecture. (See 'Intended Learning Outcomes in previous section.)

The programme's explicit aim is to train students to move beyond the disciplinary boundaries and to contribute to the development of the profession in a critical and reflective manner. Education is designed with input and initiatives from students; students structure their own study trajectory within the context of the general programme for which they can propose workshops, guests, excursions etc. This allows them to achieve a high level within the area of their own choosing, which is often inter/trans/post-disciplinary. The broad inter/trans/post-disciplinary approach of the curriculum, the wide range of educational formats, the active engagement with urgent social issues, the disciplinary and cultural diversity within the student body itself and the involvement of many different guest tutors from a wide range of disciplines (art, design, interior architecture, publish-

ing, curating) contributes to broadening and development of related personal attitudes and skills such as in in-depth critical reflection on cultural and societal contexts, effective oral and textual communication, and interdisciplinary collaborative skills.

Based on the above the committee concludes that the programme **meets this standard**.

Standard B – Programme: Content

The curriculum and extra-curricular activities form an inseparable whole. Their content matches the aspired level and broadening as formulated in the intended learning outcomes. Students and teachers provide the extra-curricular activities in concert.

Based on the material studied and its conversations with management, tutors and students, the committee concludes that there is a strong, integral connection between the curriculum and the extra-curricular activities. As stated in the assessment of the educational programme in the previous section, the programme is divided into 4 semesters of each 30 EC. Throughout, the SIS programme consists of two spheres: projects and course work. Students develop projects as individuals or in small groups. For their projects, they are supported to work on their individual practices through individual and group tutoring and peer-to-peer reviews. Course work ranges from excursions to exercises, from readings and discussions to lectures and visits and are developed by the teachers individually. In the course, the students are introduced to topics, themes, methods by the teachers that might or might not impact on students' individual practices – this depends on the student's own aims and ambitions.

In the SIS programme, the distinction between intra- and extra-curricular activities is diffuse; the programme has created an environment in which studio's, lectures, seminars, readings, screenings, excursions and projects, whether at the initiative of students or that of tutors, all contribute to the development and broadening of the skills and

competencies of the students. Students participate in workshops set up by others: what is a part of the curriculum for one student, becomes extra-curricular for another. All activities are discussed and planned with the involvement of students. Also, content-wise and with regard to the pedagogical approach, there is a strong alignment between intra-curricular and extra-curricular activities: they tie in with the aims and ambitions of the programme to train critical, reflective and broadly educated students who can contribute to new approaches within the profession.

The active involvement of students in the design and content of the programme is highly appreciated, though it can also lead to more discussion and uncertainty for students. There was a notable difference between what first years and second year students experience: first year students sometime feel a bit lost when it comes to the structure and what is expected of them, whereas second year students already show a great degree of confidence in their professional and artistic, displaying an awareness of what they need to develop their practice. Alumni noted that this feeling of being lost is something that is part of following a programme within an art context, and actually contributed to their further growth as professionals who can challenge the field.

Based on the above the committee concludes that the programme **meets this standard**.

Standard C – Programme: Learning Environment

The didactic concept is based on a challenging learning environment, small-scale and intensively designed education and a learning community of students and teachers. The small scale and intensity of the education are reflected in the degree of participation and preparation expected of the student. The design of the programme is designed to ensure that students have a nominal study progression, including extra-curricular activities.

The programme has a small-scale character, with a total of around 20 students (first years and second years) enrolled per year. Around 2/3 of the

study time is spent on the projects, supported by individual tutoring and peer-to-peer reviews; 1/3 of the study time is spent on course work. In the first year, the courses are geared towards students articulating their personal trajectory, starting from their initial motivation. In this individual trajectory, students are guided by their main tutor. To broaden students' context and feed or challenge their individual practices, the programme offers several educational formats. For example, regular group meetings with external critics for discussions and informal feedback, thesis writing, visits by guest tutors, lecturers, workshops and studio projects as well as internal and external presentations, screenings and public exhibitions. Other formats are excursions, bootcamps and the making of a publication. Overall, most lectures, workshops and seminars etcetera are held in the first and third semester of each year. In the second and fourth semester, students individual and collective practices take in a more central place.

On average, students have 21 contact hours per week, and use the other hours in the week to work on their projects. The programme demands a full-time involvement, and the students and alumni the committee spoke to indicated that they do indeed spend the majority of their time on their projects and course work, and also attend other events and activities that are organised by Sandberg Instituut. They describe the programme is very intense and demanding, but feasible because of the one-on-one tutoring, the different educational formats in which they receive feedback, support and input from tutors, guest tutors and peers, and the overall supportive nature of the learning community of Sandberg Instituut. In this sense, the Instituut is felt to be a home, a challenging but also safe and welcoming learning environment.

Finally, committee is very impressed with the inventive and conceptual manner in which programme responded to the restrictions of Covid19.

Dealing with the pandemic in an artistic and conceptual manner, while also applying approaches, methods and tools of Interior Architecture is a shining example of how a small-scale programme is able to flexibly and insightfully respond to urgent societal challenges.

Based on the above the committee concludes that the programme **meets this standard**.

Standard D – Enrollment

The programme maintains an adequate selection procedure aimed at the intake of motivated and academically and/or professionally talented students, in which suitability and interest in the small-scale and intensive educational concept, in combination with extra-curricular activities, are among the criteria.

The programme has an effective admission procedure in place which ensures that the students enrolling are all quite talented, often with already flourishing professional or artistic practices and with the right skills and attitude to flourish in the experimental and challenging learning environment of the Sandberg Instituut. As part of the admissions process, students are explicitly informed of and prepared for the type of small scale and intensive education the programme offers, with a strong emphasis on independence and self-learning; students must have their own vision on what they want to achieve and be able to ask for the support and guidance they need. Students and alumni confirmed that this is indeed communicated when they applied, and they also indicated that their choice for SIS is derived from its reputation as a programme that is open to different approaches and methods, and manner in which it challenges the disciplinary boundaries of the profession.

The committee observes that Sandberg Instituut receives significantly more applications than other art schools. The location of the institute in Amsterdam and its long-standing reputation contribute to this. The selection procedure is intensive and selective: around 10% of the applicants are admitted. The selection procedure does

not only include skills, but also motivation and vision. The selection procedure ensures that motivated and talented students enroll the programme.

Based on the above the committee concludes that the programme **meets this standard**.

Standard E – Staffing

There is sufficient staff to be able to provide small-scale and intensive education, and to shape intensive contact between teachers and students and individual counselling to students outside of instruction. The teachers can be shown to have the specific expertise and competence necessary for the objectives of small-scale and intensive education. The programme actively monitors that teachers have the necessary qualifications and, if necessary, provides training for teachers on these aspects.

The core team of the SIS programme consists of two heads (each 1,5 days a week), a coordinator (2 days a week) and four main tutors (a total of 12 days a month). The heads are responsible for the artistic direction of the programme, based on their own theoretical, artistic and professional expertise. In addition to the core team, the programme involves many different guest tutors to instruct and train the students.

Staff of the Sandberg programmes, including the heads, is usually hired on a flexible basis. According to the programme, this ensures that the programme can tune to changing developments by inviting new staff and expertise. In principle, heads of the programmes at Sandberg Instituut are contracted for a period of eight years. Leaving heads propose successors to the director. To safeguard the continuity of the courses, current coordinators stay at least one year when a new head is appointed. Sandberg has a buddy system in place in which more experienced coordinators support new coordinators.

The current heads and tutors of the programme hold a master's degree, two have a PhD and one is in the process of attaining a doctorate. The core

team as well as many guest tutors have experience with teaching at other educational institutions and other settings. The site-visit revealed that, overall, students and alumni are quite content with their tutors. They appreciate the small scale and informal character of the programme, their tutors support and guidance.

From the documentation and in conversations with students and alumni the committee learned that in recent years, particularly during the pandemic, students experienced some distance with regard to the availability of their tutors. The programme responded with an adjustment to the policy by having tutors come in on a more regular basis to guide the individual projects. There were also funds made available for a Tutor Circle aimed at connecting tutors with each other and creating the opportunity for discussions on educational formats, didactics and pedagogy.

The committee concludes that the programme is taught by a strong team of very competent staff members, who are committed, rigorous and capable of realizing the small scale and intensive education. All tutors have their own (international) practice, as artist, designer, researcher, writer, curator, director or any other art and design related practice. The individual and group tutoring is very effective and aligns with what is expected of small scale and intensive education. The committee would like to encourage the programme ensure that both students and tutors are aware of what to expect/offer when it comes to guidance and one-on-one tutoring.

The committee would also like to emphasize the importance of discussing and developing a shared pedagogical vision, even if this is applied differently by each tutor in varying contexts. The employment of substantiated pedagogical insights can be beneficial for both tutors and students, especially when working with diverse groups of students. In this context, the committee appreciates the instalment of the Tutor Circle

which is a good tool for the development of a shared and reflective pedagogical discourse.

Based on the above the committee concludes that the programme **meets this standard**.

Standard F – Material Facilities

The program has its own infrastructure with facilities for small-scale and intensive education and common extra-curricular activities.

Since December 2018, the main departments and most of the temporary programmes are located at the Sandberg buildings at the Gerrit Rietveld Academie. The buildings offer an open educational environment to stimulate knowledge sharing and to encounter creation as one community without noise and disturbances from each other. In addition, small auditoria for lectures, work meetings and student initiatives as well as consulting rooms, flexible workspaces are available. Students can also use the nearby workshops of the Gerrit Rietveld Academie.

The committee is impressed with the accommodation and material facilities of the programme. The set-up is fully aligned with the aims and goals of the programme to create an open, flexible and stimulating learning environment for its students. It is a clear example of outstanding infrastructure for the realisation of small scale and intensive education which stimulates collaboration, experimentation and critical thinking.

Based on the above the committee concludes that the programme **meets this standard**.

Standard G – Realized learning outcomes

The content and level of tests and final papers are in line with the level and broadening formulated in the intended learning outcomes. Graduates are admitted to demanding further education and/or positions. Educational returns are substantially higher than in relevant other programmes that have not been awarded the special attribute, and at least comparable to relevant other programmes that have.

The committee has established in the previous sections that the programme, the assessments and the theses and final projects are in line with the objectives of the programme as an experimental, art-based, international master's course in Interior Architecture. The committee concludes that the end products demonstrate a high level of maturity and criticality as well as a mastery of the technical aspects of the making process, with great social engagement and the ability to productively position the work in its spatial, social and (inter)disciplinary context.

The discussions with students and alumni confirmed this; they are quite capable of creating their own career path and practice. This was confirmed by an overview of current practices of alumni which prove their independence and a realized potential for success. The alumni survey shows that many international students stay in Amsterdam and establish artist/designers collectives like 'Fabulous Futures' (working cross-disciplinary), others successfully apply for 'start-subsidies', like at Stimuleringsfonds CI, they continue studies at Master or PhD programmes, and acquire assignments individually.

Most students are able to finish the programme in two years, and there is a relatively low drop-out rate: 10-20% and declining (even during Covid19 times). Over the period under review, on average 1,5 student per year drops out. Of the cohort 2020-2022 *all* students graduated within 2 years. In the cohorts starting in 2016 and 2019, 1 and respectively 2 students required extra time to graduate. This is understandable, according to the committee when considering the intense setup and demands of the curriculum. The course explicitly requires students to find and create their own path and practice. This can result in the changing of direction and goals, and hence more required time for students to finish their education.

It is however difficult to compare this rate since Sandberg Instituut is the only institute that requested and received the special feature for their

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

Based on the above the committee concludes that the programme **meets this standard**.

Considerations

Based on the written materials and the discussions on site, the committee judges that the SIS programme meets all the criteria of the Distinctive Feature small scale and intensive education. Combining its findings and considerations from the previous sections on the overall programme quality with the elements that address in particular the small scale and intensive education components, the committee considers that in its 6 years of operation, the master's programme Studio for Immediate Spaces has delivered on its ambitions.

In so far as the criteria of the Distinctive Feature are concerned, the committee concludes that:

- the intended learning outcomes are formulated at beyond professional master level and aim for a trans/inter/post disciplinary approach of Interior Architecture within an artistic context;
- The curricular and extra-curricular activities are tightly interwoven and students have an active role in the design and content of the courses which are organised by students and involve both staff and students;
- the study load of the curriculum is ambitious yet feasible;
- a very high number of students apply for the programme and only 10% is selected. The selection results in cohorts of motivated and talented students;

- staffing is adequate, both in terms of quantity and quality. Lecturers and tutors are themselves professional practitioners in the field of design, art, interior architecture, urbanism etc, and deliver teaching according to the principles of small scale and intensive education with a strong focus on one-on-one and group tutoring;
- the facilities are with the aims of the programme to offer an open educational environment which stimulates knowledge sharing, creative encounter and sustains a stimulating learning community of peers and tutors
- the theses and final works exceed the average level and quality when it comes to experimentation, criticality, technical execution and social engagement;
- the programme proves itself to be a place where students can grow, mature and develop their professional practices in such a way that they are indeed able contribute to the development of the profession of Interior Architecture in exciting new ways.

meets all criteria of the Distinctive Feature small scale and intensive education.

In addition to these positive considerations and having established that the programme meets each criterion of the Distinctive Feature evaluation framework, the committee noticed that two elements require further attention. First of all, the availability of tutors (in practical terms) needs to be communicated in a clearer manner so that both students and tutors are aware of what is offered and what is expected. Second, the committee would also like to emphasize the importance of discussing and developing a shared pedagogical vision, even if this is applied differently by each tutor in varying contexts. The employment of substantiated pedagogical insights can be beneficial for both tutors and students, especially when working with diverse groups of students.

Based on the interviews and examination of the underlying documentation, the assessment committee concludes that **the master's programme**

Attachments

Attachment 1 Assessment committee

Raoul van Aalst
Independent consultant in education and organisation

Prof.dr. Rainer Hehl
architect/urban designer and is currently guest professor at the TU Berlin and visiting professor at Yokohama National University

David Hamers PhD
is a spatial researcher and was reader of Places and Traces at Design Academy Eindhoven, and now an advisor for Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving

Elma van Boxel
Elma van Boxel is founding partner of ZUS (Zones Urbaines Sensibles)

Dylan Vianen
Teacher and responsible for curriculum development at Bildung Academie

Evelien Kanters
MEd student at ArtEZ, and teacher of dance and theatre

Jesseka Batteau PhD supported as a registered secretary.

Attachment 2 Programme of the assessment

AGENDA

DAY 1 - June 09th	
FEDLEV SIS SPACE and GRAD SHOW LOCATION	
14.00 welcome - guided tour buildings SI/facilities/workshops	
14.30 preparation meeting panel	Panel will use Day 1 to get to know each other, explain roles, look into a selection of theses, and other material we will provide. They will discuss the report generally and the agenda for Day 2
16.00 guided tour graduation show (external location)	Guides: heads of the department Note: we should avoid interference with assessments <i>Some graduating students will be available on location to meet the panel</i>
DAY 2 June 10th	
FEDLEV	
9.30 Walk in, welcome	
9.45 - 10.15 Executive Board	
10.15 - 11.00 introduction programme	both heads: presentation current programme, the way it developed, their reflection on grad show and assessments results - followed by Q&A
11.00 - 11.45 Students 1st years	4 students - available works (end of first year assessment done in May, very short presentations)
11.45 - 12.30 Students 2nd years	4 graduates - panel has seen at graduation show - Very short presentations by the graduates
12.30 - 13.15 Externals lunch with panel	4 External crits - representing professional field (also payed visit to the grad show guided by Jaap Vinken/Josien Pieterse (new external member exam board).
13.15-13.30 panel retreats	panel retreats for deliberation,
13.30 - 14.15 tutors	4 tutors - at least thesis tutor
14.15 - 14.45 research (incl short presentation fellow)	5, for wider perspective research at SI Research fellow to give a short presentation
14.45 - 15.15 intra/extra curricular/sub organisations	6, Representatives of Sandberg sub organisations, student driven organisations
15.15 - 16.00 alumni	6, alumni
16.00 - 16.30 panel retreats	for articulation of their initial findings
16.30 first findings feedback panel.	open for everyone who is interested

Attachment 3 Documents

- Self-Evaluation Report (two parts)
- Graduation Projects of 15 students