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Part A: Topics
1. Preface

This is the assessment report of the masterdegree course Dance Unlimited (DUAM) offered by Amsterdamse Hogeschool voor de Kunsten. In this report NQA accounts for its findings and conclusions and its working method. The audit was undertaken within the framework of the accreditation of programs of higher professional education. The audit process started in April 2006, when the institution submitted its internal report for evaluation to NQA. The audit visit by the NQA panel was on May 19th 2006. The panel consisted of the following experts:
Mrs A.M.D. Keurentjes (Chairperson and domain audit panel member);
Mrs dr. S. J. Norman MA (domain audit panel member);
Mrs H. Draaijer (domain audit panel member);
Mrs A.M.R. van Bussel (student audit panel member);
Mrs drs. P. Göbel (NQA auditor).

The audit panel complies with the requirements laid down in the NVAO** ‘Protocol ter beoordeling van de werkwijze van visiterende en beoordelende instanties’ (2005). This document contains a protocol of the method used by organisations that review and assess study programmes.

The audit panel includes members with domain-specific expertise, teaching and assessing expertise and expertise regarding the international developments within the discipline of the degree course (Appendix 2).

The report consists of three parts:

- Part A: The Topic Report, with the conclusions of the audit panel concerning the basic quality of the programme at topic level. It contains the considerations on which the conclusions are based. The conclusions are graded as either positive or negative. In addition, the final conclusion is formulated in the Topic Report.
- Part B: The Facet Report with the assessments of the audit panel concerning the basic quality of the programme at facet level. It states the findings that underpin that assessment. The assessments are awarded on a four-point scale as prescribed by NVAO: unsatisfactory [onvoldoende], satisfactory [voldoende], good [goed] and excellent [uitstekend]. The Detailed Report is the basis of the Topic Report.
- Part C: Contains all the relevant Appendixes.

2. Introduction

The Amsterdam Dance Courses
The Theaterschool is one of the six faculties of the Amsterdam School of the Arts and comprises the three Departments of Theater, Dance and Technique & Media. The other faculties are: the Amsterdam Conservatory, the Academy of Visual Arts, the Amsterdam

** NVAO = Nederlands - Vlaams Accreditatie Organisatie [Netherlands Flemish Accreditation Organisation]
Academy of Architecture, the Dutch Film and Television Academy and the Reinwardt Academy (museum sector).
Dance Unlimited (DU or DUAM) is the only post-graduate course (prospective Master) offered by the Dance Department of the Amsterdam Theaterschool (Theaterschool Amsterdam).

In 2002 a collaborative effort between the three dance schools (Amsterdam, Arnhem and Rotterdam) resulted in the establishment of Dance Unlimited as the first post-graduate study course in Choreography in the Netherlands. Within the collaborative framework, each of the schools has developed a distinct profile and course of study.

**Amsterdam Profile:** Amsterdam is a unique two-year study course supporting the study of the relationship between choreography, performance and new media technologies. The program takes the development of choreographic work as its starting point, and new media technologies and practices are approached from this perspective. Theoretical and critical reflection is used as a means to challenge and support the practical work; and collaboration is emphasized.

**Arnhem Profile:** Arnhem offers an emphasis on choreographic research, specifically with regard to Open Form Composition, which investigates diverse choreographic/compositional constructs that involve both set materials and improvisation, in a ‘both/and’ amalgam. The moment right before one makes a choice is of particular interest. Central to the program is the examination of the psychophysical body; how this is constructed, how it enhances, modifies, creates, challenges or informs dancing in choreography. This examination will take place through an inquiry into late 20th century models of the body.

**Rotterdam Profile:** Rotterdam focuses on the enhancement of choreographic skills through the analysis of movement material and its way of communicating using the Laban system and composition techniques presented in the following modules: Laban Movement Analysis, Composition Group work and Inter-disciplinary Works. The learning process takes the form of workshops and presentations of two productions and the pursuit of theoretical subjects, practical lessons and weeklong workshops. In addition, an individual curriculum is set up for each student.

Thus, the collaboration enables diversity (across the three profiles) and specificity within the individual study courses. Each individual study course offers students the opportunity to select parts of the other two to fulfill their education requirements. In addition, the collaboration offers an professional three-city network within which to develop. Internationally, the majority of higher degree courses in Dance where one can study relationships between choreography, performance and new media technologies exist in North America and the United Kingdom.

Around 450 students are studying at the Theaterschool in one of the 12 courses. There are around 250 teachers and other employees to support the students.

The management of the Theaterschool consists of a general manager and two deputy managers. They deal with topics like quality assurance, facilities, student care and alumni. Each course has an artistic leader who is responsible for the artistic profile and for the organization of the educational programme.
3. **Method**

The audit to the institution followed the procedures set down in the assessment protocol of NQA which is described below. The audit panel found that the internal report for evaluation and the appendixes were a clear basis for the audit. The review took into account the domain-specific frame of reference applicable to the programmes (facet 1.2).

NQA distinguishes three review phases: the preparatory phase, the audit visit and the reporting phase. A brief elaboration by phase is stated below.

**The Preparatory Phase**

An NQA auditor checked the internal report for evaluation for its quality and comprehensiveness (the screening), and determined its usefulness for the audit. After the internal report for evaluation and the appendixes had been found in order (April 2006), the panel members started preparing for the actual audit visit (April/May 2006). They read the internal report for evaluation (and the appendixes), formulated provisional assessments according to a prescribed review format. The panel members passed their questions on to the NQA auditor. With a matrix of provisional assessments the NQA auditor made an inventory of main points and priorities for scrutiny of documents and for conducting interviews. The visit was prepared in a preparatory meeting.

The main topics for review were determined. They formed the agenda for the visit, enabling the institution and the panel to prepare adequately for the visit.

In its internal report for evaluation the institution indicated what domain-specific frame of reference it chose. Together with the field expert in the audit panel the NQA auditor established whether the specific aims and objectives for the field of study were adequate, or whether detailed supplementation or specification was needed. The Detailed Report states on what national, professional and programme profiles the domain-specific framework (and the programme contents and structure) was based.

**The Audit visit**

The NQA-protocol has a standard timetable for the visit. This timetable was adjusted to the specific situation at the institution (Appendix 3). Interviews were held with the Management Team, lecturers and students. Joint interviews were held with graduates and representatives of the professional field. At the beginning and during the visit the documents requested for scrutiny were studied. In between the interviews the audit panel had discussions to exchange findings and to arrive at joint and definite assessments. The panel members substantiated their findings in writing. At the end of the visit during the interview with the management the chairperson gave oral feedback on a few impressions and experiences of the panel without an explicit conclusion.

**The Reporting Phase**

Based on the findings of the panel NQA drafted a two-part report consisting of the Detailed Report and the Topic Report. With this report in hand an institution applies for accreditation with NVAO. In the Detailed Report NQA reported on facet level. The institution received a draft of this report in July 2006 and checked it for errors of fact. This led to a few adaptations. In the Topic Report NQA states its conclusions on the topics and the study programme as a whole. This report was presented to the institution in October 2006 for a check on errors of fact.
The final audit report was presented to the institution in October 2006. The institution could subsequently submit it to NVAO together with an application for accreditation.

4. Process to Final Assessment

In this Chapter a conclusion is stated on each topic by weighing the facets of that topic. The ‘Decision Making Rules’ set by NQA in the review protocol [Beoordelingsprotocol] and elaborated on further in the NQA memorandum ‘Guidelines for the Formation of Assessment’ [Handreiking voor oordeelsvorming], have a main role in this decision-making process. Moreover the review takes into account any special emphasis the institution might have placed on the programme, the domain-specific framework, and a comparison with other relevant study programmes on a number of aspects. The final conclusion is supplemented in case of:

- weighing of assessment at facet level;
- benchmarking;
- generic findings that surpass the facet level;
- special emphasis or ‘best practices’.

In the conclusion on the separate topics the assessment of the facets is repeated each time followed by a weighing that leads to the final conclusion. Extensive substantiation is to be found in the Detailed Report.

5. Assessment by Topic

**Topic 1: Aims and Objectives of the Programme**
All three facets are assessed as ‘good’. The conclusions on this topic are therefore **positive**.

**Topic 2: Programme Contents and Structure**
Three facets are assessed with the result ‘satisfactory’. The other facets are assessed as ‘good’. The conclusions on this are therefore **positive**.

**Topic 3: Deployment of Staff**
The HBO Requirements and the Quality of Staff are assessed as ‘good’. The Quantity of Staff is assessed as ‘satisfactory’. The conclusions on this topic are therefore **positive**.

**Topic 4: Facilities**
Both facets are assessed as ‘good’. The conclusions on this topic are therefore **positive**.

**Topic 5: Internal Quality Assurance**
The facets Evaluation of Results and Involvement off Staff, Students, Graduates and the Professional Field are assessed as ‘good’. The facet Measures for Improvement is assesses as ‘satisfactory’. The conclusions on this topic are therefore **positive**.

**Topic 6: Results**
The facet Level Achieved is assessed as ‘satisfactory’, Educational Succes Rate as ‘good’. The conclusions on this topic are therefore **positive**.
6. Matrix of Conclusions and Assessments at Facet and Topic Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic/Facet</th>
<th>Facet 1. Domain-specific Requirements</th>
<th>Facet 2. Level: Master’s Degree</th>
<th>Facet 3 HBO Education</th>
<th>Overall conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic 1 Aims and Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet 2. Level</strong></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet 3 HBO Education</strong></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic 2 Programme Contents and Structure</strong></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet 3. Coherence of the Programme Contents and Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet 4. Study Load</strong></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet 5. Incoming Students</strong></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet 6. Duration</strong></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet 7. Alignment of Structure and Contents</strong></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet 8. Assessments and Validation</strong></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall conclusion                               | Positive                 |                                                                                 |                                                          |                   |                           |                 |                                             |                                   |                    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic/Facet</th>
<th>Facet 1. HBO Requirements</th>
<th>Facet 2. Quantity of Staff</th>
<th>Facet 3. Quality of Staff</th>
<th>Overall conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic 3 Deployment of Staff</strong></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet 2. Quantity of Staff</strong></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet 3. Quality of Staff</strong></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall conclusion                               | Positive                 |                                                                                 |                                                          |                   |                           |                 |                                             |                                   |                    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic/Facet</th>
<th>Facet 1. Material facilities</th>
<th>Facet 2. Student Counselling</th>
<th>Overall conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic 4 Facilities</strong></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet 2. Student Counselling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall conclusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic/Facet</th>
<th>Facet 1. Evaluation of Results</th>
<th>Facet 2. Measures for Improvement</th>
<th>Facet 3. Involving Staff, Students, Graduates and the Professional Field</th>
<th>Overall conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic 5 Internal Quality Assurance</strong></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet 2. Measures for Improvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet 3. Involving Staff, Students, Graduates and the Professional Field</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall conclusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic/Facet</th>
<th>Facet 1. Level Achieved</th>
<th>Facet 2. Educational Success Rate</th>
<th>Overall conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic 6 Results</strong></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet 2. Educational Success Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall conclusion                               | Positive                 |                                                                                 |                                                          |                   |                           |                 |                                             |                                   |                    |

7. Overall conclusion

On the basis of the above scheme and its underpinning in Section 5, it appears that the programmes score positive on the six topics, resulting in a positive conclusion about the study programme.
Part B: Facets
Criteria:
- The final qualifications of the degree course correspond to the requirements made to a degree course in the relevant domain (field of study/discipline and/or professional practice) by colleagues in the Netherlands and abroad and the professional practice.

The assessment is based on the following findings:

- The eight Final Qualifications of Dance Unlimited Amsterdam (DUAM) were devised in collaboration with the partner programs of Dance Unlimited (post graduate degree in choreography) in Rotterdam and Arnhem. These qualifications are listed in the DUAM Study Guide 2004-2006.
- The Final Qualifications have been presented to and reviewed by representatives of the international domain (educational and professional practice) in the pre-accreditation report (S. Melrose, Pre-accreditation Report: Dance Unlimited, June/July 2005) and during round table meetings. The panel has seen the Melrose report and summaries of round table meetings. The final qualifications have met with positive feedback from external representatives (Round Table Summary, 2006). Alumni confirm that the qualifications are relevant for their current practice: average of 4.3 on a five point scale.
- The eight final qualifications are not fixed at this juncture in the accreditation process. Adjustments can be expected, because of the pre-accreditation report (Melrose, 2005). The final qualifications will be presented to the Dutch National Organization of Dance Education Network.
- The Final Qualifications are formulated in relation to and are distinct from the Bachelor professional profile, and competences and qualifications as formulated by the Dutch National Organization of Dance Education Network (Opleidingsprofiel Dans: uitstroomprofielen danser & choreograaf, HBO-raad, 2002).
- The DUAM staff is involved in international platforms for arts education such as PARIP, ELIA an the MODE05 meeting. Current requirements and trends in international Master of Fine Art education are therefore reflected in the final qualifications.
- DUAM has compared the final qualifications with existing Master of Arts courses focusing on choreography (Laban London, London Contemporary Dance School, Darlington College of Arts), Dance and Technology (Ohio State University, Arizona State University), Digital Performance and Interdisciplinary Studies (Brunel University West London, Doncaster College UK, Simon Fraser University CA). This comparison appears to justify the Masters level sought by DUAM.
The final qualifications of the degree course correspond to general, internationally accepted descriptions of the qualifications of a Master.

The assessment is based on the following findings:

- The Final Qualifications have been devised in relation to the Dublin descriptors and to the Fine Arts Master degree framework (*Frame of Reference for Institutions offering HBO Fine Arts Master’s Degrees*, Netherlands Quality Agency, March 2005). The panel has seen the study guide (2004-2006) where the relation between Dublin descriptors and the final qualifications is explained.
- In the *Educational Plan* (April, 2006) DUAM shows the relation between final qualification, Dublin descriptor and professional competence. The eight qualifications are derived from six of the twelve competences for the Bachelor program. The Dance Unlimited program aims at a higher achievement in these six areas: Vision, Collaboration, Creativity, Craftmanship, Entrepreneurship and Reflection. The panel concludes that these areas reflect the aims of the course and the masterlevel.

The final qualifications are partly based on the professional profiles and/or professional competences drawn up by or in conjunction with the relevant professional field;
- A master graduated at a University of Professional Education (HBO) is qualified at the level of an independent and/or managing professional in a particular profession or related professional field, or the level required to function adequately in a multidisciplinary environment in which a degree from a University of Professional Education (HBO) is required or useful.

The assessment is based on the following findings:

- The eight final qualifications are formulated in relation to six (vision, creativity, craftmanship, entrepreneurship, collaboration, reflection) of the twelve competences for the bachelor degree put forth in 2002 by the Dutch National Organization of Dance education Network (*Opleidingsprofiel Dans: uitstroomprofielen danser & choreograaf*, HBO-raad, 2002). These six competences were selected by the three partner programs of Dance Unlimited (Amsterdam, Arnhem and Rotterdam) to distinguish the professional profile of the Master from the Bachelor.
- The final qualifications in relation to the six competences reflect developments in the field of professional practice in the specific field of dance and in the multidisciplinary environment of dance and new media (*Education Plan*, 2006) as the panel can confirm.
• In the *Education Plan* (2006) a general professional profile of the dance artist is given. In the general profile no distinction is made between the bachelor and the master profile. The final qualifications and the assessment of the master’s degree however secure an advanced professional level of the graduates. Reference to the various skill sets, both individual and collective, was seen to constitute a strong general requirement, thus to lay the basis for masters level activity.

• The pre-accreditation report (Melrose, 2005) identifies the orientation of the DUAM programme as close to the type of theoretical research that might fit the description of a University Master. In the *Educational Plan* (2006) and in the *Study Guide 2006-2008* adjustments have been made.

---

**Topic 2 PROGRAMME CONTENTS AND STRUCTURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 2, Facet 2.1</th>
<th>HBO Requirements</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The programme meets the following criteria applicable to a degree programme at a University of Professional Education (HBO):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students acquire knowledge by studying professional literature, course materials that originate in the professional practice, and by interaction with the professional field and/or applied research;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The programme has clear links with current developments in the professional field/the discipline;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The programme ensures the development of professional skills and has clear links with the current professional practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assessment is based on the following findings:

• The modules/strands (Choreographic mind, Augmented performance practice, Perspectives) and the related course materials are drawn from personal practice vis-à-vis core and guest staff members.

• In the *Education Plan* (2006) the panel has seen the literature list that is related to the course contents. In this list works can be found on dance, dance and new media, philosophy and science. The panel think this extensive list shows a variety of subjects and is up to date.

• There are organized interactions with professional practice (*Education Plan*, 2006). The annual Mini-Conference in collaboration with Springdance Festival Utrecht is part of the master course. Collab is an intensive eight day lab facilitated by a member of staff and a guest professional artist. In this lab the participants explore collaboration between interactive media arts, digital and sound art, choreography, theatre and live arts practices. Participants are master students and young artists working in the professional field.

• DUAM students have their own budget to engage artistic advisors and tutors from the professional field to assist them in the realization of their creative choreographic projects.
DUAM has a national and international network which students can use as a platform for the dissemination of information. DUAM students may do an internship with a professional artist or artist company as part of their Individual Study practice-based activities.

- An important component of the course is to place the artistic work of the students directly in the professional practice circuit of the Netherlands. In 2005-2006 there is a Performance Series in Melkweg in Amsterdam and there are Round Table meetings for staff and students with curators, producers and artistic leaders of professional organizations as Melkweg, Frascati, Gasthuis, and DWA.

- During the interviews the importance of networking was emphasized. Students are supported by the members of staff to find contacts. Students learn how and where to apply for subsidies/grants. The staff teach the students tools they need for networking. After student’s evaluation more attention will be given to networking strategies in the future.

- Students have to gain understanding of the application of research in the context of arts practice (e.g. practice-based research). The Education Plan (2006): ‘The learning activates the student’s desire and capacity to face complex, fast-changing structures and methodological debates in the domain of questions pertaining to the constitution of practitioner-based knowledge (i.e. choreographic meta-practices). One of the most important skills pertaining to arts research-based education is the ability to devise research-led activities appropriate to a wide range of possible practical outputs in addition to the artwork. At the same time the artwork itself remains of central importance.’ From the Melrose report (2005) it is clear that the theoretical input is of an almost academical level. In the Educational Plan (2006) the theory has largely been integrated with/in the practical work. According to the staff the students carry out research in the field of dance and new media, and engage with new kinds of practice-based activity that align with constantly shifting research frameworks. The Panel is convinced that the students interviewed are indeed engaged in prospective research associated with the complex, evolving structures indicated in the Education Plan.

- Two teachers and two students participate in the research group connected with the AHK Lectoraat Theorie en Onderzoek. The results from research are input for the programmes of SNDO (Bachelor course) and DUAM (Master course).

- In the Semester Evaluation 2006 students appreciate the expertise and the connection Core Staff have with the field: 3.0 on a five point scale. The satisfaction with the course materials scores 4.3 on a five point scale and the study components an average 7.0 on a ten point scale. Networking is an item that gets a lower score both from students (5.5 on a ten point scale, Program Evaluation, 2004) and alumni (2.7 on a five point scale, Alumni Evaluation, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 2, Facet 2.2</th>
<th>Relationship between Aims and Objectives and Contents of the Study Programme</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria:
- The course contents adequately reflect the final qualifications, both with respect to the level and orientation, and with respect to domain-specific requirements;
The final qualifications have been translated adequately into learning targets for the programme or its components;
The contents of the programme offer students the opportunity to obtain the final qualifications that have been formulated.

The assessment is based on the following findings:

- **The study course consists of the following main components:** three modules / strands (Choreographic mind, Augmented performance practice, Perspectives), writing assignments (connected to individual modules in the programme 2002-2004 and adapted to the format of 'dossier' in the programme 2004-2006), the individual study track and four presentations (of which two are formally assessed).
- In the *Study Guide 2004-2006* the panel has seen that for each component of the course there is listed: aims, teaching and learning strategies, schedule, assessment, criteria and credits.
- The panel is satisfied that the aims in the *Study Guide* correspond with the final qualifications. The aims are linked to criteria to constitute the learning targets (or objectives). There are also explicit criteria for the Individual Study component, i.e. Dossier writing and the choreographic projects. Often students have to make their own decisions about their course of study including aims and objectives. The core staffs monitors this process (ref. 4.2). The panel thinks it is proper that students in a master course formulate their own aims and programme (70 percent) and that the management offers opportunities. Students can also participate in other courses of the Theaterschool.
- The DUAM study course is paced over two years to allow the student to increase the complexity of their projects and the capacity for judgement and problem solving are stimulated (final qualifications 5 and 6). Creation, artistic and technical support, presentation and assessment are designed to encourage research and reflection (*Education Plan*, 2006). As there are only four students per cycle it is quite easy to make adjustments to the programme.
- In the pre-accreditation report (Melrose, 2005) some critical remarks are made about the lack of specific objectives connected to the aims. The core staff has made improvements in this respect as can be seen in Appendix 2 of the Position Document.
- Program evaluation rates an overall score of 6.7 and the Alumni evaluation of 7.0 (ten point scale). Current students rate the course a 3.3 (five point scale) for clarity of aims of the course components, and educational quality a 3.8 average. Alumni commented that the breadth and depth, level of difficulty and information concerning career possibilities are fine. The overall score for the DUAM program given by the alumni has an average of 7.1 (ten point scale).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 2, Facet 2.3</th>
<th>The Coherence of Programme Contents and Structure</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Criteria**

- Students follow a programme of study that is coherent in its contents.
The assessment is based on the following findings:

- The content of the study course is guided by the research needs of the student. Students are expected to be self-directing in their Individual Study so mentoring is a critical learning and teaching strategy for the coherence of this process. The coherence of the Individual Study is supported through finding appropriate writing and reading choices. These choices have to be facilitated by the core staff and the peers in the reading group.

- The study course contains three modules (renamed modules strands in 2004-2006). The study course is framed by dance and choreography, new media arts and culture, interdisciplinary practice and research-based education.

- The complexity of choreographic projects, presentations and writing assignments increases over the two year period.

- For the curriculum in 2006-2008 the decision is made to let go of the module structure and support greater consistency in the program by reasserting the block nature of the program over four semesters. In addition, an integrated assessment policy will be followed similar to the Bachelor level (Education Plan, 2006).

- The panel has interviewed students and alumni who are positive about the open structure of the course so that they can achieve their own goals within the qualifications. On the other hand it is not a usual structure for a school, so students have to get used to that way of learning.

- The Semester Evaluation (2006) shows a positive score (3.7 on a five point scale) for the balance input/output and the connection between the components (4.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 2, Facet 2.4</th>
<th>Study Load</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The programme can be successfully completed within the set time, as certain programme-related factors that made be an impediment to study progress are removed as much as possible.

The assessment is based on the following findings:

- The two year programme consists of 30 percent taught time and 70 percent self-directed study which demands from the student the ability to self organize. There is a gradual build up in the course over the four semesters as to the amount and scale of self-directed projects.

- The Study Guide provides the students with information about the content and planning of the programme. At the beginning of the year the year plan with a schedule is available from which the students can do their planning. In an overview of the credits in the Study Guide the study load is indicated.

- From evaluations it is clear that production takes up nearly 30 percent of the students' time. In 2004 a production assistant was introduced providing extra support for production activities. This resulted in a positive score in the Semester Evaluation (2004): 3.0 on a five point scale, technical support results are less positive (2.0).
• In the *Semester Evaluation* (2006) the outcome indicates that the students have no problems with the study load. The making and organizing of performances takes a lot of time, but is not seen as problem. The time for making projects is enough (3.3 on a five point scale) according to the students.

• Although students are positive about timetable (3.7 on a five point scale) and continuity (3.5) they still have comments about chaotic planning. According to DUAM this has to do with too much leniency in the planning to accommodate for students activities and in the next cycle there will be less flexibility and a block curriculum will be introduced to enhance the structural continuity in the programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 2, Facet 2.5</th>
<th>Incoming Students</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Criteria**

The structure and contents of the programme are in line with the qualifications of the students that embark on the degree course:

- Master’s degrees at a University of Professional Education (HBO) or University (WO):
  - bachelor’s degree and possibly selection (on contents of the subject).

The assessment is based on the following findings:

• Information about the DUAM study course and selection procedure is provided on the website of the Theaterschool AHK.

• Formal requirements for acceptation to the course are: bachelor degree in dance and three years of professional experience. Candidates are selected on their application containing a research question, documentations of previous work and a CV. DUAM selects candidates on artistic talent and degree of specificity of their aims. In the *Education Plan* (2006) the selection procedure is stated, including the criteria.

• From the applications a selection is made for the audition. The audition consists of composition assignments and an individual interview allowing the candidates the opportunity to show their directing, collaboration and composition skills in action. The members of the selection committee are staff teachers from various strands of expertise, and an external advisor. According to the committee the audition of 2004 showed sufficient numbers of applications of good quality, they are less satisfied with the level of applications in 2006.

• Members of the panel have sat in on a selection day and has seen that the procedure as described is followed. The criteria for selecting students appeared to be implicit although the committee agreed about the candidates for the new cycle. During the interview with the staff it became clear that the criteria for the audition are the same as for assessments during the course. Teachers know them and use them automatically. For the group of four students they also try to select different artistic visions and different background. These form the basis for interesting dialogues between students and between student and teacher.

• The students’ research plans presented at the audition will form a point of departure for their Individual Study program. Current students value the starting level of the courses as appropriate (3.7 on a five point scale).
• In the exam rules (*Study Guide 2004-2006*) the dispensation policy is stated. Students can make up for deficits in prior training, e.g. by following courses in the bachelors program at the AHK.
• From the interviews with students and alumni the panel learned that DUAM can meet the students’ expectations about the course. These expectations differ: one student wanted to do more with dance and different forms of dance in the context of new media, another student wanted to explore new media, a third student had a need for deepening the research and combining video-images and dance.
• In the final interview with the directors of the Theaterschool the panel’s impression about the weak marketing of DUAM was acknowledged. DUAM could function as the flagship of the school and attract the best of students with proper marketing. Improvement in this respect would secure more and better applicants for the master’s course.

### Topic 2, Facet 2.6
**Duration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Criteria**
The degree course complies with formal requirements regarding the size of the curriculum:
- Master of a University of Professional Education (HBO): a minimum of 60 credits.

The assessment is based on the following findings:
• The study program consists of a total of 120 EC over two years. This is consistent with other master courses in art schools. In the *Study Guide* (2004-2006) an overview of the credits is given.

### Topic 2, Facet 2.7
**Alignment of Structure and Contents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Criteria**
- *The didactic concepts are in line with the aims and objectives*
- *The teaching methods correspond to the didactic concepts*.

The assessment is based on the following findings:
• The didactic concepts are building on the bachelor level principles: technique education, task-based education, learning through performance, and learning in seminar. Self-directed education and Arts research-based education are added for the master course (*Education Plan*, 2006).
• Self-directed education involves initiating the learning process, making decisions about their own education including own goals, objectives and means of assessment. Arts research-based education aims to activate the individual student’s capacity to engage with recent developments in arts practice-led and practice-based research. This enables the students to have a multi-faceted approach to questions pertaining to the nature and value of arts practice
in contemporary society. This links the didactic concept through the main education aim with the vision of the study course to graduate students. In the Education Plan (2006) the learning strategies are made explicit.

- Individual Study takes up 70 percent of the student's time. They develop their own approach to practice-led research and the production of art works in a variety of formats. This includes choreographic projects/presentations, writing assignments and practice-based activities.
- The Dossier (the aggregate result of writing/reading) includes writing research proposals prior to each choreographic project and self-evaluative reports afterwards.
- Other teaching and learning strategies are: workshops/labs, lectures, conferences, tutorials and advice sessions.
- In Program Evaluation 2004 the scores for self-directed learning were 8.6 and for influence on what happens in the teaching 8.3 (ten point scale). The Semester Evaluation 2006 shows a score of 7.2 for teaching in general.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 2, Facet 2.8</th>
<th>Assessment and Validation</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria
- The system of assessments and examinations provides an effective indication whether the students have reached the learning targets of the course programme or its components.

The assessment is based on the following findings:
- The assessment policy of DUAM follows the basic outlines for tests and assessments as laid down for the Dance Sector in the Didactisch Concept: Toets en Beoordelingsbeleid (2005) and the Education Plan (2006).
- DUAM distinguishes three approaches to assessment: component assessment, continuous assessment and integrated assessment. At the end of each component a component assessment is held. The continuous assessment is part of the daily practice in which teachers continually give feedback on student progress. Twice a year there is an integrated assessment where staff teachers create an overall impression of the student's progress (Education Plan, 2006).
- The assessment of the choreographic projects is assessed by two members of the DUAM staff, one teacher from Arnhem or Rotterdam and a member of the professional field. DUAM is considering letting another student take part in the assessment.
- The Education Plan (2006) and the Study Guide 2004-2006 specify which type of assessment is applied for each program component. DUAM distinguishes assessments for modules/strands, writing requirements, choreographic projects/presentations, mentor meetings and practice-based activities. The criteria for the assessments can be found in the study guide and in the Education Plan (2006). Although the work from the students differs the criteria for assessment are suitable and help structuring the discussion.
• The results of tests and assessments, the reading and writing work and documentation of performances and extra curricular activities are kept in student files. The panel has seen several files and is positive about the level achieved.

• In the first cycle (2002-2004) students were critical about the speed of feedback (1.5 on a ten point scale), detailed feedback (4.4) and the clearness of the demands for assessments (5.7). DUAM is improving these aspects. In the Semester Evaluation 2006 one of the four students remarks that results have come late, but that evaluation/feedback is very helpful. Students are positive about the manner that progress is tested (3.5 on a five point scale).

Topic 3  DEPLOYMENT OF STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 3, Facet 3.1</th>
<th>HBO Requirements</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria

The degree course meets the following criterion for the deployment of staff for a degree course at a University of Professional Education (HBO):

- Teaching is largely provided by staff who relate the course programme to the professional practice.

The assessment is based on the following findings:

• Two thirds of the Core Staff works on a freelance basis and do all the module/strand teaching. Only the coordinator, technical support and the secretary are on contract.

• Core and Guest Staff members are experienced professionals functioning in international contexts for choreography, performance dance and new media arts. They participate frequently in (international) professional events as lecturers, teachers and experts (Study Guide 2004-2006).

• Core and Guest Staff actively translate relevant experiences to the teaching in the curriculum in the form of events like the Collab and Mini-Conferences, Network / Mobility advice, educational material.

• The professional field is consulted in Round Table events and alumni through personal talks and a questionnaire in order to keep the programme informed about developments in the field. The connection with the field, festivals and producers is good. They follow the presentations of students.

• The pre-accreditation report (Melrose, 2005) confirms that the staff is representative for professional developments in the field and that these are brought into the programme. The panel has spoken with members of staff and has seen biographies. The panel is convinced that this team of teachers can relate the course programme to the professional practice.

• Alumni and students are critical in evaluations about the stimulus for networking. By improving the methodology for mentoring of the students DUAM hopes to give more input to this aspect.
• Students told the panel that the teachers are a source of inspiration. Students are also stimulated to explore other fields of art. Alumni are asked as guest teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 3, Facet 3.2</th>
<th>Quantity of Staff</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria
- The staff levels are sufficient to ensure that the course is provided to the required standards.

The assessment is based on the following findings:
• The staff of DUAM amount to 1.15 fte, of which 0.4 fte (34%) is for coordination, technical support and secretary, and 0.75 fte for free lance teachers (66%) on four students. The student-lecturer ratio is 1 fte for 5.5 students.
• The panel can confirm that there is a balanced range of expertise: choreography, theory and new media.
• Because of the teaching format teaching hours vary: during intensive workshops teaching can take seven hours a day for one or two weeks. Other teaching can spread out in 1.5 hours sessions.
• Staff teachers all work on a free lance basis but support the coordinator in the design of the programme. Guest teachers are asked to reflect on the quality of the programme. One of the guest teachers with whom the panel has spoken, visits the course during a couple of weeks a year. Therefore he can not actively take part in the discussions. The panel is of the opinion that a lot of the actual day to day work depends on (the presence of) the artistic coordinator.
• Students are positive about the teacher student contact. Staff can be approached: 7.6, the atmosphere is good: 8.7, contacts are good: 8.4, staff is contactable: 8.7 and gives attention: 7.0. Students are critical about a lack of consistency of the teachers’ presence all year around. Some teachers are not based in Amsterdam and thus not often around.
• Sick leave has not been an issue in the programme.
• The staff represents a unique asset in its positive and open attitude to develop a continuously changing and updated educational program, which reflects exceptional qualities as a result of this investment. The panel feels that the staff deserves a particularly high level of recognition which may not necessarily be forthcoming in the framework of the current personnel policy. The management team could, according to the panel, engage on specific discussion with the staff concerned, to mutually define forms of recognition apt to guarantee long-term sustainability of this very demanding, and uniquely valuable programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 3, Facet 3.3</th>
<th>Quality of Staff</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria
- The staff is sufficiently qualified to ensure that the aims regards contents, didactics and organization of the course programme are achieved.
The assessment is based on the following findings:

- The Core Staff is qualified for teaching at the Master level of education in choreography/new media. They are experienced professionals working in the professional field: dance and choreography, new media arts and culture, interdisciplinary practice and arts based research. They have skills and experience in teaching internationally at a Master level in choreography and other arts (Study Guide 2004-2006).

- The Core Staff are involved in art based research activities internationally and with the lectorships of the Amsterdamse Hogeschool voor de Kunsten.

- Core Staff are selected or hired according to the formation plan for the programme. Developments in the profession and the education contribute to the desired profile of the future teacher. Guest teachers with various backgrounds and fields of knowledge are brought in when the program or the students have a need for them.

- In the program-evaluation 2004 the students express a high regard of teaching staff, qualified as 'knowledgeable'. The teaching receives an overall 7.2 (10 point scale) in 2004-2006. Students remark that the teaching is more about facilitating the learning process.

- The pre-accreditation report (Melrose, 2005) is positive about the teaching staff in relation to MA requirements. This was confirmed in the interview with the students.

- The Core Staff would like to be able to meet more often to discuss topics, as the panel learned in the interview with the staff. The management likewise expressed its wish for more frequent meetings though has difficulty organising them. The panel thinks that because more meetings are desirable for the two parties, a solution needs to be consensually defined. Use of videoconferencing and telephone conferencing might allow certain partners to participate in meetings, rather than depending on systematic physical presence which would clearly be very difficult for staff on a programme of this kind.

- The Theaterschool has a budget for training but there are no specific plans for the personnel available. The staff interviewed was insufficiently aware of training budget allocations and their usage. This can obviously be rectified by improved internal communications from the management team.

### Topic 4 FACILITIES

| Topic 4, Facet 4.1 | Material Facilities | Good |

**Criteria**

- The accommodation and material facilities are sufficient to implement the programme.

The assessment is based on the following findings:

- DUAM makes full time use of a dance studio and a computer room, plus additional access to dance studios and presentation studios such as the dance theatre and the AV Beeldmedia studio.
• DUMA can make use of three G4, one G5 one PC computers, a wide range of software programs, two cameras and a beamer for exclusive use of the programme.
• Students plan and self-regulate their own studio use and can reserve extra space in the building through the central planning of the Theaterschool. In case of necessity extra space can be hired outside the school.
• With the Melkweg Theatre in Amsterdam DUAM has an agreement for presenting second year work.
• Other facilities of the Theaterschool contribute to the realization of the educational programme, both general and specific such as the library and media centre, a sound/recording studio, other ICT facilities, theatre production and technical facilities and support.
• DUAM has its own production assistant and technical support specialized in the area of new media arts.
• Students are allotted their own budget to use for organizing their own projects: 3700 Euro in the first year and 4700 Euro in the second year.
• The students the panel has interviewed are enthusiastic about the facilities. The panel was shown around and can confirm that the facilities are good.
• In the Semester Evaluation 2006 students are positive about the equipment (4.0 on a 5 point scale) and the studio (3.9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 4, Facet 4.2</th>
<th>Student Counseling</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>The student support and guidance, as well as the information given to students are adequate for the purpose of students’ progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The student support and guidance, as well as the information given to students meet the requirements of the students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assessment is based on the following findings:
• Mentoring meetings take place at least six times a year with each student individually, and the mentor files reports at the end of each study semester. The student is expected to work with the mentor to prepare the agenda and topics to discuss.
• Mentoring in the DUAM course is considered a critical learning and teaching strategy as well as a curriculum component supporting the self-direction education principle of the course.
• In addition to the mentoring the DUAM coordinator has an ‘open door policy’ which affords an additional check on student progress in terms of the curriculum as well as more general guidance with organization of personal circumstances. Core Staff meets with students during the year in rehearsals or outside class hours (i.e. lunch meetings). Peer to peer support and guidance is also facilitated, i.e. the weekly Friday sessions when students give updates on their work to each other.
• The Theaterschool has a Dean who is assigned to inform students, advice and offer help in relation to general study conditions and also for mediation in relation to aspects of assessment, credits et cetera
• Basic information sources of DUAM include the Study Guide and Educational Plan. Year planning documents and schedules are provided at the beginning of each year. The production guide explains the services and facilities in the building. New information is offered through email and is online available.
• The coordinator keeps the student files.
• In evaluations students are positive about the mentoring. This was confirmed in the interview with students.

**Topic 5 INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 5, Facet 5.1</th>
<th>Evaluation of Results</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Criteria**
- The degree course is subjected to periodic review, which is partly based on verifiable targets.

The assessment is based on the following findings:
• DUAM introduced self-evaluation measures and adoption of policy and curriculum at the start of its study course 2002-2004. Many of these procedures have become formalized as described in the Theaterschool Quality Plan.
• DUAM makes use of the following instruments, developed by the Kohnstamm Institute:
  - Semester evaluation, a questionnaire at the end of each semester for the students to look back at the facilitation, time management, educational quality and didactic quality of the course;
  - Program evaluation, a questionnaire at the end of the two year study to look back and evaluate the entire study period;
  - Alumni evaluation, two year after graduation alumni are asked questions about their current activities and evaluation of their education;
  - Interviews with the students at the end of a semester to provide for an open discussion about the quality of the programme;
  - Round Table meetings with professionals and producers from the field.
• DUAM has the following target figures: 70 percent should be satisfied about the requested issue, or a score of 7 (out of 10) or 4 (out of 5), 60-70 percent or between 6 and 7 (3 and 4 out of 5 scale) means attention is needed, lower than 60 and 6 (or 3 out of 5 scale) means action is needed for improvement.
• DUAM has produced two critical reports: Audition report for the audition in 2004 and the Pre-Accreditation Report (2005) by Susan Melrose, an expert in performing arts based research and related curriculum development in the context of higher education.
• DUAM takes part in frequent exchanges with its partner DU programmes. The coordinators are external assessors for student projects of the other courses et cetera.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 5, Facet 5.2</th>
<th>Measures for Improvement</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria

- The results of this evaluation form the basis for measures that can be demonstrated to improve the course and that will contribute to reaching the targets.

The assessment is based on the following findings:

- The DUAM coordinator takes responsibility for processing and analyzing the results of each evaluation instrument and shares the results with students, other members of the Core Staff and Theaterschool personnel.
- The evaluations provide the information for the Year Reports in which each cycle is evaluated. In the Policy Plans the policy for the next cycle is laid down.
- Changes in the design of the programme are discussed with the Core Staff and selected regular Guests. Changes are implemented in such a way not to disturb the current cohort.
- The panel has seen that in the second cycle changes were made and has seen plans for changes in the third cycle.
- From the interview with the management the panel learned that there are no management contracts. There are weekly meetings with the artistic leaders which the coordinator of DUAM sometimes, if necessary, visits. The coordinator and the management meet regularly to keep in contact.
- Students are positive about improvements.
- The panel concludes that the Theaterschool lacks a structural system to monitor the implementation of improvement plans. The policy from the Quality Plan seems to offer a workable system. Because DUAM is small, improvements are discussed with everybody so implementation is not a problem, though a sounder monitoring process is advisable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 5, Facet 5.3</th>
<th>Involving Staff, Students, Graduates and the Professional Field</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria

- Staff, students, alumni and the professional field in which graduates of the course are to be employed are actively involved in the internal quality assurance.

The assessment is based on the following findings:

- The Core Staff is involved with internal quality assurance, e.g. in meetings with Susan Melrose, on all assessment committees, with Round Tables with professional field. In teachers meetings all aspects of quality assurance are discussed.
- The students take part in evaluations, feedback sessions, Friday sessions et cetera.
• Alumni are involved through talks, questionnaires, invited for Friday sessions, work as advisors and tutors for current students et cetera
• The professional field is involved through Round Table meetings, organization of guest lectures and input, through invitation as examiners for assessments, at auditions and performances.
• Students told the panel they are taken seriously and suggestions for improvements are discussed and followed up.

**Topic 6 RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 6, Facet 6.1</th>
<th>The Level Achieved</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Criteria**
- The final qualifications that have been achieved correspond to the targets set for the final qualifications in level, orientation and domain-specific requirements.

The assessment is based on the following findings:
• To achieve the Master of Choreography diploma the student must follow all components of the study course (the three modules/strands and the Individual study program including the writing, choreographic projects and practice-based activities) successfully.
• At the end the student has a concluding graduation interview with the assessment committee (following the final choreographic project/presentation). A review is made of the achieved accomplishments of the student and includes perspectives given for further development.
• In the Position Paper an overview is given of graduate work. The panel is positive about this work. The panel has seen DVD's of work of students and alumni and is of the opinion that the work represents a master level.
• The panel has seen the students files and is positive about the work.
• In Program Evaluations (2004) the students indicate they feel confident about the competences they have acquired (7.8 on a ten point scale). They are satisfied about the degree to which they are prepared in relation to the final qualifications (7 out of 8 students score more than 7.5). The students are critical about their networking ability (5.5 on a ten point scale). This aspect is also mentioned by the alumni (Alumni Evaluations, 2006) because of its importance for a successful practice as a choreographer / new media artist.
• The professional field (consulted informally and formally, Round Table Summary, 2006) is positive about the acquired qualifications of the students. They find them well organized and focused in their research. The field is more critical about finding the right exposure for research work, and the degree of reflection in socio-political respect in their work.
• In the interview with the alumni and the professional field aspects of the master level were mentioned: quality and depth of thinking, maturity of thinking as an artist, area of practice, having an identity. According to the teachers they engage with students on a master level.
The uniqueness of the DUAM program with respect to the international creative arts world was recognized.

- Of the four graduates of 2002-2004 three are working in the professional field, two have artistic careers, one an educational and choreographic career. The fourth graduate is not working in the professional practice at this moment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 6, Facet 6.2</th>
<th>Educational Success Rate</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Criteria**

- To measure the results of teaching, target figures have been set in comparison with relevant other degree courses;
- The results of teaching meet these targets.

The assessment is based on the following findings:

- The target figure for average study duration of graduates is two years with a possible prolongation of three months, and of drop outs no more than one drop out per three cycles.
- After one cycle the success rate is 100 percent. In the current group there is no study delay. All students will probably graduate in July 2006.
Part C: Appendixes
Appendix 1: Declaration of Independence by the Audit Panel Members
Onafhankelijkheidsverklaring Panellid

Ondergetekende, panellid bij de kwaliteitsbeoordeling 1 van het opleidingsprogramma:

"031AB2006.01 Cluster Dans",

visitatiedatum: 17, 18 en 19 mei 2006

van de hogeschool AHK

verklarert hierbij geen relaties of banden, privé noch zakelijk, te onderhouden met de hierboven vermelde opleiding(en) en instelling en zulke relaties, die een volstrekt onafhankelijke oordeelvorming over de kwaliteit van de opleiding ten positieve of ten negatieve kunnen beïnvloeden, de afgelopen vijf jaar met de te beoordeelden opleiding(en) en de afgelopen twee jaar met de instelling ook niet te hebben gehad (dit geldt voor advieswerk en nulmetingen).

Naam: mevrouw A. Keurontjes

Geboortedatum: 03-06-1860

Handtekening: 

Datum: 11 mei 2006

1 Het panellid dat betrokken is bij deze kwaliteitsbeoordeling maakt deel uit van een panel dat bestaat uit minstens vier (bestaande opleiding) dan wel drie (TNO) leden. De meerderheid van deze panellieden heeft geen arbeidsrelatie met NQA.
Declaration of Independence

This is to state that the undersigned, a member of the panel charged with the quality assessment\(^1\) of

031AB2006.01 Cluster Dans

on May 19th, 2006

at Amsterdamse Hogeschool voor de Kunsten

S.J. Norman,

maintains no relationships or ties, privately or business-oriented, with the above mentioned study programme or programmes nor with the institution, and has not maintained such a relationship or tie with the above mentioned study programme during the last five years nor with the institution during the last two years (this counts for consultancy services and zero measurements), as it might influence, either positively or negatively, the complete independent formation of an opinion about the quality of the study programme under review.

Name: Mrs S.J. Norman

Date of Birth: 16-10-53

Signature:

Date: 14th May 2006

\(^1\) The panel member involved in this quality assessment is part of a panel that consists of at least four members, in case of a new study programme: three members. Most of the panel members are not employed by NQA.
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Onafhankelijkheidsverklaring Panellid

Ondergetekende, panellid bij de kwaliteitsbeoordeling van het opleidingsprogramma:

"031AB2006.01 Cluster Dans",

visitatiedatum: 17, 18 en 19 mei 2006

van de hogeschool AHK

verklaart hierbij geen relaties of banden, privé noch zakelijk, te ondervinden met de hierboven vermelde opleiding(en) en installering en zulke relaties, die een volstrekt onafhankelijke oordeelsvorming over de kwaliteit van de opleiding ten positieve of ten negatieve kunnen beïnvloeden, de afgelopen vijf jaar met de te beoordelen opleiding(en) en de afgelopen twee jaar met de installering ook niet te hebben gehad (dit geldt voor advieswerk en nulmetingen).

Naam: mevrouw H. Draaijer

Geboortedatum: 06-02-1965

Handtekening:

Datum: 29-04-06

Het panellid dat betrokken is bij deze kwaliteitsbeoordeling maakt deel uit van een panell dat bestaat uit minstens vier (bestaande opleiding) dan wel drie (TNO) leden. De meerderheid van deze panellleden heeft geen arbeidsrelatie met NQA.
Onafhankelijkheidsverklaring Panellid

Ondergetekende,

panelid bij de kwaliteitsbeoordeling¹ van het opleidingsprogramma:

"031AB2006.01 Cluster Dans",

visitatie datum: 17, 18 en 19 mei 2006

van de hogeschool XXX .................................................................

verkleedt hierbij geen relaties of banden, privé noch zakelijk, te onderhouden met de
hierboven vermelde opleiding(en) en instelling en zulke relaties, die een volstrekt
onafhankelijke oordeelvorming over de kwaliteit van de opleiding ten positieve of ten
negatieve kunnen beïnvloeden, de afgelopen vijf jaar met de te beoordelen opleiding(en) en
da afgelegden twee jaar met de instelling ook niet te hebben gehad (dit geldt voor advieswerk
en nulmetingen).

Naam : mevrouw A.M.R. van Bussel

Geboortedatum : 22-03-1981

Handtekening

Datum : 05-05-2006

¹ Het panellid dat betrokken is bij deze kwaliteitsbeoordeling maakt deel uit van een panel dat
bestaat uit minstens vier (bestaande opleiding) dan wel drie (TNO) leden. De meerderheid van
deze panelleden heeft geen arbeidsrelatie met NQA.
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Declaration of Independence

This is to state that the undersigned, a member of the panel charged with the quality assessment 1 of

031AB2006.01 Cluster Dans

on May 19th, 2006

at Amsterdamse Hogeschool voor de Kunsten

maintains no relationships or ties, privately or business-oriented, with the above mentioned study programme or programmes nor with the institution, and has not maintained such a relationship or tie with the above mentioned study programme during the last five years, nor with the institution during the last two years (this counts for consultancy services and zero measurements), as it might influence, either positively or negatively, the complete independent formation of an opinion about the quality of the study programme under review.

Name: Mrs Drs. P. Göbel

Date of Birth: November 18th 1953

Signature

Date: 20 November 2006

1 The panel member involved in this quality assessment is part of a panel that consists of at least four members, in case of a new study programme: three members. Most of the panel members are not employed by NQA.
Appendix 2: Expertise of the Audit Panel Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expertise in panels cf. NVAO Protocol VMD’s; August 22nd, 2005</th>
<th>Audit panel member: Mrs A. Keurentjens</th>
<th>Audit panel member: Mrs dr. S. Norman</th>
<th>Audit panel member: Mrs H. Draaijer</th>
<th>Audit panel member student: Mrs A. van Bussel</th>
<th>Audit panel member NQA: Mrs drs. P. Göbel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise in the relevant professional field</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience in the subject: Familiar with recent developments in the professional field in this subject</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise in the subject: Experience in teaching and examining and assessing on the level and in the type of course under review</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational expertise</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student related expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit expertise</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Audit panel members have undersigned a declaration of independance.

Specific additions from the pool of audit panel members in random order:

**Audit panel member Mrs A.M.D. Keurentjies**

Mrs Keurentjies is deployed as audit panel member because of her expertise in the domain of dance and dance education, as well as her international knowledge and experience in this field. Mrs Keurentjies has experience as a mentor and teacher. Besides that she has a wide experience in setting up dance and theatre productions and the marketing activities accompanying such events. Mrs Keurentjies has individually been instructed for this visitation.

**Education:**

1972 – 1978 High school: Gymnasium α, Arnhem, The Netherlands
1975 – 1980 Dance Academie, Arnhem, The Netherlands
1989 – 1990 propedeuse Spanish language and literature
1990 – 1993 Cultural Studies, direction policy and management, UvA
  Part time Spanisch language and literature, 1 year translation science Spanish

© NQA - visitatie Amsterdamse Hogeschool voor de Kunsten Dance Unlimited Amsterdam
Work experience:
1982 – 1990 Freelance dancer and teacher
1997 - 1999 Rotterdam Dance Academy, deputy manager project centre (spring 97 and 98 and study year 1998-1999)
1998 Beppie Blankert, tour manager USA
1994 and 1995 Staff member public relations Naranti Productions, Amsterdam
95, 96,97,99 Springdance festival, staff member public relations and communication
1997 Theatre office Berbee & Rudolphi, business management and foreign countries policy
1998 project leader exchange project with Nordrhein-Westfalen (Germany) for Theatre Institute Netherlands
09/99 – 06/01 Theater Instituut Nederland, Staff member International relations
06/01 – 12/04 project manager, June 2001 - Decembre 2004
2003 –2004 Theatre Institute Netherlands, chairwoman Employees Council
2005 – now Staff member research & development, Holland Festival

Overig:
1998 guest curator ‘On the Road for Dutch Dance’ for Theatre Institute Netherlands
1998 - 1999 participant as tutor in Arts web, a tutors’ project initiated by the London Arts Board
1995 – 1999 Amsterdam Art Fund; member of the Advisory board Dance
1997 Theatre office Berbee & Rudolphi, business management and foreign countries policy
1998 project leader exchange project with Nordrhein-Westfalen (Germany) for Theatre Institute Netherlands
09/99 – 06/01 Theater Instituut Nederland, Staff member International relations
06/01 – 12/04 project manager, June 2001 - Decembre 2004
2003 –2004 Theatre Institute Netherlands, chairwoman Employees Council
2005 – now Staff member research & development, Holland Festival

Overig:
1998 guest curator ‘On the Road for Dutch Dance’ for Theatre Institute Netherlands
1998 - 1999 participant as tutor in Arts web, a tutors’ project initiated by the London Arts Board
1995 – 1999 Amsterdam Art Fund; member of the Advisory board Dance
1999 – 2000 performance visitor for the Council for Culture
Member of the program board for the Master programme of the Professional Highschool of Arts Utrecht (cooperation between the Professional Highschool of Arts Utrecht and the University of Utrecht)
2006, july member of the review committee paper proposals DaCI (Dance and the Child International) conference

Board memberships:

Audit panel member Mrs S.J. Norman.
Mrs. Norman is deployed because of her expertise in the domain of modern dance and performance combined with digital technique and digital spaces. Mrs Normans research includes performing arts, culture theory and technique. Mrs Norman has individually been instructed for this visitation.

Education:
1975 Master of Arts, University of Canterbury, Nieuw Zeeland
1980 Doctorat de 3ème cycle, Université de Paris III
1990 Doctorat d’état des Lettres et Sciences Humaines, Institut d’études théâtrales Université de Paris III – Sorbonne Nouvelle
Thesis about dance and the performing body in avant garde period in the early twentieth century
**Work experience:**
From 1988 Several publications about the performing body and related technologies, beside she's been invited guest speaker on several international dance and choreography events, among others in Australia, Belgium en Monaco.
From 1994 Director of workshops and congresses dedicated to performances in digital spaces.
2001 – 2004 General manager of the ‘Ecole supérieure de l’image’ (ESI) and founder of a Digital arts Master’s program that is matched to the Universities of Poitiers and La Rochelle by ESI.

**Audit panel member mrs H. Draaijer**
Audit panel member Mrs. Draaijer is deployed because of her expertise in the field of dance performance. She is responsible for the direction (partly or complete) of, and/or performance in a great number of dance and theatre productions. Beside that she has taught exercise, dance and choreography on several schools in The Netherlands. In the past mrs Draaijer has been member of a large number of working groups and up and untill today she is member of three advisory committees, the board of Juli Dance, member of the committee dance Raad voor Cultuur and jury member of the VSCD Dance prizes. Mrs Draaijer has individually been instructed for this visitation.

**Education:**
1991 Graduated at Dance department of the High School of Art, Amsterdam

**Work experience:**
Mrs Draaijer has been working as a teacher in art education since 12 years and as producer and artistic manager of Theatre group DOX since 1997. For nine years she worked with the Japanese choreographer Shusaku Takeuchi, the American choreografer Arthur Rosenfeld (youth dance company The Meekers), the groupe of mime players Suver Nuver and the American choreographer Ron Bunzl. Apart from the performing labour she has made many choreographies together with amateurs as well as professional dancers. She received several awards for her work among which in 1990 the ‘Ineke Sluiter Encouragement Choreography Price’ and in 1998 the ‘Deutsche Theaterzwang Preis’. In recent years she made interdisciplinary performances with different directors in various groups, as theatre group Tryater, Hesp-theatre makers, Artisjok/020 and Youth theatre group Burrp!. Also she produced various project based performances and she regularly gives workshops and training to professional drama teachers and theater performers.

**Student audit panel member Mrs A.M.R. van Bussel**
Mrs Van Bussel is deployed as a student panel member. She is fourth year’s student BA Writing for Performance at the School of Writing of the Theatre Faculty fo the Professional Highschool of Arts Utrecht, specializing in prose and poetry. Besides Mrs Van Bussel is secretary of the Faculty Participation council of her programme. Mrs Van Bussel has been individually instructed for this audit visit.

**Education:**
1999 – 2000 Anthroposofical Highschool (foundation course), Driebergen, the Netherlands
2002 – heden BA Writing for Performance, specialization prose/poetry, School of Writing, theatre faculty, Professional Highschool of Arts, Utrecht, the Netherlands

**Work experience:**
1998 – 2003 Hospitality - kitchen
2000 – 2006 Home care
2000 – 2006 Shop (a.o. book selling)
2004 – 2006 Freelance theatre/writing work
2005 – 2006 Promotional work

Audit Panel member NQA: Ms drs. P. Göbel

Msr Göbel is deployed as NQA auditor. Apart from more than five years’ experience with audit visits in almost all sections of HBO [higher professional education], her auditor qualities are based on many years of assessment experience as well as having attended auditor courses at Lloyds. She has worked in higher professional education for twenty years.

Education:
1971 – 1976 Grade two teacher training: Dutch and English:
1976 – 1979 Utrecht University, Dutch Language and Literature

Work Experience:
1980 – 1993 Lecturer of linguistic competence at Saxion Hogeschool Enschede:
1987 – 1995 Student counsellor at Saxion Hogeschool Enschede
1994 – 1997 Director at Saxion Hogeschool Enschede
1997 – 2000 Project leader at Saxion Hogeschool Enschede
2000 – 2004 Policy advisor of Quality Assurance at HBO-raad [Netherlands Association of Professional Universities]
at present NQA Auditor
Appendix 3: Audit Visit Programme 8th June 2006

The panel has spoken with:

1. Jeroen Fabius, coordinator
2. students
3. staff
4. alumni and members from the professional field
5. management of the Theaterschool

During the day there was time to study the documents.
## Appendix 4: Overview of the Documents Made Available for Scrutiny

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Subject/section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy documents (at course and HBO level)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality care</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel policy (incl. Job and qualification profiles, documentation on functioning and professionalisation)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational policy and testing &amp; assessment policy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance policy</td>
<td>2, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment reports/results (internal as well as external research) Including measuring instruments</td>
<td>2, 3.3, 4, 5, 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and examination regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The final attainment levels which should be reached</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job profile or similar document</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study guide</td>
<td>2, 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of the programme (for all variations and both locations) Including study points</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of personnel (lecturer qualifications)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Figures</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module guides</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement/final project guides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficiency programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests, portfolios and assessments, including evaluations</td>
<td>2.8, 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final products, including evaluations</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement reports, including evaluations</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>