



NVAO • NETHERLANDS

ADVISORY REPORT

University of the Arts The Hague

INSTITUTIONAL AUDIT

FEBRUARY 2020



NVAO • NETHERLANDS

ADVISORY REPORT

University of the Arts The Hague

INSTITUTIONAL AUDIT

FEBRUARY 2020



Contents

1	Summary	4
2	Introduction and methodology	6
2.1	Purpose of the audit	6
2.2	Composition of the panel	6
2.3	The structure of the institutional audit	6
2.4	Structure of the report	7
3	Profile of the institute	9
3.1	General information	9
3.2	Profile of the institution	9
4	Assessment by standard	11
4.1	Standard 1: Philosophy and policy	11
4.2	Standard 2: Implementation	14
4.3	Standard 3: Evaluation and monitoring	18
4.4	Standard 4: Development	21
4.5	Final conclusion	23
5	Recommendations	25
	Annex 1: Accreditation portrait	27
	Annex 2: Panel composition	29
	Annex 3: Programmes of the site visits	30
	Annex 4: List of studied documents	32

1 Summary

This report contains the panel's advice to the NVAO on the institutional audit of the University of the Arts The Hague. The university was formed in 1990 by the merger of the Royal Conservatoire and the Royal Academy of Art. Over the years, the University of the Arts has developed a common mission, educational philosophy and identity that reflect the institution's core values. The two faculties, the Royal Academy of Art and the Royal Conservatoire, both enjoy a large degree of autonomy and responsibility to implement the common principles in a manner that reflects their respective specific characters. The panel observes that thirty years after the university was established, both constituent institutions, the Royal Academy and the Royal Conservatoire, still retain their distinctive identities.

The panel based its assessment of the institution's performance in relation to the four standards enumerated in the assessment framework on the university's vision of education. In the panel's opinion, that vision is widely supported and substantively rich. The panel regards the formulation of that vision in an Institutional Plan and the role performed by that plan in the university's organisation as highly successful. In the process, the university reflects both the shared principles and ambitions and the distinctive features of the two strong brands, the Royal Academy of Art and the Royal Conservatoire.

The panel also finds that the university has a clear vision of quality, which is shared by all of the stakeholders and is consistent with the points of departure of the institute's educational philosophy. In each domain, the university's policy is based on common values and ambitions and is operationalised and rolled out in a manner that corresponds with the actual situation of the two faculties. The university has developed an extensive, and in the panel's view impressive, set of instruments to monitor policy implementation and the quality of the education, which ensure that the stakeholders have access to the relevant information they need to make the correct decisions at their respective levels. Appropriate follow-up is given to measurements and evaluations in closing the quality circle by not only identifying improvements, but also systematically monitoring their implementation.

During the site visits, the panel reached the conclusion that the university's organisation, policies and quality assurance system are appropriate to and involve the people who make up its population. Teachers, staff members and students display a sense of ownership of the policy and a commitment to help formulate and implement this nuanced policy. In the panel's view, this attitude is the result of the trust generated by the scope given to students, teachers and staff members by the university, the faculties and the departments. The panel is also impressed by the way 'the people' in the university have succeeded in creating a community. The panel feels that team spirit displayed is an indication of the quality culture within the institution.

The panel observes that there is wide support within the university for the construction with two director-managers. As managers, they deal well with the artistic background of the teachers. They are advised and assisted by able deputy directors and staff members and by a committed Board of Governors with relevant and complementary expertise.

The panel found from the documents it studied and the conversations it held during the two site visits that quality assurance is deeply embedded in the university, that both individual stakeholders and representative bodies demonstrate a high degree quality awareness and that there is a good balance between the quality assurance system and the quality culture within the organisation. It is therefore the panel's opinion that the University of the Arts The Hague has a quality culture and a quality assurance system capable of guaranteeing that the institution's education meets national and international standards and expectations.

In light of the ambitions, the philosophy and the choices of the University of the Arts The Hague and its reporting on the realisation of its ambitions, the panel concludes that the institution:

- has a broadly supported vision educational philosophy and pursues a corresponding policy focused on the internal quality assurance of its education;
- realises its educational philosophy in an effective manner through policy actions and processes;
- systematically evaluates whether the intended policy objectives relating to educational quality are being realised;
- has a focus on development and works systematically on the improvement of its education.

Consequently, the panel's final conclusion on the institutional audit of the University of the Arts The Hague is *positive*.

The Hague, 9 February 2020

On behalf of the assessment panel for the University of the Arts The Hague

Susana Menéndez
(Chair)

Mark Delmartino MA
(Secretary)

2 Introduction and methodology

2.1 Purpose of the audit

The purpose of the institutional audit is to determine whether the institution has a quality assurance system in place that, in combination with its quality culture, is capable of guaranteeing that its education meets national and international standards and expectations. With the institutional audit, the institution gives an accounting, on the basis of its educational philosophy and the choices it makes, of how it realises its ambitions with regard to the quality of the education it provides. The assessment addresses four coherent questions:

1. Are the institution's vision and policy concerning the quality of the education it provides widely supported and sufficiently coordinated, both externally and internally?
2. How does the institute realise this vision of quality?
3. How does the institute monitor that its vision of quality is realised?
4. How does the institute work on improvement?

The institutional audit is a voluntary exercise and supplements the assessment and accreditation of programmes. An institution that obtains a positive institutional audit decision is entitled to have its programmes accredited on the basis of the framework for limited programme assessment. In the absence of a positive decision, programmes are assessed according to the framework for extensive assessment.

In the first round of institutional audits between 2011 and 2016, 35 institutions, accounting for approximately 80% of all higher education programmes in the Netherlands, received a positive decision.

The institutional audit is conducted by a panel of independent experts ('peers') appointed by the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO). The members of the panel are authoritative figures with expertise in the following fields: administration, higher education, the conduct of audits and/or the structure and effectiveness of quality assurance systems. Students and representatives of the relevant professional field are also represented. The NVAO provides a training course in performing an institutional audit for the members of the panel. The panel's report is written by a certified, independent secretary, who is also trained by the NVAO.

2.2 Composition of the panel

The members of the panel were:

- Susana Menéndez, chairperson
- Pascale De Groote, member
- Lex ter Braak, member
- Audrey Zimmerman, member
- Floor van de Wal, student member
- Mark Delmartino, secretary
- Nancy Van San, NVAO process coordinator

The CVs of the panel members can be found in Annex 2.

2.3 The structure of the institutional audit

In preparation for the institutional audit, the University of the Arts The Hague wrote a self-evaluation. This report, entitled *Mirror and Window*, describes how the institution meets the standards laid down in the assessment framework. The panel members studied this document and its annexes in preparation for their first visit to the institution and informed the secretary of their findings. These initial

impressions were collected in a working document that served as the basis for the panel's preliminary meetings and its discussions during the first site visit.

The programme for the first site visit was agreed in advance by the institution and the panel's chairperson and the process coordinator. The same procedure was followed for the second site visit. The programme for both site visits and the range of subjects discussed during them can be found in Annex 3.

The university provided extensive information to the panel. Annex 4 contains a list of the documents studied by the panel for the purposes of the audit. The panel was greatly impressed by the quality of the documentation it received in advance or was able to inspect during the visits.

The first site visit took place on 10 and 11 September 2019 and was exploratory in nature. During meetings with 50 representatives at every level in the university, the panel acquired a wealth of additional and illuminating information, as well as various concrete examples to flesh out the self-evaluation. Based on those discussions, the panel identified a number of aspects that required further exploration. At the conclusion of the visit, the panel informed the institution of its initial, provisional impressions of the quality of its education policy and internal quality assurance.

During that concluding meeting, the topics to be explored in more depth in the audit trails during the second visit were also discussed. Every institutional audit includes an in-depth analysis of how the institution safeguards the quality of its programmes; it was agreed that for the University of the Arts The Hague this 'past performance trail' would be devoted to the Bachelor of Fine Arts and the Bachelor of Music programmes. The panel also decided to examine more closely the role of the exam committees in supporting and safeguarding the quality of education in the university. Finally, the panel selected one specific, well-defined element of the university's vision of education, namely entrepreneurship and the relationship with professional practice, and investigated how the university addresses this aspect in practice during the second site visit.

In the interval between the two site visits, the university fleshed out the audit trails in consultation with the processor coordinator and the panel's chairperson. In advance of the second visit, the members of the panel discussed their initial impressions regarding the topics of the audit trails. During that visit, on 9 and 10 December 2019, they tested the accuracy of their original perceptions.

To this end, they investigated the effectiveness of the quality assurance system in the University of the Arts The Hague on the basis of case studies and discussions with all the stakeholders – students, teachers, lecturers, participation bodies, services, the professional field, the management and the board. The panel then considered the additional impressions in light of the elements that had been found to require deeper insight and/or nuance after the first site visit. Finally, the panel reviewed all of the information it had acquired from the discussions and the documentation provided to it, reached its findings and drafted its considerations in light of the assessment framework. At the end of the second visit, the panel verbally informed a delegation from the institution of its findings.

On the basis of the panel's findings and considerations, the secretary then wrote a first draft of the report. The draft report was submitted to the panel members for commentary before the chairperson wrote the final version.

2.4 Structure of the report

Chapter 3 contains general information about the University of the Arts The Hague. In chapter 4, the panel then expresses its opinion of the institution's quality assurance system arranged according to each of the standards in the assessment framework. For each standard, the report presents the findings,

followed by the panel's considerations. The findings relating to the audit trails must all be seen as casuistic evidence of how the quality assurance system as a whole functions within the University of the Arts The Hague. In other words, they do not constitute an assessment of the courses or programmes reviewed in the audit trails, but those aspects of them that could form the basis for answers to the panel's questions. Chapter 5 contains recommendations for improvements in the quality assurance system. The report concludes with a table summarising the judgements reached on the institution's system of quality assurance.

The report also contains four annexes:

- A list of the outcomes of assessments for accreditation of new and existing programmes
- Information about the members of the panel
- The programmes for the site visits
- A list of the documents studied

3 Profile of the institute

3.1 General information

Country	Netherlands
Institute	University of the Arts The Hague
Location	The Hague
Status of the institute	Funded

3.2 Profile of the institution

The University of the Arts The Hague describes itself in the self-evaluation as a mono-sectoral university of the arts with a relatively small student population. The university is composed of two faculties: the Royal Conservatoire and the Royal Academy of Art. In light of its specific character, the university is managed on the basis of a common mission and vision of education, but with a large degree of autonomy and individual responsibility for the two faculties.

The university is managed by an Executive Board with two members, each of whom is the director of one of the faculties. The members of the Executive Board therefore have a dual role. On the one hand, they formulate the university's overall strategic policy and ensure that the best possible conditions are created for the individual faculties at the institutional level; on the other hand, they are responsible for maintaining a high standard of education and for implementing the agreed common policy within their own faculty.

The Executive Board reports to the Board of Governors. In the course of the academic year, they systematically discuss management information and together plan the university's future financial and educational policy. Internal consultation is organised at the central university level in the CMR - Council of Representatives HdK and at the level of the faculties in the faculty councils.

According to the university's mission, art is of incalculable value, both intrinsically and for the quality of life. The university plays its part by educating artists who can play an inspiring and prominent role in the creation, development, performance and innovation in the arts in an international context. In that respect, the university adopts a number of fundamental principles, or core values, that define its identity: excellence, a critical and inquisitive attitude, innovation, tradition, international, diversity, responsibility and cooperation.

The university's Institutional Plan sets out the contours of the university's policy in the medium term. It also provides specific details of the distinctive features of the university's profile: research, internationalisation, preparation for professional practice and entrepreneurship. Every two years, both faculties draft a faculty plan in which they set out the concrete measures they will take to implement the Institutional Plan. In preparation for the institutional audit, the panel carefully studied the Institutional Plan 2019-2024 and the faculty plans for the period 2019-2021 of both the Royal Academy of Art and the Royal Conservatoire.

The institution's code of conduct for language policy provides that the international learning environment imposes demands on students, teachers and staff members in terms of their proficiency in the English language and their ability to deal with cultural diversity. The vast majority of classes are taught in English. A course's language of tuition also extends to oral and written assignments. The Exam Committee can only grant an exemption from the requirement of proficiency in English if Dutch is the more appropriate language in light of the content or target group of a project or assignment.

Key figures

Student numbers (2018-2019): 1,653

- of whom 1,271 Bachelor, 382 Master, 1,033 international

Diplomas awarded (2018-2019): 452

- of which 291 Bachelor, 161 Master, 291 to international students

Staff (31 December 2018): 656 salaried employees (315 FTEs)

- of whom 448 teaching staff, 97 teaching support staff, 102 support staff and 9 management staff (including 4 deputy directors)

Programmes: 11

- of which 5 are offered by the Royal Academy of Art and 6 by the Royal Conservatoire; there are 5 Bachelor programmes and 6 Master programmes

Budget (annual report 2018): € 38,970,000

- of which € 30 million is the government grant, € 5 million is from course and tuition fees and € 4 million is other income (the figures are rounded off)

4 Assessment by standard

4.1 Standard 1: Philosophy and policy

The institution has a broadly supported educational philosophy and pursues a corresponding policy focused on the internal quality assurance of its education.

Elaboration: The institution holds a well-defined view of good education which is shared in all its departments. Teachers and students support this philosophy, and develop it in mutual consultation and in concert with external stakeholders. Periodic coordination with the relevant (changing) environment ensures the topicality of the philosophy. The educational philosophy has been translated into explicit points of departure for quality assurance. In accordance with the *European Standards and Guidelines*, the educational philosophy is student-oriented (student-centred learning).

A. Findings

The University of the Arts The Hague was formed in 1990 by the merger of the Royal Conservatoire and the Royal Academy of Art. Over the years, the university has developed a common mission, vision and identity that reflect the institution's core values. The two faculties, the Royal Academy of Art and the Royal Conservatoire, are given a large degree of autonomy and responsibility in implementing these common points of departure in a manner appropriate to their respective profile. The panel observes that thirty years after the university was established, the constituent institutions (the Academy and the Conservatoire) have both retained a distinctive identity. According to the Executive Board, the university consciously chose to retain the two 'strong brands' in light of their outstanding reputations and unique identities.

The university's mission is to "educate artists who can play a prominent and inspiring role in the creation, development, performance and innovation in the arts in a global context." The university's vision statement states that "the dynamic in society and the arts calls for artists who are able to combine high artistic values with an open and inquisitive mind. Through our teaching and research, we offer students an educational environment in which they can pursue their artistic ambitions and develop their talent to the highest possible level with a view to a future international career." The key elements of the university's mission and its educational philosophy are further defined in a number of fundamental principles which together define the university's identity: excellence, a critical and inquisitive attitude, innovation, tradition, international, diversity, responsibility and cooperation.

The panel finds that these core values constitute the yardstick of the university's policy and feature prominently in the Institutional Plan. With the Institutional Plan 2019-2024, the university set out its policy for the coming years on the basis of shared principles and common; "plotting its course" in the words of the Executive Board. It was also clear from the document that the university will also closely monitor events and so anticipate and respond to developments in society, the arts and the national and international professional field, as well as in education, and art education in particular. Entirely in line with the university's philosophy, the practical implementation of the policy is left to the two faculties. The documentation provided to the panel and the discussions it held convinced the panel of their commitment. The Royal Academy of Art and the Royal Conservatoire have both written a faculty plan setting out the concrete measures they will take to implement the Institutional Plan over the next two years.

The university's fundamental educational philosophy has scarcely changed over the years. The Institutional Plan 2019-2024 expresses the core of that philosophy as follows: "The focus of our education is on the individual student and his/her artistic talents and ambitions. Successful artists are not interchangeable, but make their mark precisely because of their personal approach and style. Artistic and professional development, personal growth and a broad social orientation (*Bildung*) go hand in hand in the education we provide: all three are important for the successful artist." The educational philosophy embraces nine components: (i) artistic and professional quality / excellence; (ii) positioning in society; (iii) personal growth; (iv) relationship with the profession; (v) assessment; (vi) multidisciplinary with a strong basis in the discipline; (vii) small-scale and intensive; (viii) talent

development; and (ix) quality. The panel understands from the detailed and excellent description in the self-evaluation and the Institutional Plan that these components not only express the shared points of departure for the university's education but also provide, in their operationalisation, the impetus for developments in policy domains that are relevant for all of the university's stakeholders. For example, the institution's aspirations in the area of personal growth are linked to good supervision (educational policy), a safe environment (quality culture) and the existence of a safety net in the form of a student counsellor (care policy). The actual translation of the philosophy and the points of departure into policy is then again delegated to the faculties.

In addition to the university's core values and the basic principles of its education, the Institutional Plan also describes the distinctive features of the institution's educational profile: research, internationalisation and preparation for professional practice/entrepreneurship. These three aspects are the pillars of the university's strategic policy. During the site visits, the panel investigated these domains at length and discussed them with a range of internal and external stakeholders. It was clear from the discussions that the three domains are recognisable to everyone concerned and are acknowledged to be key characteristics of the university's profile.

The panel observes that the drafting of the Institutional Plan was preceded by extensive consultation with stakeholders. From conversations with those involved at every level inside and outside the university – from the Board of Governors and the participation bodies to heads of department and professional field committees – it emerged that feedback is gathered through various channels, both formal and informal. It is clear to the panel that the institution only adopted the Institutional Plan after careful deliberation. The positive effect of this is that the university and its approach to education are recognisable to everyone concerned – including an external body like the visitation panel – in the Institutional Plan. It was also apparent to the panel that university's common goals and ambitions are endorsed by the various people it spoke during the two site visits. However, the panel notes that consultation and feedback are based on a draft document; there is little or no involvement of students and teachers or staff members during the initial phase of proposing themes to be covered in the university's long-term strategy and policy plans.

The university has a vision of quality. Entirely in accordance with the university's philosophy, the common principles for the policy relating to quality are laid down in the Institutional Plan and the quality assurance policy is fleshed out and implemented by the faculties. Whereas higher education in the arts has traditionally focused on artistic quality and the pursuit of excellence, the university combines artistic and educational perspectives of quality. This raises two specific and related questions that are constantly addressed at every level in the university – faculty, department and programme: (i) are we succeeding in educating students who meet the highest possible standards of artistic quality? and (ii) how are we succeeding with our programmes, assessments, teachers, facilities and learning environment? During its visits, the panel established that this vision is shared by the stakeholders and is also evident in the teaching itself. For example, students and teachers from the two programmes covered in the past performance trail said that continuous evaluation and improvement in an artistic sense are central to the educational activities, assessments, performances and exhibitions. In addition with the artistic dimension of quality, considerable attention is devoted to the structure and coherence of the curriculum, the relevance of assessments, the quality of the teachers and the accessibility of the facilities.

Various policy documents show that the education is primarily student-centred. For example, the key message of the vision of education – “the focus of our education is on the individual student and his/her artistic talents and ambitions” – encapsulates the university's mission and philosophy. In the Royal Academy of Art's educational model, the programmes are “by their nature student-centred”: in line with the educational philosophy, students are given the scope to shape their own course, on the basis of their personal fascination and supported by their own research. Students at the Royal Conservatoire are allowed to design part of their own curriculum; the curriculum often also consists of a main subject that is taught individually. The combination of the artistic and educational perspectives of quality is also designed to at enabling the student to achieve the highest possible artistic standard. Apart from the declarations in policy documents, the panel also learned from its conversations with management,

teachers, staff members, students, alumni and professionals that students genuinely occupy a key position in the day-to-day educational activities in the university.

B. Considerations

The panel is very impressed with the university's educational philosophy, and in particular its student-centred approach. Its philosophy was formulated in consultation with stakeholders and is clear, enjoys broad support and is substantively rich. In the panel's view, it is a philosophy that is imbued with an intrinsic institutional vision of the arts and the artist with a focus that extends beyond the institution itself and also incorporates an external orientation. External stakeholders and factors form an important supplement to the university's own intrinsic values and standards of good education.

The panel regards the manner in which the philosophy is documented in an Institutional Plan and the role that plan performs in the university's structure as highly successful. With the Institutional Plan, the university reflects both the common principles and ambitions and the unique characteristics of the two 'strong brands', the Royal Academy of Art and the Royal Conservatoire. Its approach also ensures that the common core values, components and distinctive features of the educational philosophy are recognisable to and actually recognised by both faculties and their respective stakeholders. There is also consistency in the way in which new policy priorities are adopted and rolled out: when new policies are formulated, it is done jointly.

In the panel's opinion, there is broad support within the university for the construction with two director-managers. Because the members of the institution's Executive Board and the directors of the faculties are the same individuals, the need for an additional management tier is avoided, which significantly improves the accessibility within the organisation. The members of the Executive Board are also not alone, but are ably assisted by good deputies and by a committed Board of Governors with relevant and complementary expertise.

According to the panel, the university has a clear vision of quality, which is endorsed by the stakeholders and matches the points of departure of the educational philosophy. Furthermore, the bodies and individuals that the panel spoke to, above all the Executive Board, revealed a high level of quality awareness. For example, significant efforts have been made at every level since the last Institutional Audit to address the points made in the visitation report, particularly with regard to reflection on and consistent refinement of the management construction. Staff members and teachers from the two faculties meet more frequently, share information and learn from each other's expertise. Where possible and desirable, action is taken on a joint, university-wide basis.

Finally, the panel finds that the university has a strong vision of student-centred education and actually realises that vision in its day-to-day educational activities. The university could still involve students and teachers/staff members more actively in policy development, i.e., the Plan stage of the PDCA cycle, by not only requesting feedback on drafts of strategic policy documents, but also asking them to suggest topics for the university's long-term vision and policy plans. In the panel's opinion, this is an issue requiring attention in the future.

C. Judgement

On the basis of the above findings and considerations, the panel is satisfied that the institution has a broadly supported educational philosophy and pursues a corresponding policy focused on the internal quality assurance of its education. The panel finds that the University of the Arts The Hague meets standard 1, *Philosophy and policy*.

4.2 Standard 2: Implementation

The institution realises its educational philosophy in an effective manner, which is demonstrated by appropriate policy actions and processes, particularly relating to staff, student assessment, services and facilities, and students with a functional impairment.

Elaboration: The philosophy has been appropriately translated into concrete policy actions and processes. The institute has processes in place for the design, recognition and quality assurance of its programmes in keeping with the European Standards and Guidelines, and demonstrates the effectiveness and application of such processes by means of a track record. Students and staff co-own the policy and contribute to its realisation on the basis of the shared philosophy. This commitment demonstrates how the institution realises its intended quality culture. Implementation is consistent with the philosophy: staff, student assessment, and services and facilities further the accessibility and practicability of the education provided.

A. Findings

As mentioned in the previous section, that the university's current educational practice and its medium-term goals and ambitions are recognisable in its Institutional Plan. The Institutional Plan outlines the contours of a policy that has to be fleshed out. Concrete measures are formulated in the biannual faculty plans of the Royal Academy of Art and the Royal Conservatoire. The panel studied the faculty plans for the period 2019-2021 and found that both documents, although differing in terms of the approach taken, contain concrete policy proposals for the faculty as a whole that are linked to the four main themes in the Institutional Plan: education, research, internationalisation, preparation for professional practice and entrepreneurship.

The specific activities in the faculty plans make the connection between the Institutional Plan and the annual plans of the departments. The departments are formed around the various programmes, have their own identity and a great deal of autonomy in designing their curricula. From the documents consulted and its discussions, the panel learned that the heads of the teaching departments play an important part in translating the policy proposals into specific activities. As artistic and educational leaders, they manage their teaching staff and are responsible for the curriculum. Every head of department, including the staff departments, writes an annual plan and discusses it with the faculty's management.

Within the university's overall vision of quality, the faculties have the freedom to design a quality assurance system that is suited to the education they provide. The panel was informed that this approach was consciously chosen, partly as a result of the university's application to take part in the pilot project with institutional accreditation. The panel studied the quality assurance systems of both faculties and found that both are based on the PDCA cycle but that each faculty interprets that cycle in its own way. For example, the Conservatoire employs a lemniscate of continuous improvement, which combines an internal and an external cycle of perception and validation of quality. This approach to the development of a quality culture emphasises continuous improvement and enhances the overall quality of the programmes. The Royal Academy of Art makes less of a distinction between the internal and external quality cycles; its system uses cycles of accountability arranged in a particular hierarchical structure and in which everyone is given responsibility and is accountable at their own level: from the student via the teacher, the department and the faculty to the university.

The documentation and the discussions provided the panel with a wealth of information about various policy domains. During the first site visit, the panel reviewed the Research and Internationalisation components of the institution's profile. The panel found that the university is a pioneer in the field of research in the arts and that the research policy strengthens policies in other domains, such as education, personnel and strategy. The university stands out from other universities of the arts in the Netherlands in the way it defines research: it is not merely concerned with the development of students' research skills, but also encouraging them to conduct their own research and reflect on their professional practice. The collaboration with Leiden University also opens up a wide range of options for

both students and teachers. The lecturers, finally, are partially affiliated with Leiden University and form the bridge between the various levels of education.

The panel observes that internationalisation is not merely a component of the institution's strategy, but also a crucial element of its educational philosophy and its identity. Important aspects of the internationalisation policy are creating an international learning environment, arranging assessment by international peers, and the use of international qualification frameworks. Based on the view that internationalisation can play an important role in comparing and improving quality, the university is involved in various initiatives relating to international benchmarking. For example, the Royal Conservatoire is a member of the *International Benchmarking Exercise* together with seven conservatories from around the world, while the Royal Academy of Art has joined with five other European institutions of higher art education in the ELIA network to form the working group on 'ranking and league tables'. The panel greatly admires the content and the approach of the Internationalisation Strategy 2019. However, despite the strengths of the internationalisation policy, the panel feels that the university needs to devote more attention to communication, particularly towards foreign students. It became clear from the discussions that the students not always have a clear impression of the various programmes, the character of the Dutch higher education system and their future prospects in the labour market.

During the second visit, the panel assessed the distinctive feature 'preparation for professional practice and entrepreneurship'. Once again, the panel finds that the university sets out the vision for this policy domain – the education at the university must be a reflection of professional practice and the demands it makes – while the faculties and departments / programmes flesh out the policy. During the two sessions with the professional contacts of the Academy and Conservatoire, the panel learned that the policy is implemented in a wide variety of ways, ranging from the interfaculty School for Young Talent to an entrepreneurial boot camp for Bachelor of Music students and from the partnership with the Residentie Orkest in the Orchestra Master to internships with leading artists or the production and exhibiting of Spatial Design prototypes for the assignment Design for Space Tourism. These specific examples show that the professional field plays an important role in the university's education, both in terms of providing a safe learning environment and safeguarding the quality of the programme.

Personnel policy is formulated at university level. In conjunction with the Institutional Plan, a new Personnel Policy Plan 2019-2024 that anticipates developments in society and the dynamic in the world of the arts and art education was adopted. Diversity, flexibility and internationalisation are important themes in the plan. The panel understands from the discussions it had that a great deal of attention is devoted to recruitment and professional training for teachers and staff members. For example, new staff members are hired from the profession, teachers receive professional training in didactic skills and are able to continue with their artistic practice. There are also possibilities for teachers to improve their research skills by following PhD programmes. The panel learned with a great deal of interest and appreciation of The Artist as Teacher, a course offered by the Royal Conservatoire to enable teachers whose expertise lies outside the domain of music or dance to enhance their competencies in teaching music students. Finally, the panel regards it as a strength that teachers with an appointment for relatively few hours are entitled to training under the university's professionalisation policy.

The panel observes that the university has recently devoted considerable attention to the combination of summative and formative assessment criteria. From the discussions relating to the past performance trail, it emerged that assessments are important learning moments for students. Because there is no universal standard of artistic quality, a judgement is always arrived at in a dialogue between peers. Despite the collective and intersubjective nature of the assessment, however, students are also entitled to clarity and transparency. During discussions with the panel, the representatives of the Bachelor programmes in Fine Arts and Music remarked that the assessment is diligent, with students being informed about the method of assessment and teachers receiving support and training in explaining their assessments with relevant feedback. The panel also learned that both faculties recruit external examiners to assess final exams in order to ensure that the final level of the individual student is established objectively and to benchmark the general level of the programme.

It was clear from various conversations that the programmes of both faculties encompass values and artistic expressions that are not part of the Western canon. However, all of our interlocutors agreed that this aspect should be more prevalent.

The panel was given a guided tour of the Royal Academy of Art and the Royal Conservatoire during its visits. The Royal Conservatoire will move to new premises in 2021, which it will share with a number of professional organisations: the Dance and Music Centre, the Residentie Orkest and the Nederlands Danstheater. The Royal Academy of Art is housed in a monumental building, with modern workshops that occupy a prominent position in its educational model. The panel was impressed by the recent efforts by the Royal Academy of Art to enhance and benchmark the expertise of the workshop instructors, also at European level.

The panel welcomes the expansion of the student counsellor's office since the last Institutional Audit, both in terms of staffing and the expertise in the service provided. In the panel's view, the cultural and geographical diversity of the student population of both the Royal Academy of Art and the Royal Conservatoire and the university's focus on the potential of individual students underlines the crucial importance of student guidance. Students said during the meetings that they had noticed and appreciated the increased capacity of the student counsellor's office.

The panel noted the university's policy towards students with a functional impairment. The point of departure is that every student who is found to be suitable should be able to follow its programmes, even if they have a functional impairment, provided the impairment does not prevent them from practising the profession for which they are being educated. Students can approach the student counsellor for advice and for tailored solutions, while the guidance is provided by the programme themselves. The university is aware that physical access to the faculties' premises is not optimal. For the Royal Conservatoire, the problem will be resolved when it moves to its new and fully accessible location. In the case of the Royal Academy, some modifications have already been made to the historical listed building and the panel was informed that a specialised NGO recently produced a study of the problems connected with access to the building. Funding has been earmarked under the Quality Agreements Plan to carry out the recommendations in the study.

B. Considerations

It is the panel's opinion that the university's common vision of education is supplemented by policies that are appropriate to the specific profiles of the two faculties and their respective departments. The panel takes the view that the implemented policy matches the reality of the university and the faculties. The result is no theoretical exercise, but rather a concrete quality assurance system. Each faculty has adopted its own method of quality assurance, both of them essentially based on the PDCA cycle. Both methods function effectively, reflect a culture that is appropriate to the faculty concerned and the current phase in which the faculty finds itself, and are expressed in the vocabulary familiar to those who implement them. During its visit the panel came to realise that the two faculties do not have different quality assurance systems, but a single system that follows the rhythm of development of each faculty. The materials provided and the discussions convinced the panel that quality awareness and quality assurance are part of the university's DNA.

The panel observes that the implementation of policy is a participatory process. According to the panel, it is a living policy. Based on a common philosophy at university level, the policy is fleshed out by the faculties and departments. The various sections of the university are involved in every domain and at every stage of the policy cycle (proposal, implementation, evaluation and improvement). The established frameworks leave sufficient professional freedom for everyone concerned. The university appears to have found a good balance between rules and an informal culture in relation to policy implementation.

During its discussions, the panel found that policy is owned by teachers, staff members and students and that they are firmly committed to fleshing out and implementing that policy. This ownership and commitment do not arise automatically, but are facilitated by the scope that the university, the faculties and the departments allow for input from students, teachers and staff members. The students gave the

impression of being empowered, with a sense of quality and a strong intrinsic motivation towards their studies. The panel is impressed at how 'the people' in the university are able to form a community. The panel regards the collegiality displayed as an indication of the quality culture that prevails in the institution.

Having studied the policies implemented in various domains, the panel is generally very positive. Its appreciation extends to both the documentation – the quality of the policy documents – and the implementation of the policies. The university is a small institution and therefore has little capacity to recruit staff for central support services. The panel regards the personnel policy as excellent. The topics of recruitment and professionalisation (lifelong learning) receive close and effective attention.

The emphasis on research within the university and the way in which research has been integrated into the teaching and the professional development of teachers in both faculties makes it a distinctive feature of the university. Internationalisation is part of the university's DNA and the policy being developed in this domain is very topical and comprehensive.

The distinctive feature of entrepreneurship is not yet as well developed as the robust policy domains of research and internationalisation. Many initiatives have been taken in the last few years. The panel finds that the approach chosen is the correct one and encourages the university and the two faculties to continue on the same course. In that context, the panel endorses the university's intention to incorporate a course in professional practice and entrepreneurship into the curricula.

From the numerous discussions with students, the panel found that there is still room for improvement in the communication, particularly to foreign students. It is important that when they enter the university every student has a clear impression of what they can expect from the programme (a high-quality course that prepares them for the labour market), what they are not entitled to expect (a job as an artist on graduation) and what can be expected of them (participation).

Finally, the panel encourages the university to continue devoting attention to values and artistic expressions that are not part of the Western canon in its efforts to promote internationalisation, diversity and inclusion. The panel finds that the university is aware of this challenge and advises everyone concerned to intensify their efforts in this regard.

C. Judgement

On the basis of the above findings and considerations, the panel is satisfied that the institution realises its educational philosophy in an effective manner. The panel finds that the University of the Arts The Hague meets standard 2, *Implementation*.

4.3 Standard 3: Evaluation and monitoring

The institution systematically evaluates whether the intended policy objectives relating to educational quality are achieved. Relevant stakeholders are involved in this process.

Elaboration: The institution organises effective feedback that supports the realisation of its policy. To that end, it initiates appropriate evaluation and measurement activities that are stably embedded in the institution. These tools provide insightful information that can be used for the formulation of desired quality development. The tools comprise a transparent method for identifying and reporting risks, taking action where needed, with a focus on improvement. Reflection on the output forms part of the organisational model, and provides sufficient insight into the effectiveness of the policy implementation in all tiers of the organisation and staff participation.

Since the measurement and evaluation activities revolve around effectiveness, they do not need to be uniform across the entire institution. Students, staff, alumni and experts from the professional field are actively involved in the evaluations. The institution publishes accurate, up to date and accessible information regarding the evaluation results.

A. Findings

In the previous sections, the principles of the university's quality policy and how quality assurance is organised at faculty level have been discussed. Based on the extensive information in the self-evaluation and the numerous discussions concerning evaluation and monitoring, the panel finds that the university has a broad range of appropriate and high-quality instruments for monitoring the implementation of policy and the quality of the programmes.

The panel understands from the overview of the instruments that each of the twenty instruments possesses a number of features which allow it to make a specific contribution to the evaluation and measurement of quality. One dimension is connected with the level at which the instruments are used to enable the stakeholders to meet their responsibility at the correct level in the policy cycle. By combining instruments at the institutional level (such as staff satisfaction surveys), faculty level (recommendations from the study programme committee) and departmental level (course evaluations), tailored information is provided by the various stakeholders.

The instruments available to the university, the faculties and the departments deliver formal and informal information. Most of the information reaches the institute through formal channels, such as the outcomes of course and project evaluations. At the same time, the small-scale nature and intensity of the education means that there is a lot of informal communication between students, teachers, heads of department and the management. The university also receives information from companies that provide internships and from partner organisations which contributes to the institution's insight into the quality of the students and the education.

The university's policy is to combine artistic and educational perspectives of quality. In addition to the tools for gathering qualitative information, this calls for instruments that yield quantitative indicators for assessing perceptions of quality and initiating necessary improvements. Both dimensions are covered in the satisfaction surveys organised among both students and staff.

The university attaches a great deal of importance to the perceptions of internal and external stakeholders and endeavours to connect and integrate the two perspectives. In addition to traditional instruments, some of which are legally prescribed and are also commonly used by other institutions and programmes, the panel found that the university also employs its own instruments, including student panels (internal) and critical friends (external). Furthermore, the university follows up its explicit involvement in international comparison and evaluation with quantitative information from benchmarking and qualitative feedback from external (usually international) examiners.

During the visits, the panel spoke to various stakeholders about their involvement in the evaluation of the quality of education. It learned from the conversations with students that, in addition to formal contacts (in the study programme committee and participation bodies) and instruments (course

evaluations and student satisfaction surveys), they also have regular informal meetings with the heads of department. In the Royal Academy of Art, these take the form of meetings with class representatives; the Royal Conservatoire employs a system of student panels. This informal aspect completes the picture of student input and allows students to express their views if they wish to. During the meetings with the panel, students said that they could give their opinion and that their remarks are effectively followed up by the faculty or the institution. The teachers also reported during the meetings that they have a combination of formal and informal channels through which they can contribute to the quality of the programme. They also felt they were listened to and that their input is ultimately reflected in day to day teaching practice.

On the basis of the documentation and the discussions with the management, the panel further finds that for some time the Royal Conservatoire has been making successful use of critical friends. A critical friend is a respected professional peer who can provide insight into the educational and artistic functioning of a particular department. On the basis of a handbook written for the purpose, the expert spends several days observing the department and speaking to students, teachers and staff members. This exercise yields specific, personal and recognisable feedback, with a depth that contributes to and inspires further development of the education.

During the second visit, the panel had a lengthy discussion with representatives of the exam committee. The exam committee has a statutory role in relation to quality assurance: as an independent committee within the institution, its responsibilities include safeguarding the quality of assessments and exams. Each faculty has a single exam committee for all of the programmes offered by the faculty. Although each committee is only formally required to have one external member, both of them have two: the chairperson of the other faculty's exam committee and an entirely external member. The discussion revealed that the committee members have all received training and are well equipped to perform their duties in relation to quality assurance. Both external members have extensive experience at other universities of the arts and significantly enhance the quality of the work of the committee. Each chairperson is familiar with the work of the other committee and together they ensure that information is shared between the committee and with the management. The discussion also revealed that the exam committee has an important advisory function. The committee members disclosed that they have no desire to assume a role in the preparation of policy, but do fulfil an advisory role within the faculty and the university, in addition to their formal supervisory tasks. After all, they have access to a great deal of quantitative and qualitative information from evaluation instruments such as student panels, course evaluations and reports by external examiners. Members of the exam committee also attend final exams as observers, when external assessors are also present. All of this information is used to provide advice on the quality of the programmes in the committee's own annual report. It emerged from the discussions with the deputy directors and the faculties' quality assurance staff that the follow-up to recommendations by the exam committee is generally good. Finally, the panel also learned that the exam committee ensured that the recommendation from the previous Institutional Audit – to ensure that the feedback to students after assessments related more closely to the attainment targets – was addressed and implemented.

During the site visits, the panel asked various interviewees whether they did not feel that the instruments constitute 'overkill' and therefore miss their goal of contributing to quality assurance. The panel concludes from the replies that the individual instruments are used prudently and that each respondent is only involved with some of the instruments, in line with the aforementioned dimensions. The instruments themselves and their rationale are known and are generally perceived as valuable. Every instrument is also embedded in the policy cycle. The Quality Assurance Department (Royal Academy of Art) and the Quality Culture Office (Royal Conservatoire) collect the data and produce the reports that are discussed along various channel within the organisation. The panel observes that as a whole the instruments ensure that the stakeholders at the various levels receive the relevant information they need to make the correct decisions regarding policy and the quality of the education. One of the strengths of the entire quality assurance system is that feedback is taken as seriously as input. Because of the transparency about the feedback on the findings and conclusions from the instruments and the measures that have been taken in response to those results, the respondents feel that their efforts contribute to the general improvement in quality.

B. Considerations

The panel finds that the university has a clear framework within which policy is planned, implemented, monitored and improved. The university employs a very wide range of instruments to monitor policy and the quality of education, which – both individually and together – are appropriate to the institution, are of high quality and are used prudently.

The panel praises the fact that a number of instruments generate informal feedback, which is then integrated into the formal process. For example, the student panels and class representative meetings provide important information about the quality of the curricula, which supplements the results of course evaluations. The panel also regards the incorporation in the instruments of input from stakeholders outside the university – such as critical friends and external assessors – as an extremely strong feature and appropriate to the institution's quality policy and quality culture. In the panel's view, the fact that the faculties and their representatives increasingly engage in a dialogue, for example within the ambit of the exam committees, which leads to good practices in one faculty being adopted by the other, is a healthy development.

The panel noted positively that all of the individuals it spoke to are familiar with the instruments that are relevant for them and use and appreciate them. It was also clear from the conversations that the number of instruments does not form an obstacle to the effectiveness of the education: on the contrary, the interviewees are committed to using the instruments because each of them makes its own particular contribution to improving the quality of education. Furthermore, the transparent feedback about the results shows the respondents that their input is being taken seriously. In that context, the panel is pleased to note that in the Conservatoire the most important results of evaluations are also communicated via Info flashes in the lavatories.

The panel is impressed by the way in which the university organises evaluation and monitoring: the array of quality assurance instruments ensures that the stakeholders at the various levels receive relevant information they need to make correct decisions with regard to policy and the quality of the education.

C. Judgement

On the basis of the above findings and considerations, the panel is satisfied that the institution systematically evaluates whether it is achieving the envisaged policy objectives relating to educational quality. It also involves all the relevant stakeholders in this process. The panel finds that the University of the Arts The Hague meets standard 3, *Evaluation and monitoring*.

4.4 Standard 4: Development

The institution has a focus on development and works systematically on the improvement of its education.

Elaboration: Feedback and reflection on output constitute the basis for measures targeted at reinforcing, improving or adjusting policy or its implementation. Following up on measures for improvement is embedded in the organisational structure. The development policy pursued by the institution encourages all the parties concerned to contribute to innovation and quality improvement. Internal and external stakeholders have been informed regarding the developments that are primed on the basis of the evaluation outcomes. The institution pursues continuous improvement, adapts to the (changing) circumstances, and conforms to the expectations of students and employers.

A. Findings

As shown in the previous section, the university has a diverse set of instruments in place for monitoring the implementation of policy and the quality of education. On the basis of the documents it studied and the discussions it conducted, the panel finds that effective use is made of the information generated by those instruments to improve the quality of the education.

The panel learns from the systematic description in the self-evaluation that depending on the nature of the measure, the outcomes of measurements (the Check stage of the PDCA cycle) are translated into concrete improvements (Act in the PDCA cycle) by the department, the faculty or the institution. It is the panel's impression that the Executive Board receives the relevant information generated by the instruments. The analysis of these results is discussed with the Board of Governors and incorporated in the decision-making process on issues affecting the institution as a whole, such as decisions to invest heavily in new premises for the Royal Conservatoire and the renovation of the building that houses the Royal Academy of Art.

During the first site visit, the panel explored the distinctive feature of research. The activities in this policy domain, and particularly the collaboration with Leiden University, illustrate the university's constant search for improvement. The university's policy in this regard is incremental and that yields lasting results. In addition to pursuing excellence in its education, the university can now combine teaching with research, with the help of four lecturers who are also affiliated with Leiden University.

The decisions made on improvements at faculty level are connected with the faculties' own implementation of the Institutional Plan (such as the Royal Conservatoire's involvement in the international network for quality assurance), their strategic choices (such as the expansion of the portfolio of Master's programmes at the Royal Academy of Art), and the outcomes of evaluations and measurements encompassing multiple departments or an entire faculty (such as stress among students or the sub-optimal quality of the IT infrastructure as reported in the course evaluations).

The panel also observes that the Executive Board plays an important role in consolidating what it describes as 'the best of both worlds': the valuable insights and experiences of the individual faculties that ought to be shared. For example, the Royal Academy of Art is currently investigating how it can introduce the concept of the critical friend, while the Royal Conservatoire is very interested in the format the Royal Academy of Art uses for the annual plans of the heads of department. The faculty management performs a similar function in bringing together common wishes or ambitions of individual departments, for example where various departments are interested in forming a partnership with the same institution. It was also clear from the documentation and the discussions that there is some convergence of the back offices of the two faculties in the sense of the staff departments learning from one another and sharing good practices. In the panel's opinion, it is worthwhile exploring the possibilities for even closer collaboration between these departments.

Various improvements originate in the teaching departments. Heads of department analyse the available information and translate the findings into policy proposals for improvement or development. The proposals that will receive priority are determined in consultation with the faculty's management

and included in annual plans. The discussions relating to the past performance trail showed that the instrument of the student panel has been particularly effective in terms of generating changes in the Bachelor of Music curriculum. Meanwhile, in the Bachelor of Fine Arts programme, the use and the quality of the assessment forms has visibly improved by virtue of input from various sources and efforts are currently underway to improve the transition from the propedeuse to the main phase of the curriculum.

Apart from the finding that the university systematically endeavours to improve quality at every level of the organisation, it was evident from the discussions that these improvements are the result of human endeavour. Entirely in line with the findings on monitoring and evaluation, the panel observes that students, teachers, staff members and professionals and their representative bodies are involved in translating the outcomes of evaluations into specific measures for improvement.

B. Considerations

The panel finds that the university works systematically on the development and improvement of its education. It has sufficient instruments and uses them effectively to complete the quality cycle and close the PDCA circle. Development and improvement are integral components of the quality assurance system and the quality culture of the university and of both the Royal Academy of Art and the Royal Conservatoire.

This focus on improvement and development of the education can be discerned throughout the institution. Measures designed to make improvements are not only adopted, but also monitored. In the panel's view, the recent efforts by the Executive Board, the management and the heads of department to align the reporting on the results achieved and new developments in the annual plans with the structure of the faculty plans and the Institutional Plan will further enhance the effectiveness of the planning and implementation of policy changes and improvements in the quality of the education.

The panel also approves of the growing practice of comparing and sharing improvements and good practices originating in the various parts of the organisation. The director-managers play a very important role in that process, but so increasingly do 'bridge builders' like the councils of representatives and the exam committees.

The visits demonstrated how seriously the university takes transparency and participation, two important qualities that indicate that a secure organisational culture is in place, with substantial involvement of students, teachers, staff members and representatives of the professional field. In the panel's view, it is this approach that explains the broad support within the organisation for planned improvements and new developments. The panel therefore fully endorses the finding in the institution's self-evaluation (page 45): "Of the utmost importance in all these structures is how everyone in the organisation is engaged with them, since a good quality culture depends both on the people involved and a permanent dialogue on the subject of quality."

C. Judgement

On the basis of the above findings and considerations, the panel is satisfied that the institution has a focus on development and works systematically on the improvement of its education. The panel finds that the University of the Arts The Hague meets standard 4, *Development*.

4.5 Final conclusion

A. Findings

The panel based this institutional audit in accordance with the four standards in the assessment framework on the University of the Arts The Hague's vision of education. In the panel's opinion, the university's educational philosophy is broadly supported and substantively rich: a philosophy that is imbued with an intrinsic institutional vision of the arts and the artist, with a focus that extends beyond the institution itself and also incorporates an external orientation. In the panel's view, the way in which the vision is formulated in the Institutional Plan and the function of that plan within the university's structure are very successful. In the process, the university reflects both the common principles and ambitions and the unique characteristics of both 'strong brands' – the Royal Academy of Art and the Royal Conservatoire.

The panel finds that the university has a clear vision of quality, which is endorsed by all the stakeholders and matches the principles of its educational philosophy. Every policy domain is fleshed out on the basis of a common vision and specific measures are formulated and implemented in a manner that reflects the reality of the two faculties. The university has an extensive, and to the panel's mind impressive, set of instruments for monitoring policy and the quality of education, which ensure that the stakeholders at the various levels receive the information they need to make the correct decisions. There is appropriate follow-up to the measurements and evaluations in closing the quality cycle because improvements are not only adopted but also systematically monitored.

During the visit, the panel found that the university's organisation, policy and quality assurance system are appropriate to and involve the people affected by them. The policy is owned by teachers, staff members and students and they are firmly committed to fleshing out and implementing that policy. In the panel's view, this attitude is the result of the trust earned by the university, the faculties and the departments by virtue of the scope they give to students, teachers and staff members.

During the discussions, students said they felt empowered and displayed an intrinsic motivation towards their studies; the teachers were self-assured and showed interest in one another and in the panel, but were also willing to display vulnerability. The panel was impressed by how the 'people' in the university are able to form a community. The panel regards the collegiality as an indicator of the quality culture that prevails within the institution.

The panel observes that there is considerable support within the institution for the construction with two director-managers. As managers, they deal well with the 'artisticity' of the teachers. They are assisted by competent deputies and staff members and by a committed Board of Governors with relevant and complementary expertise.

It is clear from the findings and considerations in the preceding sections that the quality assurance system is deeply embedded in the university, that both the individual stakeholders and the representative bodies demonstrate a high degree of quality awareness, and that there is a good balance between the quality assurance system and quality culture within the organisation. The panel therefore fully agrees with the statement in the self-evaluation (page 45): "Of the utmost importance in all these structures is how everyone in the organisation is engaged with them, since a good quality culture depends both on the people involved and a permanent dialogue on the subject of quality."

B. Considerations

The panel finds that the University of the Arts The Hague has a quality culture and a quality assurance system that guarantee that the institution's education complies with national and international standards and expectations.

On the basis of its ambitions, philosophy and choices and its accounting for the realisation of those ambitions, the panel concludes that the University of the Arts The Hague:

- has a broadly supported educational philosophy and pursues a corresponding policy focused on the internal quality assurance of its education;

- realises its educational philosophy in an effective manner with appropriate policy actions and processes;
- systematically evaluates whether it is realising the policy objectives relating to educational quality;
- has a focus on development and works systematically on the improvement of its education.

C. Final conclusion

The panel is satisfied that the institution meets each of the four standards. Its final conclusion on the institutional audit of the University of Arts is therefore *positive*.

5 Recommendations

The panel's judgement of the University of the Arts The Hague's quality culture and quality assurance system is positive. The previous chapter presented the findings and considerations for each of the standards, as well as some recommendations. With a view to providing constructive support for the University of the Arts The Hague in its further development, in this section the panel once again clearly sets out its recommendations.

- With regard to policy development, students and teachers/staff members could be more actively involved in the formulation of strategic policy during the Plan stage of the PDCA cycle. Although they provide feedback on draft versions of strategic policy documents, they have little or no involvement in terms of submitting themes for the university's long-term vision and policy plans.
- Foreign students do not always have an accurate impression of the programme, the institution or the actual prospects in the labour market in the Netherlands and elsewhere, so it is important to improve communication in these areas.
- The panel encourages the university to continue devoting attention to values and forms of artistic expression that are not part of the Western canon.

Summary of the conclusion

The table below presents the panel's judgement on each standard from chapter 4.

Standard	Judgement
Philosophy and policy	Meets the standard
Implementation	Meets the standard
Evaluation and monitoring	Meets the standard
Development	Meets the standard
Final conclusion	Positive

Annex 1: Accreditation portrait

The accreditation portrait gives an overview of the NVAO's decision on all of the University of the Arts The Hague's applications for accreditation. It covers every decision made under the regime of the second phase of the accreditation system in the Netherlands¹, on which the definitive decision was rendered before 1 July 2019. The period covered is from 2013 until the middle of 2019².

The decisions are presented in chronological order, with particular attention to special characteristics and joint degree programmes. Because the list is arranged by decision rather than by programme, programmes can appear twice in the overview, for example where the panel has found substantial but reparable shortcomings and allowed a period for them to be rectified (*herstelperiode*) and has then carried out a further assessment to determine whether the shortcomings have been rectified.

In view of the successful outcome of the University of the Arts The Hague's institutional audit on 26 March 2014, the NVAO's framework for limited assessment of programmes is applicable. As a participant in the pilot project with institutional accreditation with lighter programme assessment' (September 2018-2024), the framework for lighter programme assessment is applicable for some programmes.

The overview presents both the panel's final conclusion and the decision on the accreditation. The final conclusion can be unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good or excellent. The accreditation decision can be negative, conditionally positive or positive. The application can also be withdrawn. The entire list of possible outcomes is therefore: Negative, Conditionally positive; Satisfactory; Good; Excellent; and withdrawn. Under Comments, it is noted whether it is a decision that has been made after conditions have been imposed and complied with. In those cases, if it is established after the allotted period that the conditions have been met, a positive decision will be made on the accreditation.

Between 2011 and 2019, the University of the Arts The Hague submitted 11 applications under the regime of the second phase of the accreditation system. Ten applications were for accreditation and one was for initial accreditation of a new programme. Two of the applications were withdrawn.

Table 1. Overview of final conclusions in each procedure

Name of institution		University of the Arts The Hague				
Aggregate number		Year of decision				
Type of dossier	Final conclusion and decision	2013	2014	2016	2017	Total
Accreditation NL	Excellent	3	2		1	6
	Good		1		1	2
	Positive			1		1
	Unsatisfactory		1			1
Total Accreditation NL		3	4	1	2	10
Initial accreditation of new programme NL	Positive				1	1
Total Initial accreditation of new programme NL					1	1
Total		3	4	1	3	11

¹ The new accreditation system for higher education in the Netherlands entered into force on 1 January 2011 (Decree of 21 December 2010, Bulletin of Acts, Orders and Decrees 2010, 862).

² With the exception of decisions made under the former regime during that period.

Table 2. Chronological list of decisions*Accreditation*

Year of decision	Name of programme CROHO	ISAT	Final conclusion and decision	Special procedures	Total
2013	M Music	44739	Excellent		1
	M Opera	49105	Excellent		1
	M Sonology	49104	Excellent		1
2014	B Fine Arts	39110	Good		1
	B Dance	34798	Sufficient		1
	B Design	39111	Excellent		1
	M Type and Media	49106	Excellent		1
2016	M Interior architecture	49238	Positive		1
2017	B Music Teaching	39112	Good		1
	B Music	34739	Excellent		1
Total					10

Initial accreditation of new programme

Year of decision	Name of programme CROHO	ISAT	Final conclusion and decision	Special procedures	Total
2017	M Master of Arts in Fine Art and Design	49114	Positive		1
Total					1

Annex 2: Panel composition

Dr. Susana Menéndez, chairperson

Until 2018, member of the Executive Board of the Hague University of Applied Sciences

Pascale De Groote, panel member

Managing director of Artesis Plantijn Hogeschool in Antwerp, chairperson of the executive board of the Vlaamse Hogescholenraad (VLHORA)

Lex ter Braak, panel member

Advisor to the Council for Culture; until 2018, director of the Van Eyck post-academic institute in Maastricht

Audrey Zimmerman, panel member

Secretary of the Executive Board and director of the Management Office of Utrecht University of the Arts

Floor van der Wal, student member

Second-year student at the Design Academy in Eindhoven

Mark Delmartino, secretary

Manager, MDM CONSULTANCY bvba, Antwerp

Nancy Van San, process coordinator

Policy advisor, NVAO

All panel members and the secretary have signed a declaration of independence.

Annex 3: Programmes of the site visits

Tuesday 10 September 2019

Location – Royal Academy of Art, The Hague

09.00 Arrival of panel
09.15 Preliminary deliberations of panel
12.00 Guided tour of Royal Academy
12.30 Lunch and presentation at Royal Conservatoire
13.15 Interview with Executive Board
14.15 Discussion of standard 1, Philosophy and Policy
15.30 Discussion of standard 2, Implementation
16.45 Meeting with the Board of Governors
18.30 Open session
19.00 End of day 1

Wednesday 11 September 2019

Location – Royal Conservatoire, The Hague

09.00 Panel discussion
10.00 Discussion of standard 3, Monitoring and Evaluation
11.15 Discussion of standard 4, Development
12.15 Lunch and meeting with students
13.30 Discussion with Council of Representatives HdK
14.00 Concluding panel discussion
16.00 Feedback on exploratory visit and coordination of in-depth visit
16.30 End of day 2

Monday 9 December 2019

Location – Royal Academy of Art, The Hague

Past performance trail - Bachelor of Fine Art
09.00 Panel discussion
10.00 Meeting with students
11.00 Meeting with teachers
12.00 Meeting with management and quality assurance team
12.45 Lunch

Location – Royal Conservatoire, The Hague

Past performance trail - Bachelor of Music
14.00 Tour of the Royal Conservatoire
14.30 Meeting with students
15.30 Meeting with teachers
16.30 Meeting with management and quality assurance team
17.15 Panel discussion

Tuesday 10 December 2019

Location – Royal Conservatoire, The Hague

Trail: The functioning of the exam committees
09.00 Panel discussion
10.00 Meeting with the exam committees of the Royal Academy and the Royal Conservatoire
11.15 Meeting with deputy directors and quality assurance team
12.00 Lunch

Trail: Relationship with professional practice and entrepreneurship
12.45 Presentations, Royal Conservatoire
13.45 Contacts with the professional field, Royal Academy
14.30 Meeting with the Executive Board
15.00 Panel discussion

Wednesday 11 December 2019

Location – Royal Conservatoire, The Hague

Audit of Quality Agreements³

10.30 Panel discussion
11.45 Meeting with Council of Representatives HdK
12.30 Lunch
13.15 Meeting with the Board of Governors
14.00 Meeting with the Executive Board & Secretary
14.45 Panel discussion
16.00 Feedback
16.30 Informal close

³ The assessment of the Quality Agreements Plan was conducted as a separate 'trail' in addition to the other trails that make up an institutional audit. The panel has written a separate report on that assessment.

Annex 4: List of the documents studied

Prior to the audit, the panel was given the following documents:

- Mirror and Window, Self-evaluation for Institutional Audit 2019, University of the Arts The Hague, July 2019.
- Institutional Plan 2019-2024, University of the Arts The Hague, December 2018.
- Faculty Plan 2019-2021, Royal Conservatoire
- Faculty Plan of the Royal Academy of Art, October 2018.

The following documents were used for the management reviews and were available for inspection:

- Application by the University of the Arts The Hague to participate in the pilot project with institutional accreditation
- Student Satisfaction Survey
- Staff Satisfaction Survey
- Examples of course and semester evaluations
- Minutes of meetings of student panels and class representatives
- Documents relating to professional field committees, external examiners
- Critical Friend Handbook, including sample reports
- Examples of Erasmus student exchange
- Kunsten-Monitor (alumni survey)
- Benchmarking
- Management information
- Study Guides and Education and Examination Regulations of the faculties
- Sample curriculum handbooks
- Information about programme profiles, curricula and course descriptions (inspected on the portal/website www.kabk.nl; www.koncon.nl)
- Sample annual plans of teaching departments and staff departments
- University of the Arts The Hague, International Strategy 2014-2020
- University Teaching Qualification (UTQ) report: Quality Enhancement Research Overarching Peer Review Report (Sep. '17)
- Policy on students with a functional impairment
- Personnel Policy Plan 2019-2024
- <https://www.hogeschoolderkunsten.nl/organisatie/bestuur-en-toezicht>
- Annual Report 2018
- Board Rules of the University of the Arts The Hague
- Assessment Framework for the Board of Governors
- Participation Regulations
- Regulations of the Exam Committees
- Royal Academy of Art's Study Programme Committee: statute, annual report and protocol on procedures
- Royal Academy of Art's Exam Committee: regulations, annual report, external examiners
- The Artist as Teacher. Royal Conservatoire teacher development programme 2019-2020
- Nergens anders dan in Den Haag, University of the Arts The Hague 2010
- Een klasse apart. Kunstvakonderwijs in de metropool Den Haag / Rotterdam
- Paul Deneer, Speaking directly in an indirect way, University of the Arts The Hague 2019
- Sample newsletters from the faculty directors

The following documents were provided in relation to the audit trails:

- Fine Arts Study Guide
- Music curriculum handbook
- Annual reports of Royal Academy of Art's exam committee in 2018 (definitive) and 2019 (draft)
- Annual reports of Royal Conservatoire's exam committee for 2018 and 2019
- Regulations of the Exam Committees of the University of the Arts The Hague
- Rules and Regulations of the Exam Committee of the Royal Academy of Art
- Rules and Regulations of the Exam Committee of the Royal Conservatoire
- Sample letters of appointment

