

**Quality Enhancement Research
Overarching Peer Review Report
University of the Arts The Hague**

Site visit date 18 September 2017

Contents

Introduction	02
1. Overall conclusions, assessment and recommendations	04
2. Analysis of the critical reflections	
2.1 The university as research unit	09
2.2 Research in the faculties, resemblances and differences	10
3. Summaries of the peer review reports	
3.1 General assessment of research in the faculties	14
3.2 Assessment of the faculties according to the BKO standards	15
3.3 Recommendations at the level of the faculties	19
Appendices	23
I. Composition of the review panel	
II. Programme of the peer review visit	
Separate annexes	
A. <i>Quality Enhancement Research, Peer Review Report Royal Conservatoire, University of the Arts The Hague, Site visit dates 15-17 February 2017</i>	
B. <i>Quality Enhancement Research, Peer Review Report Royal Academy of Art, University of the Arts The Hague, Site visit dates 17 & 18 May 2017</i>	

Introduction

This is the final, overarching international peer review report on the quality of research at the University of the Arts The Hague (HdK).¹ The report is based on two preceding peer reviews, including two visits, and a concluding review audit. The preceding reviews dealt with the research carried out at the two faculties of the university: the Royal Academy of Art (KABK) and the Royal Conservatoire (KC). The concluding audit focussed on the university as the overarching research unit. The review process followed the standards and requirements of the Branch Protocol Quality Assurance Research (BKO) 2016-2022 of the Association of Dutch Universities of Applied Sciences.² According to this protocol the aim of the review is both to assess the quality of the research, and to provide insight into actions the research unit could take in order to further develop its research policy. In the review of the Royal Conservatoire the BKO standards were combined with the internationally developed and accepted standards for the evaluation of research of MusiQuE (Music Quality Enhancement), an internationally recognized organisation for the evaluation and accreditation in higher music education.

The procedure of the full review process consisted of five stages:

1. The Royal Academy of Art and the Royal Conservatoire each prepared a critical reflection. In support of these reflections, they compiled sets of underlying documentation with samples of research projects and presentations; some in printed form, others as computer files or on video. The critical reflections were structured according to the five standards of the protocol, and contained a description of the overall research policy of the University of the Arts.
2. Two review panels of international experts, one for each faculty, examined the critical reflections and visited the faculties for two extensive audits. Each panel met with directors, lecturers, teaching staff members, staff officers, students and alumni.³ The panels used the set of standards noted above as the basis for its investigations.
3. Each review panel summarized their findings in a review report. Both reports were structured according to the five standards, and consisted of general remarks, recommendations and assessments of the research according to the standards. Before presenting the reports, the panels submitted a draft version for examination to the management of the faculties.
4. An overarching review panel, consisting of two members of each review panel that visited the faculties, examined the critical reflections written by the faculties, and the review reports written by the review panels, and visited the University of the Arts for a concluding audit. The panel had interviews with the two members of the Executive Board, who are also directors of their respective faculties, and with the two lecturers. The panel presented their conclusions and recommendations at the end of the day to a broad group of representatives of the university and the faculties.
5. The overarching review panel composed the present final report, which has been submitted to the Executive Board in order to check its factual accuracy before being completed and presented.

The panel which has carried out the overarching review, and visited the University of the Arts The Hague on the 18th of September 2017, was composed of Prof. dr. Patricia Pisters (University of Amsterdam, chair), Prof. Celia Duffy (Royal Conservatoire of Scotland), Assoc. Prof. Dr. Henrik Frisk (Royal College of Music Stockholm), Prof. Sharon Morris (Slade School of Fine Art, University College London, UK), with Dr. Erik Viskil (independent researcher) as the panel's secretary. Patricia Pisters and Sharon Morris were also members of the panel that reviewed the Royal Academy of Art,

¹ This report refers to the University of the Arts The Hague and its faculties with the acronyms of their Dutch names: HdK stands for *Hogeschool der Kunsten Den Haag*, KABK for *Koninklijke Academie van Beeldende Kunsten*, and KC for *Koninklijk Conservatorium*.

² In Dutch: *Brancheprotocol Kwaliteitszorg Onderzoek (BKO) of the Vereniging Hogescholen*.

³ See Appendix 2 for the schedule of the meetings during the peer review visit.

while Celia Duffy and Henrik Frisk were engaged in the review of the Royal Conservatoire. Sharon Morris has contributed to the discussions and the report of the overarching review, however, due to personal circumstances, she has not been able to take part in the interviews and discussions during the visit.

The task of the review panel, established by the University of the Arts in consultation with the panel's secretary, consisted of three elements. The panel was requested to summarise the main elements of the two peer review reports on the faculties, as well as the underlying critical reflections. Secondly, the panel was asked to carry out an analysis of the university's research policy in relation to the actual practice in the faculties. Finally, the panel was asked to formulate recommendations for strengthening the research culture of the University of the Arts.

This final report presents the results of the review. It starts with an overview of the overall conclusions, then an overall assessment of the quality of research, and concludes with recommendations; all three sections relate to the university level. This is followed by an analysis of the relation between the university and the faculties, and a comparison of the research in the two faculties. The third section consists of summaries of the preceding reviews. The final, overarching report does not stand on its own; it is accompanied by the supporting original peer reviews on the two faculties, which have the status of annexes. A detailed analysis of a random sample of a research project is included in the review report on the Royal Academy of Art.

The members of the review panel would like to pay tribute to the thoughtful, helpful and friendly manner in which the University of the Arts received them. The university has put a lot of hard work into writing the critical reflections, compiling documentation, and organising the concluding visit, which was informative and engaging in all respects. The panel members were pleased to discover that the attitude of openness and cooperation, which is characteristic of each of the two faculties, is extended mutually between the two faculties and includes all their representatives. The University of the Arts has presented itself during the whole review process as an ambitious, committed, curious and enthusiastic institution where research in the arts has a promising future.

1 Overall conclusions, assessment and recommendations

This final report has been written after the overarching review panel examined the review reports on the faculties and the underlying critical reflections, and visited the University of the Arts The Hague (HdK) for a final audit. During the audit the panel had concluding interviews with two mixed teams of representatives of the two faculties. In this section, the main findings of the last phase of the review are presented briefly, with overall conclusions, the final assessment of the research at the HdK, and recommendations for strengthening the university's research culture. The detailed assessment of the research in the faculties is part of the summaries in section 3.

Conclusions at the level of the university

- The review panel is impressed by the serious, engaging, positive research culture in the HdK. The two panels that reviewed the faculties already highlighted the committed overall attitude to research of staff and students, and the strong desire for a further growth of the research community. The overarching panel wishes to emphasize the enormous drive and enthusiasm of the management. The two board members / faculty directors are not only supporting and enabling the research, but also safeguarding the sustainability of the research orientation and organisation in the long run, particularly by investing in cooperation with Leiden University.
- The HdK decided to have the research assessed at the level of the university, while also requiring a detailed examination at faculty level. The review panel appreciates this courageous decision. The university must have been aware that combining the two levels in one review increases the chance of finding flaws in the overall research structure, as well as, in the cooperation between the levels and among the various players. The solid and demanding procedure developed for the review process, however, led to many illuminating insights and placed the review panel in the position to formulate recommendations that can help the institution in moving on to the next phase in its development.
- All research at the HdK is located at the level of the faculties. Yet, the university has a significant impact on what is being done on that level, if only because the faculties followed the university in opting for a research-oriented profile. The University of the Arts started their cooperation with Leiden University 17 years ago. By doing so, the university has not only turned the focus of the faculties towards research, but also made it possible to build up a vast amount of expertise on research in the arts in The Hague and Leiden. This situation is without precedent in The Netherlands. No other arts university and regular university are collaborating in such a structural way, with a shared *Academy of Creative and Performing Arts*, shared electives and even PhD programmes. The level of expertise on artistic research also gives 'The Hague' a leading position internationally. The review panel is impressed with everything that has been achieved over the past 17 years.
- As also becomes apparent from the two review reports underlying this final report, the university's overall research profile reflects accurately what is being done at the various levels in the faculties. There is a strong synergy, without imbalances, between the vision of the university and the visions and practices at faculty level. Yet, if the HdK intends to strengthen the research in the faculties, its vision and policy framework could be worked out in a more comprehensive way. A possible approach to this will be sketched in the recommendations below.
- The HdK has chosen to include in the review all research-oriented parts of the education programmes, both at the BA and MA levels. The panel welcomes this approach, which will definitely help the university to develop the research capacities of artists and musicians. Artistic research may have a long tradition in the form of practical research in the studio, but its current

mode, with written and oral components and connections to theory, requires some training in skills that were traditionally not part of the curricula, and in connecting them to the more conventional ones. As far as the panel can see, this reorientation as carried out by the two faculties, can be expected to have positive effects on the artistic development of the students. An important part of student's research at the HdK is embedded in artistic practice, following the *learning by doing* method, or is meant to support the development of artistic practice. It is not yet common practice in art education that curricula entail such a strong focus on research with so many worked-out components devoted to it.

- The two faculties of the HdK each have their own strengths and priorities when it comes to the organisation of the research. Whereas the KABK has especially put a lot of effort in building up an extensive research programme in the BA, the KC has focussed more on the development of research in the MA. Research also appears to be more integrated in the programmes of the KABK, which, with good reasons, characterizes its approach to research as 'inclusive'. The KC prefers working with programme parts especially devoted to research, which at the MA level entail a broad range of activities, from writing a master plan to carrying out a research project and attending a monthly master's circle. The panel values the useful set of assessment criteria that the KC developed specifically for master research. At the KABK research at the MA level is organized within the departments, which structure the research according to the habits of their discipline. In doing so, they employ discipline-specific standards for assessing the research.
- The critical reflections of the two faculties also have their own characteristics. The critical reflection of the KABK is very concrete, with many examples, which gave the review team a good insight into how the approach and the programme are put into practice, and also of what is understood by artistic research, and the challenges that are involved in this kind of research. The self-evaluation report of the KC has been written much more at a meta-level, which, in turn, gives a clear overview of the structure of the programmes. A good example of a well-structured element is the set of criteria for assessment of research in the MA.
- Finally, the review panel would like to draw attention to the fact that both peer review reports on the faculties note difficulties in getting a clear and definitive picture of the university's expenditures on research. It seems obvious, but it is hard to back-up for the panel, that the HdK's expenses far exceed the 2% of the yearly budget, which, according to the HdK is earmarked for research. The lack of clarity is mainly due to the incompatible way the data (in FTE) are provided.

Overall assessment

The quality of the research at the HdK has already been assessed at the level of the faculties. The results of the two assessments are described in the two review reports and summarized in the present report. For the final review, the panel concentrated on the question of how the general judgement on the HdK should be formulated. The basis for this judgment was provided in the form of the outcomes and findings of the previous reviews, and the information generated in the interviews.

The considerations for the general assessment of the HdK read as follows:

1. The university demonstrates strong leadership with regard to the developments in artistic research in the Netherlands and internationally.
2. The university has established a unique and solid cooperation with Leiden University with fruitful knowledge traffic between both parties, which build and share expertise in this newly defined field.

3. The strategy adopted to invest in the collaboration with Leiden University and consequently start developing research in the faculties is currently leading to a full-fledged research-oriented environment in the arts.
4. The two lectorates with their research groups are functioning extremely well, as becomes clear from the programme components initiated, the publications, and the achievements in staff research.
5. The university, at all levels, shows a determined sense of social purpose and wider societal implications of research, and is clearly oriented towards a fruitful exchange with the local community and society in general.
6. The academic input and the research in the faculties has been increased recently, with the appointment of a second lector at the KABK (0,5 FTE).
7. The executive board, the management of the faculties, and the heads of departments are demonstrably supporting and stimulating the research ambitions of the university; the university's budgets specifically earmarked for research (officially 2% of the total lump sum budget) are exceeded every year.
8. At all levels of the university there is a strong ambition for and engagement with research, and an attitude of constant enhancement.

Based on these considerations, and the high scores on the standards in the assessments of the research in both faculties, the overarching review panel has assessed the overall quality of the research at the HdK as excellent.

Overall assessment: excellent

Aiming to arrive at one coherent overview of scores on the standards, the panel tried to combine the assessments of the two faculties. In doing so, it turned out that the content of the assessments on both sides were too diverse in order to deal with them in one coherent text and share them under one umbrella. For that reason, the overarching review panel, after ample discussion, decided to specify the scores of each of the faculties, and to combine and round off the scores in the final column.

Standard	KABK	KC	HdK
1 Profile, programme	Excellent	Good	Excellent
2 Organisation	Satisfactory	Good	Good
3 Standards	Good	Excellent	Excellent
4 Relevance	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
5 Quality assurance	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
General	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent

Recommendations at the level of the university

- Building on two complementary recommendations in the two review reports, the panel advises the HdK to transform and extend its research vision and policy into a more profound strategic plan, aiming at the further development of its research organisation and culture. Such a plan should not only make clear what is expected from the different levels in the organisation (university, faculties and departments), but also indicate where in the organisation and in what way cooperation between researchers is possible, and this would ideally be translated into a workable timeframe. The review panel is aware of the fact that the HdK succeeded in achieving its research ambitions extremely well without comprehensive strategic plans, and appreciates this highly, however, it considers the stage of development of research in the university ripe for a change of approach.

- One of the main aims of the strategic plan would be to combine *the best of both worlds*. It is obvious that the faculties each have their strengths and focal points. The review panel observes that components of the BA programme at the KABK could be interesting for the KC if they are looking for ways to strengthen their research in the first cycle; this is also what the research panel would propose. In turn, the KABK could learn from the explicit and well worked-out criteria for the evaluation of the MA research at the KC. Also the KABK's illuminating distinct categorisation into three types of research (into, for the benefit of, in and through art) could be used more widely in the university. In short, the review panel believes there are numerous valuable insights and experiences that can be shared between the faculties. The way to get there is to start talking about the overall goals of research and the connections between individual researchers and research groups in both faculties.
- Collaboration in an arts university should, in principle, come from artists and composers themselves. Nevertheless, a benign framework initiated at the level of the university could enable and stimulate researchers to meet and start thinking about possibilities. The review panel recommends the establishment of a joint seminar between the faculties. This could provide an environment for the discussion of research, which also contributes to the emergence of a more comprehensive research culture in the university; a research culture that does not primarily relate to the teaching, but to a general attitude, interest and practice of the staff members themselves, and which celebrates the sharing of knowledge. Founding a joint research seminar allows for talking about individual research projects, but also more broadly, about shared values, shared approaches, and interpretations of what artistic research can amount to, which still is a challenging question for the discipline and for parts of the outside world.
- Depending on the results of the seminar, especially its benefits for the individual research projects, the university could consider developing the initiative, in some years, into an Artistic Research School of the HdK, in which all artistic research will be brought under one umbrella. Such a research school does not have to be located in one physical place; it could consist of joint meetings, a shared name, and for instance publications, which make the research in the HdK visible to the outside world.
- The review panel observed that the connections between the different cycles in the faculties could be more effective. The huge expertise that is developed at the different levels could be shared, and staff and students could fulfil roles at different levels. This can also have implications for the evaluation criteria throughout the BA, MA and PhD trajectories. The panel considers that some of the evaluation criteria for student research presuppose an achievement at just too high a level. In turn, some other criteria seem to lack ambition. It is a matter of fine-tuning, and of alignment of the different sets of criteria to each other, a task which could be carried out well in the context of an exchange between the different levels. The review panel advises to include a reference to international criteria in this process, for instance the broadly accepted Dublin Descriptors, and also sets of criteria of comparable institutions abroad.
- The review panel finds it necessary that the university starts enlarging the volume of teaching staff engaged in research. The present numbers do not reflect the ambitions of the university, nor do they correspond to the investments in research-oriented components in education. Having said that, the performance of the KC on the volume of staff research is better than that of the KABK. The panel sees very many possibilities to have more teaching staff participating in research, and recommends that the HdK considers staff research in direct connection to student projects and other components in the education programmes.
- The review reports on the faculties make clear that the desired increase of staff research within the HdK will ultimately require a more advanced method of quality assurance. In the view of the

panel quality assurance of staff research could be located at the university level. This would enable the HdK to define general standards for evaluating the research and compare the various research groups and their methods with each other. Quality assurance at the level of the university is also a means to enable the faculties to learn from each other.

- A central department for the quality assurance of staff research could stimulate the development of sets of criteria for the evaluation of artistic research. Currently, the criteria for artistic research seem far from being solidly defined, many of them seem fluid in their meaning and interchangeable, which is, moreover, a characteristic of the field internationally. The HdK, being a centre of excellence in artistic research, could take a leading role in enhancing the quality of the criteria, in which, for instance, the value of the research process could be highlighted. A second issue that a central department could deal with relates to data protocols. The panel is aware of the fact that first steps have been taken, however, the chosen instrument is not yet accepted broadly in the university, whereas the increase of staff research (and extremely interesting student projects) makes it necessary to start establishing a tool to make research data available, searchable and accountable.
- A related leadership role that fits the HdK concerns the BKO standards. The two review panels and the overarching panel firmly agree with the HdK that the current standards are difficult to apply to research in the arts. The standards are too much oriented towards the realisation of products, and there is too much emphasis on the apparently expected instrumental, clear-cut usefulness of research. In practice, it often proves difficult to alter these kinds of criteria. The HdK, with its relatively long-standing tradition in research and its expertise in applying assessment methods and criteria, could take the lead in proposing new standards in which more appropriate and more balanced assessments are possible. They could discuss these with the field, and bring them into discussion at the level of the Association of Dutch Universities of Applied Sciences. By doing this, the HdK could contribute significantly to safeguarding autonomous places for artistic research, in which the criteria of the arts prevail.
- What has been proposed above, should, of course, be subject to thorough discussion and examination first. The review panel considers these elements useful to bring in at a higher level than the faculties. However, the panel also considers it extremely important that each faculty is kept in its own strength and is able to foster growth in different ways. The HdK's research policy, in the terms of the *strategic research plan*, should allow the faculties to develop independently, yet following unified strategic tracks. The panel also more generally advocates a pluralistic institution that allows for different types of artistic development and artistic practice, with and without research components.

2 Analysis of the critical reflections

2.1 The university as research unit

The main focus of the full review process has been on the faculties, where the research of the HdK is prepared, carried out, and evaluated. The critical reflections and the interviews have made clear that each faculty has a specific identity and style. Each of the faculties is also applying specific methods, and setting its own practices. Notwithstanding these differences, their approaches appear to be consistent with the research vision of the university, and there is definitely a fruitful two-way traffic between the two levels. Although the university's research vision covers all aspects of the research, it does not prove to be very extensive, nor detailed. After the examination of the research at the faculty level, and with the preceding in mind, the question arises as to the relevance of the university's level for the research, and what it could or should be in the future. What is the University of the Arts The Hague as a research unit?

At present, the university has at least three main responsibilities regarding research. These are the cooperation with Leiden University, the appointment of lecturers in the faculties, and the establishment of the overall research vision. The cooperation with Leiden is mainly carried out by the *Academy of Creative and Performing Arts*, and, when it comes to electives and exchanges, by the faculties. The lecturers carry out their work in the faculties as well. Since the recent appointment of a new lecturer (0,5 FTE) in the KABK, the two faculties each have two lectorates.

The research policy of the HdK consists of five related elements:

1. *A definition of the aim of research in the university*, which is: enabling students and teachers to develop a 'reflective practice' in which they 'demonstrate their understanding of who and where they are, and how their work relates to the world and to the work of others'.
2. *A description of the research at the different levels in the faculties*.
 - At the BA-level students learn basic research skills, in particular discursive skills such as dealing with information, presenting perspectives, reading, speaking and writing.
 - At the MA-level the students work on research projects in a specific field.
 - The doctoral programmes of PhDArts (visual artists and designers) and docARTES (musicians) are aimed at artistic research, and facilitated by the Academy of Creative and Performing Arts of Leiden University.
3. *A definition of artistic research*, which reads: the critical and theoretical investigation of a musician/artist into and through his or her own art and/or performance practice; it is regarded as a practice-based form of academic research.
4. *A vision on the relation between student education and staff research*, which is strengthened through mutual reinforcement.
5. *A statement on the extent of the research vision*, which is endorsed by the two faculties and is intended to have an impact on both the education and the artistic practice of the staff.

This research vision covers the research practices of the faculties, leaving room for variations. In the KABK, for example, research oriented activities in the BA appear to be more than learning discursive skills, since research activities are also integrated in practical projects. The university's definition of artistic research is related to PhD trajectories: "research by artists and musicians on the PhD level is called artistic research". This provides room for working from different, less restricted conceptions in the first and second cycle. Having said this, it is clear that the vision of the university and the practices at the level of the faculties are sufficiently unified, and that there is appropriate synergy between them.

What could be questioned, is whether the faculties carry out the policy of the university, or whether it is a description of what is shared by the faculties' research practices. Another question is whether this should be different, and to what degree it could be different. In comparison to the two faculties with their long-standing status, the HdK is not very well known. It is in the faculties that the students receive their education, and the research is being done. The faculties are important players in their fields, and they have the expertise about what is going on there. What could a different approach at the level of the university add to this? What aims should a new policy have and on what organisational aspects should it focus? A common research identity? Shared research projects? A shared quality assurance system? What would work, and what would be too much or too complicated to organize at the highest level?

Given the successful history of the faculties it is likely that a minimum of centrally organized activities and top-down initiatives suit their purposes best. This means that recommendations for strengthening the HdK's research culture should acknowledge the faculties as being the (most important) level at which decisions regarding the content and the methods of the research are made. It could also mean that recommendations should focus in particular on how and what the faculties, and the different levels and bodies in the faculties, can *learn from each other*.

The recommendations of the review panel concentrate on the introduction of a light structure that can enable the faculties in mutual exchange of experiences and expertise, with the aim of combining the best of both worlds. Such a light structure could consist of a written strategic part for the entire university, and a physical environment where researchers and management can meet and discuss. These light measures could be completed with initiatives to develop criteria for the evaluation of research and tools for collecting and disseminating research data. Furthermore, it could be useful to locate activities with regard to quality assurance of staff research at the highest level in the organisation. In all this, the HdK should be careful not to reposition research components and related activities from faculty level to that of the university, and the university's policy should enable the faculties to maintain and improve their own strength in research.

2.2 Research in the faculties, resemblances and differences

In order to arrive at a general assessment of all research in the HdK, the review panel examined the two review reports on the faculties and the two critical reflections. The next section sums up the assessments and recommendations of the review reports. In the present section, the content of the critical reflections is summarised by way of a comparison of the approaches and main achievements of the two faculties. This comparison is structured according to the five standards of the BKO protocol.

Standard 1: research profile and programme

In the critical reflection, the KABK has formulated a general vision on research, which in principle applies to the whole faculty, and is completed with descriptions of the various programme parts. The KC has described its research profile at the level of the programmes and programme parts. A quick comparison between the set-up of research at the KABK and the KC makes clear that the KABK has created more programme initiatives at the BA-level, and the KC at the MA-level. Research appears to be more integrated in the programmes of the KABK, which characterizes its approach as 'inclusive'. The KC works with programme parts especially devoted to research; it might be that in other programme parts students are involved in more integrated forms of research as well, but this is not put forward by the conservatoire.

With regard to the formulation of indicators, which are required in the BKO-procedure, both the KABK and the KC have defined their research activities and results (and those of the researchers) in

terms of input, products, use of products, and evaluation of products. It is doubtful whether this format suits the methods and culture of research in the arts. The attribution by the KABK and the KC of certain of their activities and results to the categories prescribed give the impression of a forced exercise with misfits of category indicating not only misunderstandings, but also incompatibilities.

Programme	KABK	RC
BA	Both BA-programmes pay attention to research with - six general programme parts: research and discourse, docking station, research labs, art research programme, thesis lab, studium generale - events (such as the thesis prize) - various programme parts in all departments	All three BA-programmes pay attention to research, however developments are most prominent in the BA Music which has: - a research skills course: critical music studies - a programme notes assignment - plans to start a thesis assignment
MA	All four MA-programmes focus on research, which is completely woven into the curricula in the form of 'inclusive' research projects	Three MA-programmes (Music, Sonology, Opera) include research, with developments most prominent in Music and Sonology: - intensive research course in Music - master research symposium in Music - research projects - artistic research and written thesis in Sonology
PhD	Four year PhD-training	Four year PhD-training
Faculty	Lectorate Research group PhD Incentive scheme Publication series	Lectorate Research group Upgrade to MA-degree programme PhD Incentive scheme Publication series
Dissemination of results	Through - Exhibitions, performances, installations, artist books - Publications - Presentations	Through - Artistic outputs - Research Catalogue of the SAR - Website RC - Research mailing list

Standard 2: organisation and personnel

The data on human resources show remarkable differences between the two faculties. The KABK invests 30 times more FTE's in research and research-oriented activities at the BA-level. The KC stands out with human resources reserved for staff research beyond the framework of the PhD Incentive Scheme. Whereas the KABK shows a wealth of different research oriented programme parts at the BA-level, the KC has created specific elements and positions related to research at master's level: a master research team, master circles, master research supervisors and master circle leaders. In keeping with their inclusive approach, the KABK does even not differentiate in the MA between teaching staff for practice and for theory: they are all involved in the supervision of research.

Level	KABK	KC 2016-2017*	KABK	KC
BA	15,0 FTE	0,43 FTE	759 students	487 students
MA	5,80 FTE	2,30 FTE	33 students	305 students
PhD Incentive Scheme	0,95 FTE	0,60 FTE	6 teaching staff members	3 teaching staff members
Faculty	-	4,54 FTE		
Lectorate	1,50 FTE	1,70 FTE		

* KC has also specified the data for the two previous years. Two examples: the PhD scheme involved 1 FTE in these years, the teaching faculty 2,5 FTE in 2014-2015.

Research in both faculties is strongly embedded in national and international networks. Crucial for the external connections are the lecturers, with their involvement in a range of collaborations, committees and initiatives. It is characteristic for the KABK that student projects also add to the number of external contacts.

The expenditures of both faculties are presented in FTE's. This makes it difficult to compare the costs of research with the realised income for research. Also these data show that the KC has stronger position in PhD research.

Standard 3: standards for carrying out research

The KC and the KABK both act according to various types of standards and codes, mainly educational ones. The KC emphasizes the relevance of the Polifonia / Dublin Descriptors, which, according to the critical reflection, 'clearly identify the role of research' in the MA. Both faculties show how they meet the Code of Conduct for Applied Research.

A comparison of KC and KABK with regard to preparing, implementing and evaluating research in the BA points out that the approach of the KABK is broader, more comprehensive and gives way to research as an integral part of the education. Whereas the KC offers (a part of) their students a basic skills training (critical music studies) and the notes assignment, the KABK offers a range of research components and explains how their three types of research (into art, for art, in and through art) interact in these. Both faculties work with (final) qualifications, in which attention is paid to research oriented competencies.

At the KC the preparation for and implementation of research at the MA level entails a broad range of activities. The students write a master plan, follow an introduction research in the arts, carry out a research project, receive individual supervision, write a paper and may choose to write a thesis, attend a master's circle (monthly research discussions), give a presentation during the yearly master's research symposium, and choose electives.

At the KABK MA research is organized within the various departments, which structure the research according to the habits and culture of their discipline. At the MA Artistic Research the students write a research proposal and propose a project as part of their application. All MA students write a thesis. At the KABK the different departments use specific standards for assessing research. The standards are, however, not formulated in order to evaluate research; they are more generic in character. The KC has developed and works with a set of assessment criteria specifically developed for master research.

Research of the teaching staff in both faculties is not guided by explicit (external) standards, apart from the Code of Conduct of Applied Research. The researchers work in peer groups and are coached by the lecturers. The evaluation of staff research is carried out by the lecturers.

Standard 4: relevance

The KABK and the KC deal with this standard differently. The KABK has put a lot of effort in accounting for the relevance of the research in more general terms, and for their perspective on what relevance of research in the arts amounts to. They point out that research at the KABK is practice based, relates to professional situations, contributes in the first place to the practice of the researchers, and connects naturally to education. Publications by staff researchers are still limited in number, but there are other ways in which the research is disseminated and connected to discourse and society. The KABK also accounts for the relevance by referring to grants. The indicators identified as part of the review procedure (relating to input, products, use of products, evaluation of products) are worked out in a scheme, which has been completed with information provided by a number of researchers and teachers of the school. The critical reflection of the KABK includes a

series of interviews with teachers, which underpin and contextualize the information provided in the schemes.

The KC accounts for the relevance of their research by summarizing the information given by researchers, in response to a survey, into one overall schematic overview. This overview provides detailed quantitative data on the key categories input, products, use of products, and evaluation of products (RC, CR, 47). An important outcome of the survey is the conclusion that the KC has to develop a structured approach towards the collection of data on research output.

Standard 5: quality assurance

The approach to quality assurance in the two faculties is for a large part the same. Research in both faculties is an integral part of the system of evaluation, by which the quality of the BA and MA programmes are monitored. It is also a structural topic on the agendas of meetings. Both faculties make a distinction between internal and external evaluation instruments and processes.

Both faculties		KC	
Internal	External	Internal	External
Student surveys	Evaluation by external (examination) committee members		Benchmarking activities
Course evaluations	Professional stakeholders' meetings		Critical friends
Student panels	Accreditation reports		
Staff surveys	Evaluation by review panels		
Employee performance reviews			

One difference between the faculties is that KC in the self-evaluation pays more attention to the explanation and motivation of the cyclic system of evaluation. A second, and more important one, is the participation of the KC in benchmark activities. The KC participates in the International Benchmark Exercise (IBE) and U-Multirank. In both of these instruments research is included as a category of comparison. A third and interesting difference is that the KC explicitly points out its (excellent) performance in rankings. Quality Assurance at the KC seems to involve a competitive element or at least motivation.

In the critical reflections, as follow-up to the section on quality assurance, both faculties present a list with opportunities for improvement. Most of these relate to research oriented activities in education. The KC has also included a list of planned or desired improvements within faculty research. This is important, because – as is clear from the critical reflections – in the framework of quality assurance not much specific attention is paid to staff research. Research by the teaching staff is monitored and evaluated in the course of the research processes by the lecturers. The PhD projects of the teaching staff are supervised according to the regulations of Leiden University.

3 Summaries of the peer review reports

3.1 General assessment of research in the faculties

The summary section of this report begins with the general conclusions of the review reports. The texts are partly quoted, partly paraphrased, and for the largest part identical with the reports. Since the panel of the KC referred to themselves as *review team* this term is used here in the context of the KC. Where in the review report on the KC the term *overall* is used, this has been changed in *general*, since the term *overall* is reserved for the university's level in the present report.

Royal Conservatoire (KC): excellent

The general assessment as 'Excellent' is based on KC's research leadership in relation to peer institutions in the conservatoire sector, the high quality of its Master's provision, the strong emphasis on, and creative approach to, staff development in research, areas of world-leading research, and the investment of the institution in pioneering support for research such as the Research Catalogue.

The Review Team commends and acknowledges:

- The ambition of KC's research activities and its investment in its development, particularly in Master's programmes for both staff and students and in the new Lectorship;
- KC's strong national and international research networks, partnerships and connections the high internationally-recognized quality of its research leadership and many of its outputs;
- KC's pervasive attitude of enhancement and critical self-reflection, evident throughout, and particularly in the final section of the SER;
- The excellent standard of documentation;
- A strong QA ethos and precise understanding of QA processes;
- Investment in and support for staff researchers.

The Review Team found that there is still uncertainty over the definition and practice of artistic research among staff and students. The standpoint expressed in the documentation is not universally shared or understood and there are mixed messages. The Review Team believes that there needs to be an institutional conversation about the nature and practice of artistic research, and how it plays out in all cycles; a conversation which recognizes the differentiation emerging in the field, challenges orthodoxy and is open to different research fields and approaches

The Review Team heard powerful testimony from staff members about how KC's research support had helped develop their voices as advocates for the arts. The Review Team commends the new lectorate as a significant step in assisting KC in articulating its relevance to society, but it encourages KC to promote its artistic-research outputs more effectively, including by considering widening the definition of 'products' of artistic research in the public domain.

Royal Academy of Art (KABK): excellent

The KABK demonstrates a remarkably positive research culture, which it has developed very rapidly and without compromise. The panel is impressed by the overall attitude to research and how the school manages to address social issues and the world at large without instrumentalizing art. The panel observes a strong desire and need for further development and growth of the research community. On the basis of what is already achieved – which is significant –, and the reassuring plans for the future, particularly in relation to the continuing collaboration with Leiden University, the panel dares to foresee strong headway.

The panel welcomes recent developments with great enthusiasm, such as the transformation of the Master Artistic Research (MAR), the appointment of a new head of technical workshops, and the decision to establish a second lectorate, specially devoted to the design disciplines. The MAR can bridge the gap between the orientation and more skills driven bachelor programme and the doctoral research trajectories of PhDArts in Leiden. The panel very much appreciated learning about the many initiatives, including the self-initiatives of the students, in the city of The Hague. The panel understands the KABK to be a fruitful catalyst of artistic development in the city. It suggests that by adjusting the research even more to the city's context and its diverse population and communities, the academy can further contribute in inspiring ways to the overall urban fabric and the cultural and social life of its inhabitants.

The review panel agrees with the KABK that the framework and some of the standards, and the interpretation given to these standards, are far removed from the attitude and methods employed in research in an art and design context. To a large extent, research in art and design is about the process as much as it is about outcomes. In this respect standards that focus on products miss the point as far as the artistic disciplines are concerned. The review panel holds, however, that notwithstanding the framework, the KABK has succeeded in presenting its views and achievements in a clear and meaningful way.

The review panel deeply appreciates the research approach and achievements of the KABK. The overall assessment cannot result in anything else than 'excellent'. Yet, the panel decided to assess standard 2 with only 'satisfactory'. Considering the needs of the KABK's research programme and the situation of research within art schools in the Netherlands, the allocation of human resources, which is the weak point regarding standard 2, would not necessarily lead to a score below good. However, the KABK has grand ambitions, and is part of an international field of art schools in which the attention to research is increasing rapidly. In order to be able to compete and succeed in this field the KABK should, according to the panel, further invest in staff research. The excellent profile and programme, as well as, the excellent way in which the KABK succeeds in enforcing the relevance of the research, constitute the right conditions for a further development of the research community. The assessment of standard 2 can be seen as a harsh encouragement to this end. The overall assessment shows how the panel values the larger whole of the research, based on a careful consideration of all five standards and the obvious and extraordinary strengths within the admirably well-developed approach.

3.2 Assessment of the faculties according to the BKO standards

This section provides an overview of the scores on the five standards of each faculty and of the related conclusions. The conclusions are summarised briefly in order to facilitate a comparison of the faculties.

Standard 1: research profile and programme

Royal Conservatoire (KC): good

- KC's research profile and research programme are indicative of a distinctive, relevant, and ambitious institution which is challenging specific norms in conservatoire education, in professional practice and in the knowledge domain.
- This quite varied research profile is in synergy with the research vision of the University of the Arts The Hague and can count on support from internal and external stakeholders, in part because of sophisticated relationships.
- KC is taking the much-debated field of artistic research and committing substantial intellectual and human resources to its presence in this area, particularly at Master's level, but indeed in all the educational cycles.

- KC is strategically very well-placed in the development of innovative practices at this time.
- The research strategy at KC builds productively upon areas which KC can regard as internationally-leading, such as Composition, Early Music and Sonology.
- The Review Team did not see the specific strategic objectives of the research programme articulated in the concise form of vision and mission statements.
- The use of quantitative instruments, especially those imposed externally, presents challenges, and a full-scale internal audit of research activity within the institution has yet to be realised in a way that would enable such information to be truly powerful in a political context.

Royal Academy of Art (KABK): excellent

- The research profile of the KABK and the vision of research of the university as a whole form a recognizable unity and demonstrate a high level of synergy.
- The review panel values the profile and the well-thought-out vision on research of the KABK.
- Both profile and programme are relevant, ambitious and challenging, and stimulate a positive, compassionate research culture within the KABK.
- The omnipresence of research in the KABK and the number of students, teaching staff and practitioners from outside that are involved strongly supports the profile and the programme components; this was further confirmed in the interviews.
- The review panel is enthusiastic about the transformation of the Master Artistic Research from an interdisciplinary programme of the Royal Conservatoire to a programme of the KABK. It encourages the KABK to come to a certain level of alignment between the MAR and PhDArts, as announced by the management.
- The review panel is very positive about the establishment of the double degree programme for excellent students who are able to combine a practical art school programme with a theoretical art-oriented programme at Leiden University.
- The panel valued the so-called 'open source' research approach in the workshops, the convergence between analogue and digital technologies, and the impressive experimental use of 3D printers.
- The objectives of staff research and research-oriented components of the bachelor and master programmes are well defined and subject to quality assurance – see standard 5.

Standard 2: organisation and personnel

Royal Conservatoire (KC): good

- The organization of research at the KC appears to be sound and well structured and students and teachers confirm that they know how it is organized.
- Given the large cohort number at Master's level, and its increasingly international student profile, not enough attention is being paid to aspects of risk management.
- The Master's Circle is a good format that allows Master's students and teachers to discuss both research and practice. The Lectorate, 'Research in the Arts', is a sensible construction and an asset in the process of developing an internal research culture.
- There is quite a large conceptual gap between first and second cycle research expectations and there is also a gap between second and third cycles: that only a few students progress from KC to docARTES and that only rarely do second cycle research presentations have the potential to be transformed into PhD research.
- Human resources for the Master's research programme are not adequate, although it is difficult to prove this from the information available.
- Teachers could be given better research career opportunities.
- The allocation of finances was difficult for the Review Team to unpack, but the institution prioritizes support for research on all levels and spends more than specific research funding allows.

- The Faculty feel hindered in their continued development as researchers by the lack of research time. However, there are resources available for conferences and similar events.
- The fact that in the new site of the Royal Conservatoire will not include the physical presence of the music library gives the Review Team some concerns.
- The contribution to wider arts and culture from artistic research carried out by often highly distinguished staff members could be better reflected.

Royal Academy of Art (KABK): satisfactory

- The KABK demonstrates a positive research culture, with an active, reflective and open-minded attitude towards research and a wealth of initiatives within the educational structure.
- The organisation of both the research activities within the education and the staff research are transparent and effective, with a high level of self-direction and an active and open-minded attitude.
- Although the critical reflection gives detailed insight into the distribution of the human resources involved in research, it is not sufficiently clear what expenditures are dedicated to research.
- The research portfolio of the KABK consists of research projects of the participants of the Research Group, the doctoral candidates supported by the Incentive Scheme, and the lector. The projects listed are relevant, ambitious and stimulating for the education.
- The volume of research by the teaching staff is too limited against the background of the ambitious research profile of the KABK and deserves to be increased substantially.
- Research at the KABK shows a range of developments that have occurred since the last review, ranging from the establishment of programme components (for instance Research & Discourse) to the provision of research grants.
- Researchers and the KABK as a whole have relevant and stimulating connections with the outside world.

Standard 3: standards for carrying out research

Royal Conservatoire (KC): excellent

- Internationally-recognised research leadership is provided by the two Lectors.
- Research supervision for the Master's is carried by a team of PhD alumni and PhD students; moreover, research supervision is carried out by teachers who are involved and supported in their own research development in second and third cycle programmes.
- The number of supervisors has significantly enlarged over the years and there is an incentive scheme for staff research development.
- Other elements of good practice include the strong philosophy of sharing practice. This is evident through the use of the Research Catalogue, the Master's Circle and through twice-yearly meetings of all supervisors.
- The published outputs of researchers are a clear indicator of research quality and many such outputs, some of a high international standard, were made available to the Review Team.
- The Review Team appreciates the significant investment in the Research Catalogue with the caveat that its limitations should also be clear (this is not the only place that researchers should look for research outputs) and with questioning its usefulness as a tool for supervision.
- The Review Team agrees with the view that identifying a number of research clusters could help to organize research without losing the richness and variety of approaches.
- The Review Team believes that artistic activity can form an important output of artistic research and should be properly accounted for.

Royal Academy of Art (KABK): good

- Although research standards in the field of art and design are not always conventionally strict, sometimes even implicit or difficult to pin down and in a lot of cases relying on personal

methodologies, the KABK employs a number of well-defined procedural standards for different stages of its research projects.

- The review panel interprets the procedures listed by the KABK as procedural standards.
- The research at the KABK reflects the mentality and methodologies of the disciplines involved, and in this sense also complies with the ethics and the values of the professions and disciplines.
- The KABK uses as a guideline the Code of conduct for practice-based research for Universities of Applied Sciences.
- The critical reflection reflects thoroughly on matters of methodology and the applicability of a standard-based approach to research in art and design. The methodological choices made are well accounted for and allow for fruitful research projects.
- The selected sample of a research project convinced the review panel of the thoughtful way in which the KABK deals with the standards of its fields.

Standard 4: relevance

Royal Conservatoire (KC): excellent

- The Review Team found the classifications of the BKO framework indicators awkward and not entirely fit for purpose as a framework for artistic research. It agrees with KC that a more structured approach towards the collection of data on research output is desirable and that there is a need to track the 'invisible research economy' at KC.
- In responding generally to this standard on the impact and relevance of KC's research activity, the Review Team notes four areas of major impact:
 - a. The development of a research culture at KC is having an effect on conservatoire higher music education internationally. KC is in the vanguard in this respect and is differentiating itself from its competitors. Its many partnerships and collaborations also enrich and enlarge its influence and impact.
 - b. The discipline of artistic research has changed as a result of KC's activity. KC has had a profound impact on shaping the discipline of artistic research in music. This is having impact beyond the conservatoire sector.
 - c. The state of knowledge has changed. KC's research builds on solid foundations: the research has had a marked impact on professional practice and knowledge over many years in particular in areas such as Sonology and Early Music performance practice;
 - d. 'Artistic performance practice' has changed, which especially identified in areas such as Early Music and Sonology.
- The Review Team welcomes the new Lectorship, which has the specific remit of exploring connections to the outside world and relevance to society. It also commends the CAAR initiative; this newly planned Centre for Advanced Artistic Research, aiming at the realisation of interventions in the city and the performance of research results, is specifically about the nature of engagement with KC and other institutions in the city of The Hague. Both are important contributions to increasing the visibility and relevance of KC research.
- The relevance of research to the community at large is relatively underdeveloped and could be strengthened.
- The social relevance of research at KC is not clearly articulated.

Royal Academy of Art (KABK): excellent

- Research at the KABK is practice-based, with research questions emerging from the individual artistic practice of the artists and designers involved or, in the case of certain student research projects, established in consultation with external parties.
- Research projects relate to professional situations; some projects are commissioned.
- All research contributes in the first place to the development (or the development of insight into) the artistic practice of the researchers.

- Research projects by teachers are mostly reflected in the content and methods of the educational programmes; the connection between research and education is close and natural.
- The review panel values the reflective manner in which the KABK accounts for the relevance of its research projects.
- Since research-in-and-through-art as a field of its own is relatively young and the volume of staff research at the KABK is still modest, explicit contributions to knowledge development in the form of publications are still limited and, as far as PhD research by the teaching staff is concerned, in preparation. At the same time, it must be recognized that the research activities are informing the discourse in the disciplines involved in all kinds of explicit and less explicit ways. The lectorate has contributed to different fields of knowledge with well-received books, symposia and conferences.
- The review panel agrees with the KABK that the assessment framework of this review does not fit the attitude and the methods employed in research in art and design. With its independent and constructive critical approach the KABK demonstrates a profound insight into the complex relation between research and relevance in art and design.

Standard 5: quality assurance

Royal Conservatoire (KC): satisfactory

- The Review Team congratulates KC on its thorough and systematic approach of QA and further endorses its pervasive attitude of continuous enhancement.
- The Review Team notes the positive results of internal feedback and the perspective provided by various engagements with external experts.
- The BKO indicator grid is not entirely suitable for framing the products of artistic research. Nevertheless, it seems that KC undersells its research 'products' and that it should have the confidence to declare more of its artistic outputs in this grid. As the Review Team understands it, only 'discursively framed concerts' are counted; this seems an unnecessarily restrictive definition. The Review Team would also expect to see the many research-led encounters with the music professions (including recordings, orchestras and ensembles, broadcasters, festivals) represented here.
- The U-Multirank example gives rather the opposite picture. The Review Team understands and endorses the use of a benchmarking tool for international comparisons, but until it is more widely adopted and unless there is some consistency in the definition of research-based artistic activities, its usefulness will be limited.

Royal Academy of Art (KABK): satisfactory

- The written information as well as the interviews with management, quality officers and staff members made clear to the panel that when it comes to quality assurance the KABK has an active and thoughtful attitude and can rely on an effective cyclic system.
- The research included in education is thoroughly monitored and evaluated with the help of a cohesive set of instruments.
- The still modest amount of staff research benefits from a mode of quality assurance that is integrated into the processes of guidance and supervision.
- If the volume of staff research increases substantially, the review panel advises the KABK to consider developing tools in order to monitor and evaluate the research activities and outcomes in a way that exceeds the scope of individual supervisors.

3.3 Recommendations at the level of the faculties

In this section, the recommendations of the two peer review reports are combined into one overview. Each recommendation is related to one of the standards of the BKO procedure. This

makes it easier to compare the recommendations for the two faculties. The overview shows that the majority of recommendations relate to the first two standards of the procedure.

Recommendations relating to standard 1: research profile and programme

Royal Academy of Art (KABK)

1. Although the research profile of the KABK is ambitious, well accounted for and in line with the vision of the university as a whole, the panel suggests a further development. Positioning itself as a research art school with an inclusive approach to research, which the panel supports, will in the long run probably not be sufficiently distinctive, especially in light of the increasing international competition among art schools. The panel highly values the views of the KABK on research and is convinced that the most interesting ideas could be worked out systematically into a set of principles supporting a more comprehensive research profile, one that acknowledges the multifaceted nature of research and reflection in art and design in a more explicit and profound way.
2. In its critical reflection, the KABK encompasses a diverse range of activities under the heading of research. In order to strengthen the importance of its approach the KABK should consider refining its terminology in a way that, for instance, the learning of both generic and specific research skills, getting acquainted with theoretical insights, and practicing simple forms of inquiry are clearly distinguished from the more complex activity of carrying out a research project.
3. As a next step in the collaboration with Leiden University and possibly building on the first experiences of the double degree programme, which started in September 2017, the KABK could investigate the potential of interdisciplinary projects and programmes that go beyond the humanities. This would make it possible to connect research in art and design with the natural sciences, technology and other fields.
4. There is an opportunity and a challenge for the KABK in raising the profile of the existing material research in the workshops and to emphasize the possibilities of this kind of research to students and teachers. To this end, the KABK could take advantage of connections with industries, of which some already appear to show interest in the workshops' material research.

Royal Conservatoire (KC)

The many networks and instruments that KC uses in developing its work are admirable, but they sometimes confound staff and student understanding of the institution's strategic direction with respect to research. Clear communication to all stakeholders is needed about how their participation in research, as well as being beneficial for personal and professional development, is important to the institution's strategic development. The Review Team recommends:

1. The collection of more detailed and systematic quantitative information concerning research outputs per annum at KC, with a view to understanding trends and communicating such information more clearly [A]; but more importantly:
2. The development and publication of a clear, concise institutional research strategy document, which can be developed largely from the documentation prepared for this Review, but would need to be fashioned as addressing staff and students, so that they genuinely understand their role in the large-scale evolution of their research environments;
3. In the development of a research strategy, instead of reinforcing separations, to consider the benefits of creating bridges among the different fields of music research.

Recommendations relating to standard 2: organisation and personnel

Royal Academy of Art (KABK)

1. In order to actively realise the ambitious research profile in practice the review panel recommends that the KABK invests in additional possibilities for the teaching staff to engage with research. The Research Group could be enlarged, additional research groups could be established, material research by the technical staff in the workshops could be included, and

research grants for teaching staff related to certain educational components or projects could be introduced. The panel understands the difficult position of the management, which has the responsibility to first and foremost facilitate education. The panel also knows about the long-standing desires for additional funding for research. However, if the KABK really intends to be a research-oriented art school, this needs to be made clear by the amount of time and means invested.

2. In connection to the previous item, the panel would like to point out the importance of developing a clear vision on the financial position of research and the division of financial means within the academy.
3. In this period of transition, in which theory and practice are in a process of mutual reorientation, teachers, especially those in artistic disciplines, face the challenge of keeping up with developments. In particular, they have to keep pace with the speed in which students develop in relating to theory and reflection. The interviews made the panel aware of the opportunities research projects can provide for teachers who are open to developing their pedagogical qualities by way of reflection. The panel recommends a broad use of research projects and grants that favour the further professionalization and vitalisation of the teaching staff.

Royal Conservatoire (KC)

1. Given the very large cohort of Master's students, formal procedures in case of problems should be transparent and the responsibilities of members of the Master's Research Team clearly articulated; staffing of the Master's programme should also be reviewed to ensure it is adequate for such a large cohort, and that it is fully aware of the need for proactive risk-management.
2. The criteria and mechanisms for funding in-house research projects should be made clearer.
3. Staff researchers should be encouraged to view the long-term potential of their research for their professional development, rather than regarding it as a necessary 'hurdle'.
4. KC should encourage a more open and clear attitude towards what artistic research can be and ensure that this is communicated between departments and levels.
5. See also Recommendation 1, standard 3 below on the Research Catalogue [B].
6. See also Recommendation 2, standard 4 below on widening the definitions of artistic outputs as research 'product' [C].

Recommendations relating to standard 3: standards for carrying out research

Royal Academy of Art (KABK)

- (No specific recommendations)

Royal Conservatoire (KC)

1. KC should undertake a review of the Research Catalogue, evaluating its fitness for purpose, and how it is used and regarded by its users, prioritizing the needs of all research students and staff. [B]
2. KC should consider 'research clusters' as a useful way of organizing research.
3. See also Recommendation 1, Section 1 on tracking and documenting research activity across the institution [A].

Recommendations relating to standard 4: relevance

Royal Academy of Art (KABK)

The review panel encourages the KABK to further engage the diverse communities of The Hague in its research projects and, by doing so, involve them in the academy, in the curriculum and programmes, and in the attitude and visions that inspire artists and designers.

Royal Conservatoire (KC)

1. KC should gather external input on its research activity specifically as regards impact in the wider cultural sector.

2. A review of the policy for inclusion of 'product' in the BKO grid should be undertaken with a view to widening the criteria for inclusion. [C]
3. The social relevance of research at KC should be more clearly articulated.

Recommendations relating to standard 5: quality assurance

Royal Academy of Art (KABK)

In the present situation the quality assurance of the research done by the teaching staff is effective. If the KABK increases the volume of staff research substantially it should consider developing special tools for monitoring and evaluating the research activities and outcomes in order to stay in control and assure that the quality of research is in balance with that of the education.

Royal Conservatoire (KC)

As for Recommendation 2, Section 4 above on artistic research outputs [C].

Appendices

Appendix I

Composition of the review panel

Professor Celia Duffy (*panel member*)

Former Director of Research and Knowledge Exchange, Royal Conservatoire of Scotland

Assoc. Professor Henrik Frisk (*panel member*)

Associate Professor Royal College of Music Stockholm

Prof. dr. Patricia Pisters (*panel member and chair*)

Professor of Media and Film Studies, director of research of Amsterdam School of Cultural Analysis (ASCA), Faculty of Humanities, University of Amsterdam, NL

Professor Sharon Morris (*panel member*)

Professor of Fine Art, Head of the Doctoral Programme, Academic Deputy Director, Slade School of Fine Art, University College London, UK

Dr. Erik Viskil (*secretary of the panel*)

Independent researcher, writer and advisor, Amsterdam

Appendix II

Programme of the peer review visit

Monday 18 September 2017

KABK / Royal Academy of Art, Prinsessegracht 4, Den Haag

- 09.30 - 10.00: Preparatory meeting panel members conservatoire with secretary
- 10.15 - 10.45: Preparatory meeting panel members academy with secretary
- 10.15 - 10.45: Conservatoire members tour academy

- break

- 11.00 - 12.30: Panel meeting 1: framing first conclusions and questions

- lunch

- 13.00 - 13.45: Panel meeting 2, with:
Executive Board / directors academy and conservatoire
Marieke Schoenmakers and Henk van der Meulen

- break

- 14.15 - 15.00: Panel meeting 3, with:
Lectors academy and conservatoire:
Prof. dr. Janneke Wesseling and Prof. dr. Henk Borgdorff

- 15.00 – 17.00: Panel meeting 4: framing conclusions

- 17.00: Transport to the conservatoire

KC / Royal Conservatoire, Juliana van Stolberglaan 1, Den Haag

- 17.30 - 18.00: Feedback meeting for leadership and all other interested
- 18.00 - 18.30: Tour Royal Conservatoire