Beslissing van het Bestuurscollege

Datum	Kenmerk	Beleidsdomein
28-02-2025	BC/B/2025/BEAA/159053	Bestuurlijke aangelegenheden

HOGENT-regie voor de borging van de kwaliteit van de opleidingen: planning kwaliteitsbeoordelingen en actualisatie van de aanpak van de balansmomenten voor de opleidingen van de School of Arts

Situering binnen het strategisch plan 2023-2028
HOGENT leidt door experiment en innovatie de professional van de toekomst op. (SD1)

Adviezen
De planning van de kwaliteitsbeoordelingen van de opleidingen van de departementen kwam tot stand in overleg met de genoemde opleidingen.
De actualisatie van de aanpak van de balansmomenten voor de opleidingen van de School of Arts kwam tot stand in overleg met de decaan van de School of Arts.

Toelichting
Gelet op:
- de start van de nieuwe zesjarige kwaliteitscyclus binnen de geactualiseerde HOGENT-regie voor de borging van de kwaliteit van de opleidingen (BC/B/2023/BEAA/138598);
- de beoordeling door een externe revieworganisatie van de kwaliteit van de academische bachelor in de muziek, de master in de muziek, de Engelstalige variant, en de master-na-master in de hedendaagse muziek (juni 2022);
- de beoordeling door een externe revieworganisatie van de kwaliteit van de academische bachelor in het drama, de master in het drama en de Engelstalige variant (mei 2023);
- de beoordeling door een externe revieworganisatie van de kwaliteit van de academische bachelor in de audiovisuele kunsten, de master in de audiovisuele kunsten en de Engelstalige variant op basis waarvan de opleidingen een accreditatie verwierven van 1 oktober 2016 tot en met 30 september 2024 en het feit dat die opleidingen binnen de HOGENT-regie voor de borging van de kwaliteit van de opleidingen door een externe revieworganisatie opnieuw worden beoordeeld op 28, 29 en 30 april 2025;
- het feit dat de nieuwe beoordeling door een externe revieworganisatie van de kwaliteit van de academische bachelor in de beeldende kunsten, de master in de beeldende kunsten en de Engelstalige variant pas zal plaatsvinden in 2026,

en strevend naar:
- een evenredige spreiding van de kwaliteitsbeoordelingen binnen de zesjarige kwaliteitscyclus over de opleidingen en de departementen;
- een optimale afstemming tussen de kwaliteitsbeoordelingen en de jaarlijkse kwaliteitsdialogen per opleiding, waarbij de afspraken en aanbevelingen uit de kwaliteitsbeoordelingen worden besproken en opgevolgd;
- een realistische spreiding van de kwaliteitsbeoordelingen over de groep van zes externe voorzitters van de balanscommissies;
- het realiseren van een haalbare werkverdeling voor de beleidsmedewerkers Kwaliteitszorg van de Vlaamse Universiteiten en Hogescholenraad (Vluhr KZ) in samenwerking met de stafmedewerkers Kwaliteitsborging van de dienst Kwaliteitsborging;
- een vereenvoudiging van de aanpak van de balansmomenten voor de opleidingen van de School of Arts, waarbij het beoordelingsrapport van de externe revieworganisatie als het equivalent van een balansmoment wordt beschouwd en op basis waarvan het bestuurscollege een borgingsbesluit uitspreekt,

wordt aan het bestuurscollege voorgesteld om:

- de planning van de kwaliteitsbeoordelingen van de opleidingen van de departementen tot en met het academiejaar 2028-2029 goed te keuren (cf. bijlage 1);
- in functie van de planning van de kwaliteitsbeoordelingen van de opleidingen van de departementen tot en met het academiejaar 2028-2029 aan de volgende opleidingen een verlenging met een academiejaar van het borgingsbesluit toe te kennen:
    - bachelor in de biomedische laboratoriumtechnologie;
    - bachelor in de agro- en biotechnologie;
    - bachelor in het bedrijfsmanagement, afstudeerrichting marketing;
    - bachelor in het bedrijfsmanagement, afstudeerrichting accountancy-fiscaliteit;
    - bachelor in het bedrijfsmanagement, afstudeerrichting milieu- en duurzaamheidsmanagement;
    - bachelor in het bedrijfsmanagement, afstudeerrichting rechtspraktijk;
    - bachelor in de toegepaste fiscaliteit (banaba);
    - graduaat in het winkelmanagement;
- in functie van de planning van de externe kwaliteitsbeoordelingen van de opleidingen van de School of Arts de volgende opleidingen een verlenging met twee academiejaren van hun borgingsbesluiten toe te kennen: de academische bachelor in de beeldende kunsten, de master in de beeldende kunsten en de Engelstalige variant;
- aan de academische bachelor in de muziek, de master in de muziek, de Engelstalige variant, en de master-na-master in de hedendaagse muziek tot en met het academiejaar 2028-2029 een borgingsbesluit toe te kennen;
- aan de academische bachelor in het drama, de master in het drama en de Engelstalige variant tot en met het academiejaar 2029-2030 een borgingsbesluit toe te kennen;
- aan de academische bachelor in de audiovisuele kunsten, de master in de audiovisuele kunsten en de Engelstalige variant tot en met het academiejaar 2026-2027 een borgingsbesluit toe te kennen;
- een geactualiseerde versie van de HOGENT-regie voor de borging van de kwaliteit van de opleidingen, in het bijzonder voor de aanpak van de balansmomenten voor de opleidingen van de School of Arts (cf. bijlage 2), goed te keuren.

Bijlagen

Bijlage 1: Planning kwaliteitsbeoordelingen van de opleidingen van de departementen tot en met het academiejaar 2028-2029
Bijlage 2: HOGENT-regie voor de borging van de kwaliteit van de opleidingen
Bijlage 3: Beoordelingsrapport muziek
Bijlage 4: Beoordelingsrapport drama
Bijlage 5: Beoordelingsrapport audiovisuele kunsten

Juridisch

Codex Hoger Onderwijs, artikel II.122
BC/B/2023/BEAA/138598 HOGENT-regie voor de borging van de kwaliteit van de opleidingen

Budgettair

Niet van toepassing

Voorbereiding dossier

Marc D'havé

Beslissing
Het bestuurscollege beslist:
art. 1 de planning van de kwaliteitsbeoordelingen van de opleidingen van de departementen tot en met het academiejaar 2028-2029, toegevoegd als bijlage 1, goed te keuren;
art. 2 de borgingsbesluiten van de volgende opleidingen met een academiejaar te verlengen:
- bachelor in biomedische laboratoriumtechnologie;
- bachelor in de agro- en biotechnologie;
- bachelor in het bedrijfsmanagement, afstudeerrichting marketing;
- bachelor in het bedrijfsmanagement, afstudeerrichting accountancy-fiscaliteit;
- bachelor in het bedrijfsmanagement, afstudeerrichting milieu- en duurzaamheidsmanagement;
- bachelor in het bedrijfsmanagement, afstudeerrichting rechtspraktijk;
- bachelor in de toegepaste fiscaliteit (banaba);
- graduaat in het winkelmanagement;

art. 3 de borgingsbesluiten van de academische bachelor in de beeldende kunsten, de master in de beeldende kunsten en de Engelstalige variant te verlengen tot en met het academiejaar 2026-2027;
art. 4 aan de academische bachelor in de muziek, de master in de muziek, de Engelstalige variant, en de master-na-master in de hedendaagse muziek tot en met het academiejaar 2028-2029 een borgingsbesluit toe te kennen waaruit blijkt dat deze opleidingen kwaliteitsvol onderwijs realiseren, dat zich op een internationaal en maatschappelijk relevant niveau bevindt, dit op basis van het beoordelingsrapport van de externe revieworganisatie, toegevoegd als bijlage 3;
art. 5 aan de academische bachelor in het drama, de master in het drama en de Engelstalige variant tot en met het academiejaar 2029-2030 een borgingsbesluit toe te kennen waaruit blijkt dat deze opleidingen kwaliteitsvol onderwijs realiseren, dat zich op een internationaal en maatschappelijk relevant niveau bevindt, dit op basis van het beoordelingsrapport van de externe revieworganisatie, toegevoegd als bijlage 4;
art. 6 aan de academische bachelor in de audiovisuele kunsten, de master in de audiovisuele kunsten en de Engelstalige variant tot en met het academiejaar 2026-2027 een borgingsbesluit toe te kennen waaruit blijkt dat deze opleidingen kwaliteitsvol onderwijs realiseren, dat zich op een internationaal en maatschappelijk relevant niveau bevindt, dit op basis van het beoordelingsrapport van de externe revieworganisatie, toegevoegd als bijlage 5, op basis waarvan de opleidingen een accreditatie verwierven van 1 oktober 2016 tot en met 30 september 2024, en het feit dat die opleidingen binnen de HOGENT-regie voor de borging van de kwaliteit van de opleidingen door een externe revieworganisatie opnieuw worden beoordeeld op 28, 29 en 30 april 2025;
art. 7 de geactualiseerde HOGENT-regie voor de borging van de kwaliteit van de opleidingen, in het bijzonder voor de aanpak van de balansmomenten voor de opleidingen van de School of Arts, toegevoegd als bijlage 2, goed te keuren;
art. 8 de algemeen directeur opdracht te geven een afschrift van deze beslissing over te maken aan de commissaris van de Vlaamse Regering;
art. 9 de algemeen directeur te belasten met de uitvoering van deze beslissing.

Koen Goethals
Algemeen directeur

Paul Van Cauwenberge
Voorzitter

MusiQuE
Music Quality Enhancement

REPORT

Bachelor and Master of Arts in Drama

English Master of Arts in Drama

KASK & Conservatorium

Ghent, Belgium

22-24 May 2023

Content

List of abbreviations

DRAG: the student council of KASK Drama

DLO: Discipline-specific learning outcome (*Domeinspecifieke Leerresultaten*)

FTE: Full-time employment

KASK: Koninklijke Academie voor Schone Kunsten (Royal Academy of Fine Arts)

NSA: Nomadic School of Arts

NVAO: Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatieorganisatie (Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders)

QA: Quality Assurance

TPC: Training Programme Committee

VKS: Vlaamse Kwalificatie Structuur (Flemish Qualification Structure)

VLE: Virtual Learning Environment

Introduction

KASK & Conservatorium forms part of the School of Arts of University College Ghent (HOGENT), which is affiliated with the Association of Ghent University and Howest University College. KASK & Conservatorium has a student body of 2,000 and a faculty staff of 500 in addition to technical and professional services staff[1]. The Royal Academy of Fine Arts (KASK) was founded in 1751 and the Royal Conservatory (Conservatorium) in 1835, with drama training having been established within the Conservatorium in 1860[2]. In 2009-10, the drama programme was integrated into KASK and now sits within the Department of Film, Photography and Drama. It comprises a three-year Bachelor's degree taught in Dutch, a one year Master's degree taught in Dutch and one year Master's degree with an identical curriculum taught in English[3].

Under the leadership of Sam Bogaerts, Chair of the Drama Training Programme Committee from 2005 to 2013, a new curriculum was developed and implemented in 2007-2008. A further major review of the programme was undertaken in 2013 with significant changes to curriculum, teaching staff and infrastructure being made. The programme as it currently stands has adopted a 'broad profile', aimed at creating drama artists, rather than graduating students in specific disciplines such as acting or directing[4].

In the past ten years the programme has been through a period of consolidation and this enhancement review has been undertaken with the aim of testing the programme's currency and taking the opportunity to identify and address any issues or areas for enhancement in partnership with stakeholders including staff, students, professionals and alumni. In preparation for this review, the programme undertook a number of semi-structured conversations with students and teachers, both together and separately, based on the MusiQuE standards[5]. Through this process, the programme's main stakeholders identified some of the challenges, opportunities and potential actions for its future development, which were then integrated into a self-evaluation document.

The Flanders region operates a three-cycle degree structure, with accreditation of programmes and review of institutions overseen by NVAO (the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders). HOGENT was last reviewed in 2022[6]. KASK & Conservatorium is one of four institutions in Flanders offering drama degrees at Bachelor's and Master's levels, the others being in Antwerp, Brussels and Leuven.

The procedure for the review of the drama programme followed a three-stage process:

- KASK & Conservatorium prepared a self-evaluation report (SER) and supporting evidence, based on the *MusiQuE Standards for Programme Review*

[1] *SER,* p.5
[2] *SER,* p.6
[3] The Dutch and English Master's are distinct programmes with the same content but different languages of delivery and assessment. It is a requirement of the Flanders education system that all institutions offering a degree programme taught and assessed in English must offer an equivalent programme taught and assessed in Dutch.
[4] *SER,* p.6
[5] *SER,* p.4
[6] *SER,* p.7

- An international review team composed by MusiQuE reviewed the SER and supporting documents and conducted a site-visit at KASK & Conservatorium from 22nd to 24th May 2023. The site-visit comprised meetings with the Training Programme Committee, teachers, administrative and technical staff, students, alumni and members of the professional field. The review team used the *MusiQuE Standards for Programme Review* as the basis of its investigations.
- The review team produced the report that follows, structured to align with the standards mentioned above.

The review team consisted of:

- Jeroen Fabius, Artistic Leader DAS Choreography, Amsterdam University of the Arts, Netherlands
- Konstantina Georgelou, Assistant Professor, Performance Studies, Utrecht University, Netherlands; Tutor and Theory Advisor, Amsterdam University of the Arts, Netherlands
- Izah Hankammer, recent graduate of Fontys Dance Academy, Netherlands (Student Member)
- Mist Thorkelsdottir, Head of International Programmes in the Performing Arts, University of Southern California, USA (Chair)
- Laura Witt, Registrar and Secretary, Royal Academy of Dramatic Art, London, UK (Secretary)

The review team would like to commend the programme management for the clarity and criticality of the documentation produced by KASK & Conservatorium. The voices of staff, students and other stakeholders were clearly embedded within the SER, which identified both the challenges facing the programme and a number of carefully considered ways in which it could be enhanced in future. All staff, students, alumni and professionals who attended meetings with the review team were open, honest and demonstrated a clear commitment to the future of the drama programme. This enabled the review team to gain a detailed insight into the programme and its importance to the institution, the city of Ghent and the wider region.

Key data on KASK & Conservatorium

Name of the institution	KASK & Conservatorium
Legal status	Publicly funded higher education institution, School of Arts of the University College of Applied Sciences and Arts Ghent (HOGENT)
Date of creation	1751
Website address	https://schoolofartsgent.be
Departments	Architectonic Design Autonomous Arts Design Film, Photography and Drama Music Production, Jazz and Pop Music Classical Music Theory of Art Practices
List of reviewed programmes	Bachelor and Master of Arts in Drama, English Master of Arts in Drama
Number of students enrolled in the programmes reviewed	89
Number of teachers serving the programmes reviewed [permanent and part-time staff]	11.12 FTE

1. Programme's goals and context

Standard 1. The programme goals are clearly stated and reflect the institutional mission.

KASK & Conservatorium's stated mission is the development of arts, education and research in an international perspective. Related to this, the School has established an eight point educational plan, applicable to all of its programmes, upon which the vision for the drama programme is based[7]. Key to the programme's ethos is the aim to "keep an open perspective on what performing arts can be"[8], an approach that has engendered a broad scope and a pedagogical approach that exposes students to a diverse range of artistic practices.

The programme begins with two years of intensive training during which students are taught within ateliers to develop their performance skills, whilst simultaneously undertaking theoretical and research training with the aim of embedding a research-focus within the evolution of individual artistic practices. Students are encouraged to move fluidly between making and playing roles and the programme uses the combined terms "playing while making" and "making while playing" to emphasise this interdisciplinary approach[9]. In the third year of the Bachelor's programme, a project-based, results-oriented model is adopted, building to a master's project which represents the culmination of each student's artistic research and development.

The drama programme has recently taken the decision to adapt the articulation of its goal to educate "autonomous drama artists" (indicating a focus on the individual working alone) to support the development of "interdependent drama artists" who produce work through interaction with others[10]. The change reflects what the programme team considers to be its collaborative and caring approach to learning and teaching, through which the programme aims to foster artistic communities that include collaboration and caretaking wherein students are able to work in connection with their social contexts[11]. The programme team acknowledges that there is work to be done to tackle the emphasis on individual work and move further toward interdependence and collaboration, be that within the programme (where most Master's students continue to make independent work), within the School (where opportunities for collaboration with other artforms are limited by the intensity of the drama curriculum) or within wider social contexts[12].

The drama programme distinguishes itself from the drama degrees offered by three other institutions in Flanders by maintaining its broad approach within a single degree and not differentiating between named pathways such as 'acting' and 'writing'[13]. Through its admissions process, the programme actively seeks out students with diverse profiles who are interested in different artistic processes and will benefit from exposure to the broad palette of practices offered through the curriculum[14]. The programme's admissions capacity is determined by the particular funding arrangements within Flanders, which employs a closed

[7] *SER*, pp.8-11
[8] *SER*, p.8
[9] *SER*, p.8
[10] *SER,* p.9
[11] *Meeting 1 with the Training Programme Committee*
[12] *SER,* p.11, *Meeting 3 with teachers*
[13] *SER,* p.7
[14] *Meeting 1 with the Training Programme Committee*

envelope shared between all drama programmes in the region, and the need to balance income per student with the teaching staff budget[15].

As noted by the review team during the interviews on site, the teaching staff considered that, in comparison with other regional and national organisations, within KASK & Conservatorium the working environment was more connected with current social issues and that they were able to learn about different embodied experiences because of the diverse identities present in the student body. Teachers commented that, while the programme aims to situate itself within a global context, it remains rooted in a local context which in itself contributes to its unique character[16].

The programme has undergone the Flemish procedures for formal approval and legal recognition and was first accredited in 2004, with the current accreditation valid until September 2024. In Flanders, common domain specific learning outcomes (DLOs) for all programmes in a subject area are approved by the NVAO (the accrediting body) and the School has translated these DLOs into a more detailed curriculum wherein the learning outcomes are mapped across the programme's units[17]. In addition to regular external accreditation processes, the School uses a number of quality assurance mechanisms such as surveys for students and applicants, focus groups, a professional field committee, data analysis and committee meetings to ensure that academic standards are maintained[18]. The outputs and action plans resulting from these QA processes are published in an online portfolio accessible to all staff and students within HOGENT.

The programme is overseen and developed by a Training Programme Committee with responsibility for curriculum, delivery and quality. This committee comprises teaching staff and students with professional services staff in attendance, ensuring that all key stakeholders are engaged in the programme's organisation and development[19]. DRAG, the student council for the drama programme in KASK and Conservatorium, also acts as a key line of communication between students and staff, and the programme plans to strengthen opportunities for input in future by increasing the amount of contact between the Training Programme Committee and DRAG[20]. Both students and alumni are included in admissions juries and alumni are also invited to join evaluation juries, providing opportunities for them to give further feedback on these aspects of the programme. An Alumni Resonance Committee also provides a platform for formal alumni feedback on the curriculum. A Professional Field Committee comprising working professionals meets annually to reflect on the currency of the programme, and members of the work field were able to provide examples of amendments to the curriculum made as a result of their feedback, such as the inclusion of advice about completing funding applications[21].

The programme aims to embed equal opportunities by adopting the School's commitment to a culture of care and firmly embedding this framework within the curriculum. Bystander training is offered in order to promote a proactive approach to inclusion and the programme has achieved a good gender balance across its staff and student bodies. The programme's flexibility enables the development of personalised learning tracks and the School offers

[15] *Meeting 7 with programme managers*
[16] *Meeting 3 with teachers*
[17] *Annex 4 Curriculum tables and learning outcomes*
[18] *Meeting 7 with programme managers*
[19] *SER,* p.44
[20] *SER,* p.45
[21] *Meeting 5 with industry professionals*

learning track counselling, financial support and psychosocial support to students on an individual basis[22].

The School acknowledges that while equality and diversity is a priority for the drama programme, there is a need to develop more formal policies within the institution and to provide additional training for staff, particularly in relation to accessibility and inclusive teaching practices for disabled and neurodivergent students. The Nomadic School of Arts (NSA), a project recently undertaken to develop participatory and integrated approaches to arts practice in a range of social contexts, has concluded but is due to report on lessons learned in relation to off-campus education, equality, diversity and inclusion, and modular education with the aim of integrating these themes into institutional policy[23]. The programme team is also very conscious that its teaching staff is predominantly white and that there is work to be done to address this beyond engaging guest teachers from ethnically diverse backgrounds[24].

The review team found that the drama programme had a clear identity and a number of unique attributes that distinguished it from other drama programmes in the region. The rationale for the broad focus of the programme was understood by staff, students and external stakeholders, and was comprehensively embedded throughout the programme's approach to admissions, pedagogy, research and assessment. The professional field and alumni were able to articulate the strengths of the programme very clearly and it was evident that students and alumni embodied the ethos of the 'drama artist', able to occupy and transition fluidly between writer, performer, maker and teacher roles.

Students and alumni also pointed to the programme's focus on physicality and embodied learning, and its strong grounding in theoretical and research practices as key strengths. These elements, in particular the physicality of students, were particularly evident to the review team through its experience of student work shared during the site-visit and are a clear strength of the programme. These unique characteristics leading to distinct graduate attributes were mentioned in the SER and other documentation provided in the context of the review, however the review team felt that the particular focus on embodiment, theory and critical thinking could have been specifically foregrounded and more explicitly articulated within the vision for the programme. It is suggested that this could be achieved by outlining within its vision and external communications the value that the programme places on the embodied physical approach to theatre as well as the development of theoretical skills for reflection and analysis.

The impact of the School's goal to create a 'culture of care' was clear to see and although there was widespread acknowledgement that the intensity of the curriculum in the first two years created a level of pressure that needed to be addressed, there was a sense of community amongst staff and students, with one alumnus describing the School's approach to the review team as 'love-based'. The programme team has clearly identified goals for its future development in the areas of diversity, community and care and challenged itself to avoid ableism, to engage in dialogue with students about diversity and to embed inclusivity throughout the whole programme.

The review team felt that further consideration could be given to the programme's approach to internationalisation, in particular the position of the English Master programme, which

[22] *SER,* p.10
[23] *Meeting 2 with senior administrative and QA staff*
[24] *Meeting 3 with teachers*

had enrolled very few students since its inception[25] and was not fulfilling the original aim to internationalise or diversify the student body. The review team recommends pausing the English language Master's programme until such time as a clear market and strategy for integration with the Dutch language programme can be established, especially in the context of current pressures on facilities and resources as outlined in standard 5.

Compliance with Standard 1

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 1 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Fully compliant
Dutch Master	Fully compliant
English Master	Partially compliant

[25] *Annex 2 Number of students*

2. Educational processes

2.1 The curriculum and its methods of delivery

Standard 2.1. The goals of the programme are achieved through the content and structure of the curriculum and its methods of delivery.

As outlined under standard 1, the drama programme has aligned its curriculum with the KASK & Conservatorium educational plan. The progression from broad-based skills training to multifaceted drama artist intersects with a number of elements of the educational plan, for example *the educational course as the student's personal project*, *practice takes centre stage*, *exploration*, *theoretical development and critical reflection*, and *interdisciplinary openness*[26].

The curriculum is also fully aligned with the domain specific learning outcomes (DLOs) set by the accrediting body. The Flemish region publishes DLOs for Bachelor's and Master's programmes in drama, related to the level descriptors outlined in the Flemish Qualification Structure (VKS), which in turn are based on the Dublin descriptors. The Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO) has approved nine DLOs for first cycle drama programmes, which are translated within the Bachelor's programme into three clusters: competences pertaining to making and playing theory research and reflection, and result and artistic identity. Cluster one is embedded within the atelier training, which includes working with text, improvisation and movement and performer training. This extends into project weeks including interdisciplinary collaboration and into the third year projects. Cluster two is embedded within general and drama specific theory courses, and cluster three within the personal project, Process Dramaturgy, Portfolio and Theatre and Society courses[27].

There are five DLOs for the Master's programme, which focus on artistic autonomy, development of individual projects, independent research and discourse, and reflection on one's own work and the wider context of performing arts practice. These outcomes are fully integrated within the Master's project, a research-driven project incorporating theory, reflection and practice, culminating in a performed work. The graduation project consists of two units, the first focused on research and creative process and the second on the performed output of the research, in addition to which students produce a written thesis[28].

The programme's pedagogical concept is manifested within the curriculum through three learning tracks that provide students with a solid grounding in performance skills and critical thinking before progressing them toward increasingly independent (and interdependent) artistic practice. These tracks are named in the SER as "from training towards project", "from process towards result" and "from offer driven towards question driven". The first of these begins with the daily atelier-based training in the first and second year of the Bachelor's programme, wherein learning focuses on experimentation and the development of artistic process, scaffolded by skills development in areas such as voice and movement, theory courses, and "research and reflection" courses designed to bridge the gap between theory and practice, encouraging students to draw these elements together into a single integrated

[26] *KASK & Conservatorium Educational Plan*
[27] *SER,* pp.18-19
[28] *SER,* p.20

training[29]. Through this learning track students are given the confidence to move to a project-based model of training in the third year.

Students are introduced to project work during the first and second years, however the transition "from process towards result" is central to the third year, in which students develop their own projects for presentation to an external audience. This approach develops in parallel with the third learning track, "from offer driven towards question driven", which culminates in the Master's Project. The Master's Project requires students to work autonomously under the guidance of artistic and theory mentors to create a research-driven project either independently or collaboratively, which is presented publicly, often in external venues.

During the site-visit it was evident to the review team that the project-based approach to learning and teaching enables students to develop both a strong artistic voice and an independent approach to researching and developing their creative practice. However, some students felt that the transition from the teacher-led second year to the student-led third year was a shock to the system, and although support from teaching staff is available during this time, the review team concluded that more could be done to scaffold this support[30]. In discussions with the review team, programme managers indicated that they were fully aware of this and were making efforts to ensure that the transition from the training years to project work is fully supported[31]. Alumni provided a useful perspective on the importance of this transition point in the programme during the site-visit and could be invited to share this insight, and any helpful advice, with current students.

The whole programme is underpinned by a focus on students' articulation of their own artistic process, through reflection on their own experience and its relationship to broader discourse, practice and research within the field. This element is foregrounded within research and reflection classes, third year projects and the artistic master proposal[32]. Practice (of playing and making), theory (general and drama-specific) and research and reflection are increasingly integrated throughout the programme, with the later years making space for the nexus of practice and research to develop within project work. "Collective sessions" are organised throughout the Master's to provide a space for students to enter a dialogue with their peers about their developing artistic and professional practice[33].

A research-focus runs through the design of the curriculum and the programme's approach to learning and teaching. Research projects, PhDs and post-doctoral research opportunities are available to teaching staff, who are required to have a 0.3 FTE teaching load in order to maintain the connection between teaching and research, and researchers often deliver drama projects, masterclasses and Master's seminars[34]. Teachers described a feedback loop between teaching and research, including opportunities to conduct research in dialogue with students and to conduct pedagogical research[35].

Throughout the programme there is a progression from teaching to coaching and finally to mentorship. The start of the third year represents a significant shift in teaching approach, with students moving from a highly structured timetable to an independently driven learning

[29] *SER,* p.13
[30] *Meeting 4 with students*
[31] *Meeting 7 with programme managers*
[32] *SER,* p.14
[33] *SER,* p.16
[34] *SER,* p.21
[35] *Meeting 3 with teachers*

experience. They are guided through this transition by four teachers each focused on different areas, by theory and practical mentors and technical and production managers[36]. In a meeting with the review team students reported feeling disoriented as they experienced this shift into the third year and explained that they had to reach out for feedback[37]. Alumni reflected that while this stage of the programme was not easy for everyone, it was an important step towards independent working. They felt that the programme had developed in response to student feedback and that there were now more opportunities for the cohort to come back together in the third year[38].

The curriculum is developed from the bottom up in response to student and staff feedback channelled through the Training Programme Committee[39]. Due to its project-based nature and focus on the development of individual artistic practices, the programme has the flexibility to adapt to the needs and interests of each cohort of students. The student-centred approach is further facilitated by the use of guest teachers and project leaders, who are recruited in response to direct feedback from students and conversations with teaching staff about their artistic trajectories[40].

There are opportunities for students to take courses from other programmes within the School of Arts or Ghent University within their third year. In addition, drama students are encouraged to work with students from other disciplines, such as music, costume and film, on their own projects, however this is dependent on their personal connections and preferences[41]. Bachelor project weeks and Master seminars are also offered across programmes and provide opportunities for students from different programmes to interact. The SER states that students on programmes throughout the School would like to have more of these opportunities for cross-pollination and staff intend to reinstate some of the opportunities that previously existed but subsided due to the pandemic[42].

Students have numerous opportunities to present work both internally and externally throughout the programme. In the first and second years, work is shared internally with peers and from the third year onwards, project work leads to public productions either in one of KASK & Conservatorium's studios or an external theatre venue in Ghent. Master's projects are presented individually in the first instance and repeated during the GRADUATION festival, which showcases student work from across the School[43]. During the site-visit, alumni indicated that there was an issue with the amount of pressure on students during the second year, as the projects in this year were becoming more externally focused, with members of the profession keen to attend at an earlier stage[44]. The SER confirms this growing level of ambition in the first and second years and notes that third year and Master projects have become increasingly professionalised, leading to mounting pressure on resources. Where possible, the School presents Bachelor projects on campus rather than in external venues to maintain a safe space for students[45] and the programme team is considering assessing Master projects

[36] *Meeting 1 with Training Programme Committee*
[37] *Meeting 4 with students*
[38] *Meeting 6 with alumni*
[39] *SER,* p.20
[40] *Meeting 6 with alumni*
[41] *SER,* p.20
[42] *SER,* p.21
[43] *SER,* p.20
[44] *Meeting 6 with alumni*
[45] *SER,* p.22

during GRADUATION in order to reduce the number of public productions to a more manageable level[46].

A Student Affairs Office and learning track counsellors are available to provide guidance and support for students to navigate the programme, develop study skills and support individual wellbeing. Students also have ready access to their practice teachers to discuss their academic progress. Formal feedback meetings, known as 'appreciation conversations' are also embedded within the timetable[47].

The programme team indicated that the intensity of the first two years can have a negative impact on students' ability to fully digest the learning and the review team concurs that they should continue to explore ways to reduce load and implement a culture of care within the early part of the programme. The review team suggests that this could be achieved by rebalancing some of the workload across the three years of the Bachelor programme.

The review team felt that the strong ethos of research and critical reflection embedded within the programme at both Bachelor and Master levels was commendable, both in terms of the close relationship between research and pedagogy and the opportunities for self-reflection and peer feedback within the curriculum.

The programme is moving towards a stronger emphasis on collaboration and is actively exploring the possibility of giving credit for working collaboratively but students indicated that most Master students still wished to create independent work. Despite this, the review team saw evidence of students working collaboratively and was impressed by the extent to which alumni had worked together to form successful collectives. There are fewer opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration and the programme is encouraged to find ways to better integrate collaboration with students from other programmes at KASK & Conservatorium within the drama programme.

Compliance with Standard 2.1

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 2.1 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Fully compliant
Dutch Master	Fully compliant
English Master	Fully compliant

2.2 International perspectives

Standard 2.2. The programme offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international perspective.

[46] *Meeting 7 with programme managers*
[47] *SER,* p.26

The programme aligns with KASK & Conservatorium's mission to work within an international perspective in part through the presence of teaching staff who operate internationally as artists and academics. International perspectives within the curriculum stem mainly from the involvement of international guest artists, and Belgian artists who work internationally, with the delivery of projects and masterclasses.

The research and student-centred focus of the curriculum gives students the freedom to explore international practice, however the programme acknowledges that the curriculum continues to be based on a Western framework and could be more diverse[48]. The review team was advised by the Training Programme Committee that activity is underway to decolonise the curriculum within the theory department, which is working with teachers to share good practice and diversify the range of cultural and artistic contexts referenced within the programme.

In a meeting with the review team, the Training Programme Committee described how the drama programme is well connected to the Flemish theatre scene, which in itself is very international. There is a desire to preserve more classical Dutch language trajectories and some graduates go on to work in this area, however this is balanced with the influences that come from the international context in which Flemish theatre scene is situated[49].

The English Master's programme was developed with the aim of internationalising the student body and stemmed from a desire to bring in students with a more established practice and a range of international perspectives. However, due to the integration of the Bachelor and Master programmes, the drama department has found it difficult to create a bridging programme for those joining the Master's, as most teaching at Bachelor's level is in Dutch[50].

Students have opportunities to undertake Erasmus+ exchanges to gain credit in their third Bachelor year or during the Master's, and KASK & Conservatorium has established Erasmus partnerships with a number of schools across Europe.

The structure of the programme limits the opportunities for international travel due to the intensity of the curriculum and only a small number of students undertake international exchanges. The course unit 'Arts in Practice' functions as a 'mobility window' and provides an opportunity for Master students to complete an international internship[51]. There are also some international field trips embedded within the curriculum, for example annual involvement of Master's students in the *Centre National de la Danse* (CND) Camping in Paris, and some other ad hoc international projects and the programme team reported that it was considering how to strengthen its international partnerships[52].

There are few international students on the programme and only five incoming exchange students over the past five years[53], however the School does provide support with accommodation and operates a welcome programme and buddy scheme for Erasmus students[54]. A full international study guide is available in English and there is an international liaison person within each academic department, responsible for working with the international office. An induction session is also organised for all English Master's students

[48] *SER,* p.22
[49] *Meeting 1 with the Training Programme Committee*
[50] *Meeting 1 with the Training Programme Committee*
[51] *SER,* pp.23-24
[52] *Meeting 7 with programme managers*
[53] *Annex 6 outgoing and incoming students*
[54] *SER,* p.24

across the School[55]. Other arrangements to support international students, such as allowing a student to defer entry in order to learn Dutch[56] are arranged on a case by case basis. The English language courses at KASK & Conservatorium follow the same curriculum, learning, teaching and assessment arrangements as Dutch language courses, therefore the same quality assurance processes apply to all programmes and students[57].

The programme actively seeks to recruit international teaching staff and currently has five teaching staff from other western European countries, in addition to a number who are Belgian citizens but have international backgrounds. A larger number of guest teachers and international artists come to the School to lead drama projects and masterclasses[58]. This influx of guest teachers provides students with opportunities to encounter a more diverse range of practice and experience. Core teaching staff have the opportunity to undertake Erasmus+ exchanges, however as with the student body, few engage with this. As many have an active professional practice and work or have worked internationally, a degree of internationalism is embedded throughout the teaching team.

Many students make work in English and Master's students are able to take bridging modules to learn Dutch or English. Some of the collectives formed by drama programme alumni perform work in various languages and staff reported that increasing numbers of graduates were making multi-lingual work that was performed internationally[59].

The review team was pleased to hear that the theory department is actively working to diversify the curriculum and the programme is encouraged to continue with this work.

The review team recommends that the programme considers how to build a level of flexibility into the programme at both Bachelor's and Master's levels that would allow more students to participate in international exchange programmes in future.

The English language Master's programme has the potential to add international diversity to the student cohort, however the structure has made it difficult for the drama department to integrate international students wishing to join the programme. The review team was encouraged to hear that arrangements had been made for individual students to take time to learn Dutch in order to join the programme.

The review team recommends the programme to consider how other models of delivery might make it possible for international students to integrate into the drama department, given the strategic importance of internationally-oriented English language Master's programmes for the School.

Compliance with Standard 2.2

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 2.2 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level

[55] *Meeting 7 with programme managers*
[56] *Meeting 1 with the Training Programme Committee*
[57] *SER,* p.25
[58] *Annex 14 Influx guest teachers*
[59] *Meeting 1 with the Training Programme Committee*

Bachelor	Substantially compliant
Dutch Master	Substantially compliant
English Master	Substantially compliant

2.3 Assessment

Standard 2.3. Assessment methods are clearly defined and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes.

Assessment methods within the drama programme are aligned to the structure of the curriculum and the shifting pedagogic emphasis as students progress through the Bachelor and Master. All assessments are team marked throughout the programme, with the aim of reaching a consensus on standards attained. For written assignments such as the Bachelor Portfolio and the Master's Thesis at least two readers are involved in marking to ensure that the grade is not based on a single perspective[60]. The School as a whole is looking to enhance assessment and feedback practices through the 'European Learning Academy' project, which includes the development of an Evaluation Feedback Guide, a website for sharing good practice in relation to assessment rubrics and evaluation techniques, and dedicated study days on evaluation and feedback for teachers[61].

"Appreciation reports" act as a mechanism for collating and providing constructive personal feedback from all internal and external assessors throughout the Bachelor and Master programmes[62]. These reports are more frequent during the first two Bachelor years, when formative feedback is particularly critical to students' development. The review team heard that for some general theory courses it was not possible to provide extensive feedback due to the size of the groups, but that more feedback was provided for drama-specific theory, leading to some inconsistency across the programme[63]. However, alumni reported that great care was taken in the language used in feedback on assessed work[64].

Assessment methods and weightings for each unit are clearly outlined in the unit descriptions that make up the study guide for the Bachelor and Master programmes. Assessment criteria are explicitly outlined in the form of final competencies for each unit, which are aligned to the learning objectives for that unit[65]. A 20-point grading scale is used for all years, with grades below eight leading to strong advice to leave the programme and grades above 16 indicating excellent work[66]. Grading criteria follow the ECTS grading scale, developed at the European level.

During the site-visit some teachers expressed a reluctance to grade students due to the tension this created in relation to the individual creative process but confirmed that grading assessments was a national requirement[67]. Where there are external artists leading projects,

[60] *SER,* p.29
[61] *SER,* p.30
[62] *SER,* p.26
[63] *Meeting 3 with teachers*
[64] *Meeting 6 with alumni*
[65] *Drama Programme Study Guides, Bachelor and Master*
[66] *SER,* p.27
[67] *Meeting 3 with teachers*

these are assessed by them alongside the internal teaching team. Teachers confirmed that the practice of team teaching meant that the agreed mark was rarely at the top or bottom end of the scale because the final grade was the result of a negotiation between markers with slightly differing views[68]. While this may limit the range of grades used, the review team found that this approach ensures that the final grade is calibrated between markers and reduces the possibility of inconsistent approaches to marking and feedback.

Bachelor's assessment

Continuous assessment (or "permanent evaluation") is used throughout the first two years of the Bachelor, undertaken by practice teachers within the atelier context.

Open classes at the end of each atelier require students to share work with peers and teachers without the need to deliver a public performance, thereby enabling the programme to maintain the emphasis on process in the years that make up the first learning track ("from process towards project"). At this stage of the programme, formative feedback is provided through appreciation conversations, during which teachers comment on students' progress and development and students are also able to provide feedback on their learning experience. Appreciation reports are issued every semester during these years and provide individualised written feedback upon which the conversation is based[69].

Students in the first and second years are also assessed for their personal projects by the team of practice teachers. Assessment criteria focus on process rather than result, in order to encourage experimentation in line with the aims of the first learning track[70], however teachers advised the review team that they were aware of a contrast in tone between supportive formative feedback on continuous assessment and more critical feedback on project outcomes that could be difficult for students to assimilate[71]. Alumni also reported that external professionals sometimes came to watch second year performance projects, leading to an increase in emphasis on the quality of outcomes that had the potential to undermine the focus on process at this stage of students' learning trajectory[72].

In line with the second learning track "from process towards result", in the third year of the Bachelor students are assessed to a greater extent on the results of their project presentations and performances. The evaluation methods and wording of the final competencies in the Bachelor study guide reflect this change of focus through the units Drama Project I, II and III, where I and II are guided work assessed on the basis of rehearsal process and internal presentations, III independent work assessed on the final presentation[73]. The first two Drama Project units are assessed internally, whereas for the third year Drama project the internal jury is joined by one external jury member[74] and a single summative appreciation report is issued at the end of the academic year. From examples of assessment reports provided for Drama Project III, the review team determined that the assessment criteria are precisely formulated and are clearly derived from the programme's class materials and pedagogy[75]. Students

[68] *Meeting 3 with teachers*
[69] *SER,* p.26
[70] *SER,* p.26
[71] *Meeting 3 with teachers*
[72] *Meeting 6 with alumni*
[73] https://studiefiches.hogent.be/index.cfm/programme?mid=18470&opl=ABA-DRA&dep=SCH&acadyear=2022-23&lang=2
[74] *SER,* p.27
[75] *Annex 10: Evaluation Reports*

commented that, because of the move from a semesterly to a yearly report, they found it difficult to get a sense of their progress throughout the year, as they had to invite teachers to view their work if they wished to get feedback in the meantime[76].

In addition to the appreciation reports and appreciation conversations with teachers, the Bachelor programme makes extensive use of peer feedback, initially as part of Research and Reflection 1 and 2 and subsequently while creating their own projects[77]. Third year students also participate in a coached study week at Performing Arts Forum (PAF) in France, wherein they learn to reflect on their process through academic text. Students are also invited to give and receive peer to peer feedback after the performances of Drama Project III[78].

Master's assessment

The Master's project is currently divided into two units, in addition to a thesis consisting of a written critical reflection on the project. The first project unit is focused entirely on process and is assessed by the students' mentors across a range of activities and modes of assessment depending on the nature of the individual project[79]. Students receive feedback both through conversations with mentors and through the appreciation report.

The second project unit assesses the graduation performance and is evaluated by an external jury of four members with differing professional experience, who each attend the performance separately before coming together to deliberate. Jury members are provided with a manual, which outlines the assessment criteria for the project under three categories: work and research, work and artistic language, and work and the world[80]. Students have the opportunity to meet individually with the external jury and in this way gather valuable feedback from the professional field. The external jury is 'moderated' by the Master Coordinator and the internal mentors have an input into the final grade. A detailed jury report is included in the appreciation report at the end of the academic year. Alumni indicated that they appreciated the opportunity to be assessed by external jury members, who brought fresh insight and whose judgement was not clouded by pre-existing knowledge of each student's performance[81]. Those who had acted as external jury members confirmed that the assessment rules were clearly set out and created a healthy context in which to discuss the students' work[82].

As in the Bachelor, peer feedback forms a key element of the formative assessment process. The 'master weekend' provides an opportunity for Master's students to share their project proposals and their approach to peer feedback is continued through collective feedback sessions using the DasArts method as project work progresses[83].

From its discussions with staff and students, the review team concluded that appreciation conversations provide opportunities for students to both receive and give feedback and considered this dialogic approach to assessment, which continues throughout the Bachelor and Master programmes, to be an example of good practice that enables both students and staff to learn from their exchanges. The Review Team reviewed appreciation reports and feedback on projects and found these to be comprehensive, formative

[76] *Meeting 4 with students*
[77] *SER,* p.28
[78] *SER,* p.29
[79] *Annex 10: Evaluation Reports (Examples 7-9)*
[80] *Manual External Jury*
[81] *Meeting 6 with alumni*
[82] *Meeting 6 with alumni*
[83] *SER,* p.29

documents that aid students' artistic development, concluding that in general, assessment is conducted with a compassion and precision that reflects the individual learning process of each student. The extensive use of input into assessment and feedback from external professionals in the final Bachelor year and within the Master programmes is commendable as it provides current and helpful feedback from those working within the field, within a guided and structured learning environment.

The programme is considering how to embed notions of interdependence and collaboration within the assessment process in order to support its aims in this area, therefore the review team suggests that the final competencies for Bachelor and Master project units are reviewed in order to strengthen the assessment criteria associated with collaborative working.

The review team was pleased to learn that the School is currently developing evaluation and feedback guide to provide teachers with additional information about assessment principles and concepts, study days and a website to share best practice. The drama programme is encouraged to fully engage with these resources, particularly when considering how to best support Bachelor students through the change of assessment approach between study tracks 1 and 2.

It was noted that the focus in the first two years of the Bachelor is on process and the review team endorses this approach, however both students and staff felt that projects in these years were straying into the territory of public performance opportunities, placing additional pressure on students and resources. The review team recommends that the programme team establish clear boundaries for these assessments to ensure that expectations are clear for Bachelor students. Teachers are aware of the possible tension between critical and supportive feedback, particularly within the Bachelor, and the programme team is encouraged to continue to seek to address this to reach a balance that best supports Bachelor students' trajectories. In doing so teaching staff might also consider how marking schemes can be used most effectively in order to indicate a range of outcomes utilising the whole of the available scale, for example by introducing opportunities for those involved on assessment to meet to calibrate their approach to awarding marks at the upper and lower end of the grading scale.

Compliance with Standard 2.3

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 2.3 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Substantially compliant
Dutch Master	Fully compliant
English Master	Fully compliant

3. Student profiles

3.1 Admission/Entrance qualifications

Standard 3.1. There are clear criteria for student admission, based on an assessment of their artistic/academic suitability for the programme.

To gain admission to the Bachelor programme, students must hold a Belgian secondary school degree or equivalent and pass an admission test, comprising two phases. Academic and language entry requirements are clearly outlined on the School's website[84].

Phase one of the admissions test requires applicants to perform a 3-5 minute devised piece and to recite set texts provided in advance. Alumni indicated that there was little guidance provided for the devised piece but understood that this was probably deliberate as the programme aimed to attract students with a broad range of approaches and interests[85]. A selection committee comprised of teaching staff and current students assesses candidates on the basis of their potential, personality, creativity and critical thinking[86]. The admissions criteria for this phase support the programme's aim to develop a diverse range of practitioners by focusing on artistic personality, imagination and expression, and are outlined in full on the admissions pages of the website[87].

Phase two of the admission exam includes a written test and an interview focused on the applicant's motivation for joining the programme and requires them to reflect on societal, cultural and artistic issues. The applicants also participate in a workshop and undertake speech and voice tests. Criteria for this phase are focused on written and technical skills, critical thinking and teamwork[88] and are also clearly outlined on the School's website, which includes comprehensive details of the whole admissions process. Alumni reflected on this phase of the process as mirroring the first two years of training and therefore providing applicants with an insight into the student experience[89]. Current students also commented that the audition process provides an opportunity for applicants to get to know teachers and KASK's vision of theatre and performance[90]. Students completing the Bachelor's degree are automatically eligible for entry to the Master's programme. Direct entrants to the Master's programme are required to submit an application outlining their research proposal, a digital portfolio and to pass an audition with an Orientation Committee, including a 5-15 minute performance or presentation and an orientation conversation[91]. A detailed guidance document including admissions criteria, procedures and practical information is available on the School's website[92]. Most direct entrants are required to enrol in a bespoke bridging programme, designed by the Orientation Committee as part of the admissions process,

[84] https://schoolofartsgent.be/en/onderwijs/toelatingsvoorwaarden/
[85] *Meeting 6 with alumni*
[86] *SER*, p.31
[87] https://schoolofartsgent.be/en/onderwijs/toelatings-en-orienteringsproeven/academische-bachelor/drama/
[88] *SER*, p.31
[89] *Meeting 6 with alumni*
[90] *Meeting 4 with students*
[91] *SER*, p.32
[92] http://docs.Schoolofarts.be/documenten/INFO%20EN%20HANDLEIDINGEN/Admission_procedures_masters/AGL_VAVD.pdf

including a preparatory programme if the student's first degree is not considered to be fully equivalent to the KASK drama Bachelor[93]. This ensures that the applicant is able to integrate into the drama programme and to gain the knowledge and skills to succeed in the Master's project. All applicants are provided with detailed written feedback at each stage. The reports grade or comment on the applicant's performance in relation to the stated admissions criteria[94]. Alumni commented that this report enabled applicants to reapply and build on their performance at the first attempt, thereby contributing to their individual development[95].

The review team found the admissions criteria for the Bachelor's and Master's programmes to be well articulated and clearly set out for applicants on the School's website. Jury members fully utilise these criteria during the admissions test, as evidenced by the way in which feedback reports are laid out. The programme demonstrates an ethical consciousness in its engagement with applicants, for example through providing extensive individual feedback to applicants. Alumni articulated the value of the admissions process to the review team, as an opportunity to get to know teaching staff and to experience a taste of the training, enabling them to assess its suitability for themselves. The review team commends the care with which the admissions process is handled and how it ensures that successful applicants are well matched to the programme and that the majority engage and progress well. The process also contributes to the criticality and professional development of current students by inviting them to join the admissions jury.

In conversation with the review team, alumni reflected on the importance of the admissions test for creating diverse cohorts. The emphasis on potential and individual artistic personality lends itself to the recruitment of a broad range of students and leads to the creation of very different cohorts from year to year, which in turn feeds the development of the programme. For entry to the Master's programme this individual approach is supported by the creation of bespoke bridging programmes for new students, which despite creating challenges in relation to English-speaking students joining classes normally taught in Dutch, is handled with flexibility and sensitivity by the programme team.

Compliance with Standard 3.1

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 3.1 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Fully compliant
Dutch Master	Fully compliant
English Master	Fully compliant

[93] *SER,* p.32
[94] *Annex 8, examples of feedback reports*
[95] *Meeting 6 with alumni*

3.2 Student progression, achievement and employability

Standard 3.2. The programme has mechanisms to formally monitor and review the progression, achievement and subsequent employability of its students.

Students' progression throughout the programme is overseen by a trajectory jury made up of a team of teaching staff who meet to discuss each individual's progress in all elements of the programme, including theory courses, ateliers, projects and independent work[96]. Students also engage in discussions with their teachers about their progress and development as part of the "appreciation conversations" (see 2.3). Feedback on all elements of the programme is collated in the appreciation report, which is shared with students.

Progression is formally monitored by a learning track counsellor from the Student Affairs department, who monitors the number of credits completed and guides students in relation to the 'learning account' which governs the number of credits each student can take within the Flanders higher education system[97]. Study progress is also monitored by examination committees, which take action based on study advice guidance issued by the School[98]. The Quality Assurance and Educational Development department uses business information systems (BI tool and Power BI) to enable the School to monitor students' progress centrally and take action to support study progress. The Quality Assurance team confirmed that in comparison to the rest of the School, completion rates for the drama programme are high[99].

The majority of students progress well through the Bachelor, with 94% completing their registered credits and an average completion time of 3.39 years for the three-year programme. Progression through and completion of the Master's year is much slower, with an average completion time of 2.56 years[100]. This creates a challenge for the School as it receives funding per credit and therefore longer completion times lead to lower income. In order to address this the two Master's project modules have been merged to ensure that they are undertaken in the same year[101].

Other factors affecting progression within the Master's programme include students completing long internships and enrolling in high numbers of masterclasses, impacting their ability to complete theory units due to lack of time, overlapping timetables and fatigue[102]. The SER also identifies a reluctance from students to enter the professional field and aims to empower them through the introduction of the proposed organisational care learning track[103].

Students are able to gain credit for Erasmus and international exchanges during the third year of the Bachelor and the first semester of the Master. It is also possible for students to gain exemptions from course units on the basis of previous study or experience, through requests to the learning track counsellor[104].

The School surveys recent graduates (up to five years out) about their current career, however there are no other structured mechanisms in place to monitor the ongoing professional

[96] *SER*, p.32
[97] *SER,* p.33
[98] *Deliberation Approach at KASK & Conservatorium*
[99] *Meeting 2 with senior administrative/QA staff*
[100] *SER,* p.33
[101] *Meeting 2 with senior administrative/QA staff*
[102] *Meeting 3 with teachers*
[103] *SER,* p.34
[104] *SER,* p.33

activities of alumni. Informally, the programme team follows the careers of their graduates and encounters their work at festivals such as Theater Aan Zee, Love at First Sight and Het Theater festival and can point to a strong alumni profile[105]. The School keeps in touch with alumni through newsletters and social media and a number return as guest teachers.

The alumni survey undertaken by the School indicates that over 90% of respondents were employed within the arts within a year of graduation, from a total of 23 respondents[106]. The programme team is aware of the tension between their focus on the creative process, the competitive nature of the professional field and the funding challenges for graduates. In response the programme attempts to foreground the breadth of creative career opportunities available[107]. Professionals described graduates of the drama programme as sharp, able to reflect on their work and receive feedback, and possessing a real sense of agency that means they are taken seriously by professional peers[108].

Students are encouraged to undertake different types of roles throughout their studies and this is reflected in the range of broad artistic and professional profiles held by alumni, including documentary theatre making, acting, witing and visual arts. The group of alumni who met with the review team typically had portfolio careers including roles as writers, performers, theatre makers, dramaturgs, film and theatre actors and teachers. They described a fairly easy transition into the profession, as most already had work lined up as a result of interest from the profession during their studies. Despite these connections, alumni felt that they could have been better prepared to deal with the practicalities of becoming a freelance artist, for example applying for funding grants and were keen to have the opportunity to provide practical advice to those about to graduate[109]. The programme aims to embed more of this content into its proposed organisational care learning track.

Professionals indicated that the programme prepared students to take on a wide range of roles in different work fields and to wear different hats within different contexts, from film, theatre and journalism, through to social and community contexts. Recent graduates of the drama programme are considered to be particularly strong in physical theatre and critical writing, and many are present in collectives, which are central to the theatre landscape in Flanders[110]. Due to the range of roles undertaken by graduates, including those who met with the review team during the site visit, their contribution to cultural life in Ghent, Flanders and beyond is significant. The Training Committee described how some play a role in sustaining and progressing Dutch classical theatre whereas others push boundaries through experimental work. Many make work in English or without spoken language, which reaches across national boundaries. Collectives often perform in multiple languages and many of those formed by the programme's alumni have been successful internationally[111]. The programme's focus on artistic research also provides the context in which students can shape the future development of dramatic art practice.

The programme has established a Professional Field Committee (or *Resonance Commission*) which meets once a year to discuss the programme and gather feedback on its relevance for current practitioners. Employers and professionals are invited to view student performances

[105] *SER,* p.33
[106] *Annex 11, Numbers regarding employability of alumni*
[107] *SER,* p. 34
[108] *Meeting 5 with industry professionals*
[109] *Meeting 6 with alumni*
[110] *Meeting 5 with Industry professionals*
[111] *Meeting 1 with Training Programme Committee*

and feel able to give feedback to the programme team. Others sit on evaluation juries and are able to comment directly on the quality of students' work. The members of the professional field who met with the review team felt that the programme was receptive to their feedback and pointed to the involvement of alumni in discussions about further embedding support for completing funding applications within the curriculum as an example of this[112].

Based on the abovementioned findings, the review team considers that the drama programme prepares its graduates for a wide range of careers in drama and the creative and performing arts more widely due to its individual focus and broad scope. The review team was particularly impressed by the number of collectives formed by programme alumni, the impact that these have had on the performing arts ecology and their importance to the professional field.

The review team commends that way in which alumni and professionals act as critical friends to the programme team, which is receptive to feedback and capitalises on this engagement to ensure that the programme remains relevant and that graduates are prepared for the realities of working life. The review team found the involvement of professionals and alumni on juries and the number of public performances embedded within the final Bachelor year and the Master to be an example of good practice, which leads to notable permeability between the programme and the professional field.

The review team encourages the programme to continue with its plans to re-establish the alumni feedback committee in order to formalise opportunities for graduate input into the development of the programme.

The review team is encouraged that the programme is exploring ways of expediting the timely completion of Master's students but recommends that efforts to ensure that these students complete within expected timeframes are prioritised, including finalising the restructure of the Master's project units.

Compliance with Standard 3.2

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 3.2. as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Fully compliant
Dutch Master	Substantially compliant
English Master	Substantially compliant

[112] *Meeting 5 with industry professionals*

4. Teaching staff

4.1 Staff qualifications and professional activity

Standard 4.1. Members of the teaching staff are qualified for their role and are active as artists/pedagogues/researchers.

The Flanders region has in place set requirements for tenured teaching positions in higher education, which requires a Master's degree[113] for all artistic teaching positions and a PhD for lecturer positions. The programme focuses on recruiting teachers who are active as artists and professionals in the field as this link is key to the ongoing development of the teaching team.

The programme engages teaching staff on a range of different contracts, including engagement of those with government recognised artist status on a short term or freelance basis[114]. The majority of permanent teaching staff have active artistic careers in a range of roles including actors, writers, directors, performing artists, dramaturgs, writers, critics, dancers and choreographers[115]. This strong connection to the working field, complemented by the use of prominent guest teachers, enables the programme to remain adaptable and retain its currency.

Continuing professional development is supported by training courses offered by HOGENT. The SER highlights that KASK & Conservatorium has identified a need to add further development opportunities specifically for teachers in artistic disciplines, including specialist pedagogical study days[116] and the review team found this to be a positive step towards enhancing support for pedagogical development. Teachers have also requested additional training to support them to develop inclusive teaching practice and the programme is working to put courses on neurodiversity and bystander training in place, in addition to developing a range of resources based on the Nomadic School of Art project. The quality assurance team works to identify staff development needs that can be addressed centrally across the School through attendance at the different Training Programme Committees[117].

Artistic and pedagogical research is supported by the provision of short and long-term research project opportunities for teaching staff. The mandated allocation of teaching hours to research staff further strengthens the links between research and pedagogy. The review team met teachers from the programme who were undertaking funded research projects and described their approach to researching through their teaching practice and in dialogue with other teachers. The programme has a budget for research activities that can be used to engage artists for short projects where desired[118]. The School allows a great deal of flexibility

[113] In exceptional cases, the university board may appoint a part-time member of independent academic staff on the basis of exceptional scientific merit or specific expertise (*Higher Education CODEX Article V.20.)*
[114] *Meeting 3 with teachers*
[115] *SER,* p.36
[116] *SER,* p.35
[117] *Meeting 7 with senior managers*
[118] *Meeting 3 with teaching staff*

in teaching staff contracts, which enables individuals to continue to develop their artistic practice and incorporate this into their teaching.

A review process is in place, which requires teachers to complete a self-evaluation exercise every 3-5 years including a form and a conversation with their head of department. Any required improvements are identified and monitored through this process[119]. Teaching teams also meet regularly to reflect on their practice and appreciation conversations provide an opportunity for them to receive feedback directly from students.

As part of their contractual obligations, all teaching staff with a contract of at least 0.25 FTE are required to undertake a number of supporting activities, such as involvement with student recruitment, open days, induction, juries and masterclasses. Some teachers sit on the Training Programme Committee or other School committees, such as the Board of KASK & Conservatorium[120].

During the site-visit, the review team identified a strong connection between the profession, teaching and research which informs the continuous development of the drama programme. The reflective capacity of the programme team is reflected in the SER, which is critical and identifies a number of areas for further development. This ability and willingness to reflect also emerged strongly during meetings with teaching staff. The integration of teaching and research is supported by the requirement for researchers to teach and by the availability of research grants for teaching staff. However, teaching staff spoke of a much broader and richer range of research activities than those recorded centrally by the School. The review team suggests that the programme explores ways to connect the research culture within the programme with the School's infrastructure for supporting and promoting research. Indeed, the programme should celebrate its efforts in this area and find a way to highlight the internal artistic and research activities within the greater context of HOGENT.

While a number of professional development activities are available through HOGENT, these appear to be focused on managerial and technical skills and more could be done to support the specific development needs of teaching staff. The programme has already identified a number of areas in which it could enhance its development offer, particularly in relation to developing diverse, inclusive and accessible teaching practices. The Nomadic School of Art produced some rich material in this area that is currently being captured and developed by the School. The programme may contribute to the School's efforts to ensure that the learning from the Nomadic School of Art is preserved and use this resource to inform the introduction of different social contexts within the curriculum.

Compliance with Standard 4.1

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 4.1 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Fully compliant

[119] *SER,* p. 35
[120] *SER,* pp.35-36

Dutch Master	Fully compliant
English Master	Fully compliant

4.2 Size and composition of the teaching staff body

Standard 4.2. There are sufficient qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the programme.

The programme has a core team of teachers with substantial appointments, a wider team of those who contribute to teaching on smaller fractional contracts and a larger pool of guest teachers who mainly lead projects or deliver masterclasses and workshops. Each category of teaching staff brings particular strengths and advantages to the programme in terms of their teaching experience and artistic diversity. In 2022-23 the headcount of the teaching team was 46, 27 of whom were on permanent contracts, amounting to 11.12 FTE[121].

In reviewing its student numbers six years ago, the programme considered the maximum number of students it could accommodate within its teaching staff resources and has maintained that number. This led to an increase cohort size to the current intake of around 16 new undergraduate students per year and therefore to an increase in teaching staff workload[122]. Project work has been a particular challenge, however the staffing model allows for short term recruitment of guest teachers to address gaps in both resourcing and the curriculum[123].

The majority of staff within the teaching team are employed less than 0.5 FTE, enabling these teachers to continue to pursue their own practice as theatre makers, performers, dramaturges, writers and in other creative roles. This ongoing professional experience and artistic development, alongside the use of guest teachers, creates an adaptable learning environment and a curriculum that reflects the changing nature of the performing arts landscape. The research opportunities outlined above also enable teachers to explore their artistic and pedagogic practice in relation to the wider field in which their work is situated. The School aims to have a number of returning guest teachers contributing to the same course unit each year, which embeds a sense of continuity while maintaining strong professional links[124].

The first two years of the programme are taught largely by a fixed team of teacher-practitioners, supporting delivery of the core training in these years, whereas from the third year greater use is made of visiting staff from a range of backgrounds and disciplines. This exposure to diverse and distinctive artistic practices supports the programme's focus on interdisciplinarity and the development of individual students' artistic trajectory. The programme has expressed a desire to create more opportunities for young artists and recent graduates to teach on the programme and thereby contribute to its currency[125].

[121] *Annex 13 Teaching Staff*
[122] *Meeting 7 with senior managers*
[123] *SER,* p.36
[124] *SER,* p.36
[125] *SER,* p.37

The programme is conscious of the need to diversify its teaching team and guest teachers are often used to bring different backgrounds and lived experiences that contribute to the decolonisation of the curriculum. There is an ongoing aim to achieve more representation amongst the permanent staff team and the School has recently initiated a series of workshops to evaluate the inclusivity of its recruitment practices. An agile approach to recruitment is helpful in this regard but makes staffing difficult to manage as it is necessary to work around the availability of individual artists each year[126].

The review team found that recruitment policies applied to the programme support its student-centred approach and desire to maintain relevance and currency and that the number of teachers employed is adequate for the delivery of the curriculum. The way in which the programme cultivates ties with a diverse range of guest teachers and the ability to draw on this diverse range of contributors to respond quickly to individual students' needs and interests is commendable. However, it was evident from meetings with staff and students that there are some challenges for the programme team in maintaining continuity due to the number of teachers on small contracts who may prioritise their other professional activities over their small teaching allocation, leading to increased pressure on the core team.

The desire to diversify the teaching staff and support the decolonisation of the curriculum was strongly articulated as a priority for the team throughout the site-visit. Training for existing staff to enable them to make their teaching accessible to students from different backgrounds and with different disabilities was also highlighted to the review team. The review team suggests the programme to continue working to decolonise the curriculum to bring more diverse teachers onto permanent contracts as opportunities arise, so that the different backgrounds and perspectives currently contributed by guest teachers are embedded within the core of the programme.

Compliance with Standard 4.2

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 4.2 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Fully compliant
Dutch Master	Fully compliant
English Master	Fully compliant

[126] *Meeting 7 with programme managers*

5. Facilities, resources and support

5.1 Facilities

Standard 5.1. The institution has appropriate resources to support student learning and delivery of the programme.

The drama programme has at its disposal four studios on the Bijloke campus of KASK & Conservatorium. During the site-visit the review team was able to view activities taking place within the studio spaces allocated to the programme and to experience the other facilities on campus. All studios have some lighting and sound capability and can be darkened, and three have sprung floors to accommodate dance and movement. The programme provides basic light and sound equipment for student use and additional equipment can be borrowed from other departments within the School. There is also a small budget to hire equipment from external companies[127]. A drama salon provides a combined space for meeting, socialising and studying.

During the site-visit both staff and students articulated difficulties with the limited space available on campus. Students expressed a need for more studios, more technical support and more facilities for scenography[128]. The existing space is used almost entirely for the training elements of the programme in years one and two. All other activities, including drama projects, masterclasses and Master's projects are presented in hired external venues, which makes coordination burdensome. Increased cohort size has put further pressure on studio spaces and there are no suitable spaces for public performances on site. In order to resolve these issues the School plans to build a new Drama Cluster, to include a theatre space and rehearsal studios suitable for Bachelor's and Master's projects.

The Training Programme Committee reported that the Drama Cluster had been in discussion for 15 years and although the budget has been allocated since 2018, the project has been delayed due to legal and infrastructural issues associated with the listed status of the buildings[129]. Final decisions about infrastructure rest with the Board of HOGENT[130]. The plans for the new building have been developed in collaboration with the drama programme to address its infrastructure needs and provide multi-functional spaces that will be able to accommodate the majority of activities currently taking place off-campus.

Students on the drama programme have access to two libraries within KASK & Conservatorium; an art library and a music library. Students and teachers are able to request additions to the physical collection and a digital library provides access to international databases of literature, recordings and other resources. The programme is supported by a range of digital systems including an intranet, Chamilo VLE and ASIMUT timetabling software.

The review team found that the space and technical resources currently in place are sufficient for the delivery of the training elements of the programme, however there are no theatre facilities on site that enable students to present work in something approaching a professional context.

[127] *SER,* p.38
[128] *Meeting 4 with students*
[129] *Meeting 1 with Training Programme Committee*
[130] *Meeting 7 with senior managers*

The use of external theatre spaces for some Bachelor's and all Master's projects may be beneficial in terms of partnerships with the venues and connections with the profession, however the programme lacks control over these spaces and coordinating external hires creates logistical issues. Technical equipment and scenography facilities are limited and students have very small budgets with which to produce their projects, however this contributes to their distinctive aesthetic and encourages students to make the most of the resources they have.

The review team concluded that the combination of internal spaces and externally hired facilities are fit for purpose but for the size and structure of the programme, more specialist facilities would be beneficial. The Drama Cluster will be critical to ensuring that the infrastructure is in place to support the programme in the long term and will be of utmost importance should the School consider expanding the Master's programme (for example by recruiting more students to the English language programme). Therefore, the programme should seek to acquire more specialist spaces and facilities, either through the realisation of the Drama Cluster, or by other means, such as securing the purchase or long-term hire of dedicated spaces elsewhere in the city.

Compliance with Standard 5.1

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 5.1 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Substantially compliant
Dutch Master	Substantially compliant
English Master	Substantially compliant

5.2 Financial resources

Standard 5.2. The institution's financial resources enable successful delivery of the programme.

Funding for KASK & Conservatorium comes almost entirely (93%) from the Flemish government and is determined on the basis of a funding formula based on the programme's recent performance in terms of credits and degree awards completed by students. Funding is distributed across subject areas and in the case of drama, there are four programmes in the region sharing a closed envelope of funds. If one of these programmes grows, the funding for the others is reduced. The Review Team was informed that the School modelled different cohort sizes for the drama programme in an exercise six years ago, which determined that 16-17 students was the optimum size with the resources and infrastructure available[131]. Due

[131] *Meeting 7 with senior management staff*

to the current financial challenges brought about by inflation and rising energy costs, the real terms value of government subsidies has decreased in recent years and the School's reduced income has meant that the drama department is facing budget cuts in order to remain financially viable[132]. There are few opportunities for the programme to increase its budget, as the School is unable to invest in additional staffing to facilitate new collaborative projects that have the potential to generate income[133].

The School has a limited allocation of fully funded credits and aims to balance this internally across programmes[134]. The total budget of 27.7 million euros in 2023 is divided between staff, infrastructure, working budget equipment and investments as approved by the Board of KASK & Conservatorium[135]. A budget for teaching staff, equipment and other delivery costs is allocated to each department based on need. The drama programme has a budget of around €10,000 per year for ongoing investments in areas such as lighting, sound and video equipment, however major investments requiring Board approval were paused for 2023 due to financial constraints[136].

In the face of budget cuts, the programme is undertaking a budget control exercise to safeguard its financial sustainability, in line with the whole of KASK & Conservatorium and University College Ghent. This has provided an opportunity to consider how to streamline the curriculum and reduce the load on staff and students. Some overlap between discipline-specific and general theory courses has been identified and there is drive towards the latter, however as drama theory is currently a strength of the programme this has the potential to diminish the curriculum[137]. Other strategies to reduce costs include shortening the time taken for students to graduate, particularly on the Master's programme, and reducing the number of public performances. As outlined in Standard 2.1 the programme is considering evaluating Master's projects during the GRADUATION festival, reducing the need for additional performances earlier in the year.

The financial situation in which the School finds itself has the potential to impact the sustainability and future development of the drama programme. However, the programme team is taking a proactive approach to reducing costs and making efficiencies in the way in which it delivers the programme, and is approaching the need to make cost reductions as an opportunity to consider how to do less better, and to reduce pressure on students and staff.

Steps have already been taken to reduce the length of time that students spend on the Master programme and therefore the cost to the School. It was encouraging to see how the programme is actively considering other ways to reduce costs, for example by combining Master's juries with the GRADUATION festival. However, the review team felt strongly that in order to continue to deliver the programme to the current high standards, the School will need to focus its efforts on advocating for reforms to the current funding system, which in its current state will inevitably lead to further real terms budget reductions over the coming years.

[132] *SER,* p.40
[133] *Meeting 2 with administrative and QA staff*
[134] *Meeting 7 with senior management staff*
[135] *SER,* p.39
[136] *SER,* p.40
[137] *Meeting 1 with the Training Programme Committee*

Compliance with Standard 5.2

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 5.2 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Substantially compliant
Dutch Master	Substantially compliant
English Master	Substantially compliant

5.3 Support staff

Standard 5.3. The programme has sufficient qualified support staff.

Administration and daily management of the programme is largely undertaken by the Bachelor Coordinators (0.6 FTE) and Master Coordinator (0.25 FTE), who organise classes, guest teachers, masterclasses, projects and assessments alongside their teaching allocation. There is no separate non-academic administrative role dedicated solely to supporting the organisation of the programme and the Training Programme Committee indicated that there is significant strain on the coordinator roles, particularly as the production load continues to grow[138].

A single Technical and Production Leader coordinates all technical aspects of classes. Drama and Master projects for the drama programme and both staff and students reported during the site-visit that this role was overloaded. The Review Team learnt that the programme is considering how it might configure projects differently in order to reduce the level of production support required but is mindful of the impact this will have on the student experience. If productions are not reduced, additional technical support will be required and, in the past, the programme has been able to take in interns from production courses at other institutions in order to assist[139].

The review team was informed that students are also supported by centralised services provided by the Deanery and Counselling team. The counselling services available to students are appropriately resourced and able to respond to key issues, for example gender identity, raised by individual students and cohorts of students. Student and learning track counsellors are introduced to students at the start of the programme and provide personal, practical and study skills support. Specialist psychological support and financial advice are also available through these services. Students can self-refer but are often signposted to Counselling or Student Affairs by their teachers[140]. Information about counselling services is

[138] *Meeting 1 with the Training Programme Committee*
[139] *Meeting 7 with senior management staff*
[140] *Meeting 2 with administrative and QA staff*

made available to students through Chamilo (the School's VLE), where they can also find online resources relating to study skills[141].

Other administrative and professional support services, including human resources, finance, research, quality assurance, communications, ombuds persons, libraries, infrastructure and catering are provided centrally within the School. The administrative and technical staff body comprises 65 FTE, 23% of the total staff body within the School[142]. Students indicated that the ombuds person was very visible and proactive in helping them to resolve issues[143].

A consistent approach to professional development applies across academic and administrative and technical roles, with development opportunities tailored to individual needs. All staff can access the range of training courses organised by HOGENT, including IT, management, wellbeing and communication courses[144].

The review team found student wellbeing and learning support to be adequately resourced through the School's central support services. The availability of individual study skills guidance aligns with and sustains the student-led nature of the drama programme.

Within the programme itself, organisational support is minimal, with fractional Bachelor's and Master's coordinators responsible for a wide range of organisational responsibilities in addition to their teaching allocation. There is a considerable burden associated with the organisation of numerous guest teachers, public performances and external venues, and this should be monitored to ensure that the small programme team is able to continue to manage these areas within its limited capacity.

Technical support for the programme, while of a good standard, is particularly under resourced, with only one devoted member of staff for all project and production work. The review team discussed the possibilities of routinely engaging production students to undertake some of this work, a practice that has previously operated on an ad hoc basis. It is recommended that the programme continues to explore opportunities to partner with other institutions to increase the provision of technical support.

Compliance with Standard 5.3

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 5.3 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Substantially compliant
Dutch Master	Substantially compliant
English Master	Substantially compliant

[141] *SER,* p.41
[142] *SER,* p.41
[143] *Meeting 4 with students*
[144] *SER,* p,41

6. Communication, organisation and decision-making

6.1 Internal communication process

Standard 6.1. Effective mechanisms are in place for internal communication within the programme.

The programme makes use of both face-to-face meetings and digital platforms provided by KASK & Conservatorium and HOGENT for communication between staff and between staff and students. This includes HOGENT email accounts, Chamilo VLE, iBaMaFlex student records system, ASIMUT timetabling system, Microsoft Teams and the HOGENT intranet. The School also has an established staff intranet with a student intranet currently in development. News and information are also shared for both internal and external purposes on the School's website and Facebook page, in addition to which internal newsletters for staff and students are circulated by email. The educational portfolio on the website includes programme information including the results of surveys and other feedback mechanisms and details of action taken in response[145]. In addition, a Master's guide is produced, which acts as a handbook for the programme including information about deadlines, assessment and criteria for each course unit[146].

For the drama programme with its intensive schedule and small staff and student body, the majority of communication occurs face to face. In the first and second years, community sessions provide an opportunity for students and teachers to meet to discuss pertinent topics. Students indicated that they found these sessions to be a useful development and informed the review team that they feel comfortable approaching the programme coordinators to provide feedback and can have one-to-one conversations with teachers after classes[147]. Some teachers embed 'closure talks' within their teaching, however this is not yet standard practice due to the number of guest teachers working within the programme[148].

Where there are fewer opportunities for students to make contact with teachers in the third year and the Master, additional opportunities for discussion are scheduled. These include talks after each Drama Project and regular collective sessions for MA students. Outside of these sessions, communication in these years is largely led by students, who are responsible for inviting teachers and mentors to view their work, however the teaching staff regularly discuss students' progress and intervene where there has been no contact for an extended period of time[149]. The programme intends to reinstate further opportunities for meeting and reflection such as reading clubs and to develop 'deep democracy' exercises within the proposed new 'organisational care' learning track[150].

Most communication with part-time and guest teachers relating to course content, practical information, ateliers and masterclasses is channelled through the Bachelor's and Master's Coordinators for the programme[151]. Until recently, guest teachers only had a HOGENT email account for the time that they were on site, however the programme has now negotiated longer

[145] *SER,* p.42
[146] *SER,* p.43
[147] *Meeting 4 with students*
[148] *SER,* p.43
[149] *Meeting 7 with senior management staff*
[150] *SER,* p.43
[151] *SER,* p.42

term access, renewed on an annual basis, to ensure that they have continued access to internal systems. Guest teachers are also provided with support to forward HOGENT emails to their personal accounts to ensure that communications reach them[152].

The effectiveness of the communication systems used by the programme and School is monitored through meetings with the Student Affairs team and through responses to quality assurance questionnaires, however not many students complete these[153]. Guidance documents and a helpdesk are provided to ensure that staff and students are supported to use online communication platforms. In order to ensure that the VLE remains effective and fit for purpose, HOGENT holds a maintenance focus group attended by a representative from KASK & Conservatorium[154].

The review team concluded that there are appropriate and effective channels of communication in operation and that students know who to approach outside of the immediate programme team should they have an issue with the programme that they are unable to discuss internally. Detailed programme information is available online and the educational portfolio provides a transparent mechanism for students and staff to view feedback on the programme and understand how this is being addressed.

During the site-visit it was evident to the review team that there is a high level of trust between students and staff and the senior staff within the programme are readily accessible to students. Third year Bachelor students expressed a need for more communication with teachers and with each other, but acknowledged the usefulness of community sessions for them to discuss the programme in general.

The review team considers that there are good opportunities for students and teaching staff to discuss their experiences and provide feedback, particularly where 'closing sessions' are embedded in teaching. The programme may wish to consider providing additional guidance to guest teachers on adopting this practice at all levels, in order to respond to feedback from students requesting more opportunities to reflect on projects.

The COVID-19 pandemic had an impact on face-to-face communication and brought a number of extra-curricular activities to a halt that had provided less formal opportunities for staff and students to interact with each other. The review team encourages the programme to reinstate these opportunities as planned, within the organisational care track.

Compliance with Standard 6.1

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 6.1 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Fully compliant
Dutch Master	Fully compliant
English Master	Fully compliant

[152] *Meeting 7 with senior management staff*
[153] *Meeting 4 with students*
[154] *SER,* p.42

6.2 Organisational structure and decision-making processes

Standard 6.2 The programme is supported by an appropriate organisational structure and decision-making processes.

Governance oversight at the programme level sits with the Training Programme Committee (TPC), membership of which comprises teaching staff and students, who make up a third of its membership. Meetings are also attended by quality assurance and learning track counselling staff, establishing a mechanism for these teams to identify needs at the programme level. The TPC meets every six weeks and is responsible for recommending programme changes to the Board of KASK & Conservatorium, reporting through the School's Educational Council. The Chair of the TPC is a member of the Educational Council, chaired by the Dean, and representatives of the drama programme are members of the Research Board[155].

Parallel to the Educational Council is a Department Chairs Council, under which sits a number of Department Councils. Those relevant to the drama programme are the Department Council for Film, Photography and Drama and the Department Council for Theory of Art Practices. The Department Councils meet every month and have oversight of operational areas including teaching and technical staff, infrastructure, planning, research, investments and finances[156]. The TPC and Department Councils therefore have clearly defined responsibilities and work closely together to manage all aspects of the drama programme. TPC Chairs (who act as programme leaders) and heads of departments (who oversee a particular academic discipline or disciplines) come together with coordinators of the deanery offices to discuss overarching themes at regular Base Meetings[157].

The review team noted that students have a range of opportunities to contribute to decision-making processes, either by discussing issues in community sessions, or through student representative roles on boards and committees at various levels of the organisation[158]. Drama programme students have established DRAG, a student representative organisation that organises events and supports public performances. DRAG acts as a key channel of communication between staff and students, and discussed issues at its meetings which are then referred to the TPC. The drama programme is the only programme in the School with an active student council and the TPC has recently strengthened its connections with DRAG by meeting to discuss student feedback[159].

Based on all evidence collected during the site-visit and through the documentation received, the review team confidently concludes that the organisational structure and decision-making responsibilities within the School and the programme are well defined and clearly differentiated. The Training Programme Committee and Department Councils have specific remits for academic and operational management respectively, and effective mechanisms are provided for these bodies to work together to deliver the programme as a

[155] *SER,* p.44-45
[156] *Annex 1 Organigram KASK & Conservatorium*
[157] *SER,* p.45
[158] *Meeting 4 with students*
[159] *Meeting 7 with senior management staff*

whole. The prominence of student members within the Training Programme Committee is an example of good practice, which ensures that decisions about the curriculum are taken with high regard for the developmental needs and interests of current students.

The drama programme has a particularly active student body and the programme team has nurtured the development of DRAG by providing opportunities for it to contribute to the programme's organisation and management. The programme is encouraged to continue its efforts to ensure that the DRAG initiative is sustained and that the Training Programme Committee continues to engage with this group. Further, the programme may wish to consider how conversations between these bodies can be formally captured in programme action plans.

Compliance with Standard 6.2

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 6.2 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Fully compliant
Dutch Master	Fully compliant
English Master	Fully compliant

7. Internal quality culture

Standard 7. The programme has in place effective quality assurance and enhancement procedures.

The programme operates within the quality assurance framework implemented by HOGENT and the Quality Enhancement Plan developed by KASK & Conservatorium. Reference points for quality assurance include the domain-specific learning outcomes (DLOs) and the School's educational plan (see standard 1). Teachers are encouraged to take ownership of quality processes and the short lines of communication between staff and students means that feedback and enhancement actions can be communicated in real time[160].

Formal quality assurance mechanisms in use by the School include student data analysis (admissions, progression and graduation data), feedback from the professional field, programme action plans, annual student surveys, quinquennial graduate surveys, exchange student surveys, applicant surveys and tailored focus groups[161]. Students reported that not many of them respond to online surveys as they feel some of the questions are not applicable to them and therefore find it difficult to answer, however most felt able to share their feedback directly with the programme team face-to-face or through representation on boards and committees[162]. The programme team acknowledges that students would like additional information about what happens in response to their feedback and the quality assurance office has conducted a survey to investigate students' preferences for communication. Some students indicated a need for more anonymous feedback mechanisms and in 2022, the School implemented *Suggestionox*, an online reporting system that allows for anonymous communication while ensuring that issues are followed up[163].

Data from general student surveys are sent to the TPC, which shares them with the student body through meetings with DRAG[164]. Actions arising from student feedback and other QA mechanisms are gathered in a two-year action plan covering a range of key areas[165]. The output of all QA instruments is published in the educational portfolio along with information about learning outcomes and action plans. The portfolio has recently been added to the student intranet and is signposted in calls for feedback, however work is still underway to publicise its availability to the student and staff bodies[166].

The drama programme values input from the professional field as a measure of its quality, through participation in juries, internships, research, guest teaching and through the Professional Field Committee, which is made up of professional experts and alumni, organised by the Chair of the TPC. The Professional Field Committee is consulted as an advisory body about employability, the profile of the programme, links with the industry and other relevant

[160] *Meeting 7 with senior management staff*
[161] *SER,* pp.45-46, *Meeting 7 with senior management staff*
[162] *Meeting 4 with students*
[163] *SER,* p.47
[164] *Meeting 7 with senior management staff*
[165] *Annex 16 Action plan Drama 2022-23*
[166] *SER,* p.47

matters[167]. Drama also gathers input from an additional Alumni Field Committee and is the only department in the School to have such a committee[168]

The programme undergoes periodic external review (such as this review by MusiQuE), for which the programme team writes a self-evaluation. The results are discussed at various levels from the Chair of TPC to the management of HOGENT. Quality assurance processes are internally audited under the scrutiny of the HOGENT Audit Committee and are monitored through institutional review exercises[169].

The drama programme has a strong quality culture with a high-level of self-reflection and a responsiveness to feedback from different stakeholders. As the chains of communication are short, teachers gather ongoing feedback from students and peers which is used for the continuous enhancement of the programme. The School has robust and transparent quality assurance processes in place and the review team found the programme not only to be fully engaged with these mechanisms, but to go further through initiatives such as the Professional Field Committee.

Anonymous feedback mechanisms are maintained alongside focus groups, and the Training Programme Committee monitors the performance of the Bachelor's and Master's programmes in relation to the educational plan and its own action plans using these and a range of other mechanisms, supported by the Quality Assurance department. In light of comments from students, the review team concluded that additional useful data could be captured if surveys were more relevant and the Training Programme Committee is encouraged to use drama-specific surveys or similar feedback mechanisms to facilitate the collection of anonymous feedback from students and alumni.

The educational portfolio is an excellent resource indicative of a transparent and committed approach to quality assurance within the School. Further work is needed to improve the visibility of the educational portfolio for students and to maximise its potential as a source of key information on the programme, however this is a recent development and a communication strategy is already underway using the VLE and other systems to signpost.

Compliance with Standard 7

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 7 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Fully compliant
Dutch Master	Fully compliant
English Master	Fully compliant

[167] *SER,* p.46
[168] *Meeting 7 with senior management staff*
[169] *SER,* p.46

8. Public interaction

8.1 Cultural, artistic and educational contexts

Standard 8.1. The programme engages within wider cultural, artistic and educational contexts.

In line with its educational vision, the drama programme aims to create artistic communities that include collaboration and caretaking, and to nurture artists who can make contributions to society[170]. Engagement with and reflection on public discourse and cultural issues is embedded in courses such as Research and Reflection, Portfolio and Theatre and Society and Arts in Practice. Staff and students regularly contribute to arts publications such as *Rekto:Verso*[171] and *Etcetera*[172], and a number of alumni are active as writers and editors of journals that include cultural commentary[173].

The programme makes a major contribution to its immediate cultural context due to the number of performances produced each year at venues around Ghent, which attract external audiences and industry professionals. The annual GRADUATION festival is a high profile event comprising a film festival, concerts, arts exhibitions, a fashion show and a drama festival, supported by a major communications campaign[174]. Such events enable students to make professional connections and to shape the local artistic landscape.

After graduating, many drama programme alumni contribute to Flemish festivals focused on 'young work' that provide professional exposure and enable them to impact the development of performing arts within the region. KASK drama graduates have been particularly successful in forming innovative collectives that blur the boundaries between making and playing and therefore inject the ethos of the programme into the evolution of performing arts in the region[175].

The review team was pleased to see how the programme prepares its students to make a social and cultural impact through its involvement in initiatives such as the Nomadic School of Arts. The School is building on this project to create a range of resources to support innovative teaching methods that foreground inclusion and nomadic teaching in a range of social contexts. There are some limited opportunities within the programme for students to move outside of the School and link their work directly with broader social contexts, for example excursions to arts centres and theatres as part of the Theatre and Society course, and collaborations with youth organisations[176].

Some of the recent projects taking place within the School, such as a recent project on the Boarder Policy of the European Union with Thomas Bellinck, engage with current social issues and have a broad impact on students even if not participating directly[177]. The drama

[170] *Meeting 1 with Training Programme Committee*
[171] https://www.rektoverso.be/
[172] https://e-tcetera.be/
[173] *SER,* p.48, *Meeting 6 with alumni*
[174] *SER,* p.48
[175] *SER,* p.49
[176] *Meeting 3 with teachers*
[177] *Meeting 1 with the Training Programme Committee*

department has also established partnerships with Jong Gewei and *de nieuwe spelers*, through which it aims to reach a range of underrepresented groups and to make drama accessible to young people from all backgrounds[178].

Students from the drama programme and other KASK programmes take part in the annual *Mayday Mayday festival* alongside students from the other Flemish art schools; Royal Conservatorium Antwerpen, LUCA, RITCS, Toneelacademie Maastricht. The festival is hosted by CAMPO arts centre in Ghent and provides an opportunity for students from across the region to collaborate and make work together[179].

The review team was impressed by the extent to which graduates of the drama programme feed the development of the performing arts scene in Flanders. The success of alumni in creating collectives and collaborative work demonstrates how the broad profile of the programme and its approach to training students to undertake a range of different roles is having an impact on the performing arts scene nationally and internationally. The performances staged as part of the programme attract public and professional audiences and make their own contribution to the local arts scene.

Initiatives such as the Nomadic School of Art have enabled learning and teaching on the programme to connect with different communities and environments and to provide an impetus to work towards inclusive practices. However, as NSA has now concluded and opportunities to undertake site-specific or community-based work are limited, the programme may wish to explore how to embed further opportunities for students to make work in different social contexts within the programme's curriculum.

Compliance with Standard 8.1

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 8.1 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Fully compliant
Dutch Master	Fully compliant
English Master	Fully compliant

8.2 Interaction with the artistic professions

Standard 8.2. The programme actively promotes links with various sectors of the drama and other artistic professions.

As outlined in standard 4.2 the programme establishes a broad network of links with the profession through its teaching staff, the majority of whom are employed on fractional contracts and spend much of their time as working artists. Staff are supported to undertake external projects and other professional work by the flexibility of the School's contractual

[178] *SER,* p.48
[179] https://www.campo.nu/en/production/24088/mayday_mayday_festival_2023

arrangements and the programme recognises the importance of maintaining these arrangements in order to maximise its connections with the professional field. Guest teachers for projects and masterclasses vary year by year and provide strong connections between the programme and the professional field.

Collaborations with theatre houses and theatre companies are cultivated on an ongoing basis, and Drama Projects have been co-produced with companies such as Campo, VIERNULIVER, Platform K and A Two Dogs Company[180]. In addition to the partnerships outlined in 8.1, the programme has an ongoing agreement with NTGent (Ghent City Theatre) which includes use of the theatre for a two-week period. The programme plans to pursue similar agreements with other organisations in future[181].

As noted under standard 7, the programme has established a Professional Field Committee, through which it assesses and monitors the ongoing needs of the professions. The Committee includes members working as programmers, performers, theatre makers, cultural workers, critics and interdisciplinary artists[182]. In addition, the engagement of external practitioners as evaluation jury members, strengthens industry links with the programme and enables students to gain individual feedback from experienced professionals.

Input from practicing artists and professionals is fully integrated into the programme through the widespread use of guest teachers and the integration of external members into evaluation juries. The programme has a supportive and porous network of professional contacts who are able to input into the development of the programme. The Professional Field Committee is a particularly valuable initiative that enables the programme to obtain detailed feedback for individuals in a range of artistic roles.

The programme engages with several projects that promote collaboration with the professional field, for example the partnership with NTGent. The review team encourages the programme to continue to develop such structural partnerships in order to further develop its networks and enhance student engagement with a range of performing arts organisations.

Compliance with Standard 8.2

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 8.2 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Fully Compliant
Dutch Master	Fully Compliant
English Master	Fully Compliant

[180] *SER,* p.49
[181] *SER,* p.50
[182] *SER,* p.50

8.3 Information provided to the public

Standard 8.3 Information provided to the public about the programme is clear, consistent and accurate.

KASK & Conservatorium has a dedicated Communications Department, which manages most printed and digital communication, including the School's website and social media. Programme information is reviewed on an annual basis at the start of the recruitment cycle, when the Communications team consults with all programmes to update website information, study guides and lesson schedules. Coordinators, Heads of Department and Training Programme Committee Chairs are able to request changes throughout the year as necessary[183].

Public performances are publicised through the School's website, social media channels and through the programme's own website, and custom posters are produced by the Communications Department for all student performances in the School's house style[184].

The KASK &. Conservatorium website includes information about teachers, admissions tests and publications and an overview of upcoming and recent student projects. A separate programme website, which also contains information on student projects is managed separately from the School's main website in order to facilitate the publication of additional information about certain projects and to provide an additional channel for internal communication, however this refers back to the main School website for any technical information in order to maintain consistency[185].

The School also produces the KASK Drama Newsletter to which members of the public can subscribe to receive information about public performances and other news contributed by students, teachers and coordinators. The programme has its own Facebook page, managed by practical coordinators, where events are posted and promoted, with ticketing managed through Eventbrite. Freesheets are not produced as all relevant information is posted on Facebook, including information used to contextualise performances such as content warnings.

The School is striving to reach more diverse public audiences and this was one of the priorities for the Nomadic School of Arts. Widening participation work takes place in different social contexts such as prisons and retirement homes, which are given access to streamed shows[186].

HOGENT publishes a range of information about its quality assurance systems on its website, including details of policies and procedures making up its quality assurance framework. Reports from programme and institutional reviews are also publicly available[187].

The School has clear systems and processes to ensure that publicly available information on the programme is regularly reviewed an updated through close liaison between the programme and the Communications Department. During the review process, the review team found the programme information on the School's website to be detailed and

[183] *SER,* p.50
[184] *SER,* p.50
[185] *SER,* p.50
[186] *Meeting 2 with administrative and QA staff*
[187] https://www.hogent.be/dit-is-hogent/beleid/

accessible. The HOGENT website also contains helpful information about the programme, such as reports from programme reviews which support its transparent approach to quality assurance. The use of a separate website for the drama programme allows greater flexibility for direct communication from and between teachers and students.

Communication with the public about performances appears to be generally well managed and resourced, with information on the website, social media, posters and emails accessible to a range of audiences. The review team attended two public performances during the site-visit and noted that no printed contextual information was available for audiences. Information about performances, such as content warnings, is made available on Facebook, however the programme may wish to consider expectations and guidelines around contextual information in order to ensure an ethical approach to audience engagement.

Compliance with Standard 8.3

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 8.3 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Fully compliant
Dutch Master	Fully compliant
English Master	Fully compliant

Summary of the compliance with the Standards and recommendations[i]

The review team concludes that the KASK Drama programmes comply with the *Standards for Programme Review* as follows:

1. Programme's goals and context	
Standard 1. The programme goals are clearly stated and reflect the institutional mission.	**Fully compliant (Bachelor and Dutch Master) /** **Partially Compliant (English Master)**
Recommendations: • The review team recommends pausing the English language Master's programme until such time as a clear market and strategy for integration with the Dutch language programme can be established **Suggestions for further enhancement:** • The programme could acknowledge and articulate more strongly its key strengths, for example embodiment, theory and critical thinking.	
2. Educational processes	
Standard 2.1. The goals of the programme are achieved through the content and structure of the curriculum and its methods of delivery.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**
Suggestions for further enhancement: • The programme is encouraged to continue to focus on reducing load and implementing a culture of care within the first two years of the training programme, possibly through a rebalancing of workload across the first three years. • The programme is encouraged to find ways to better integrate collaboration with students from other programmes at KASK & Conservatorium within the drama programme.	
Standard 2.2. The programme offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international perspective.	**Substantially compliant (all programmes)**
Recommendations:	

- The programme should consider how alternative models of delivery might make it possible for international students to integrate into the drama department.
- The review team recommends that the programme considers how to build a level of flexibility into the curriculum that would allow more students to participate in international exchange programmes, such as Erasmus+.

Standard 2.3. Assessment methods are clearly defined and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes.	**Substantially compliant (Bachelor)/Fully compliant (Dutch and English Master)**

Recommendations:

- It is recommended that the Bachelor programme establishes clear boundaries for performance assessments in the first two years of the programme to ensure that expectations are clear for students and the focus on process is maintained in line with the stated learning outcomes.

Suggestions for further enhancement:

- The review team suggests that the final competencies for Bachelor and Master project units are reviewed in order to strengthen the assessment criteria associated with collaborative working.
- The review team encourages teaching staff to continue to seek a balance between critical and supportive feedback that best supports students' trajectories, particularly as they move from the second year to the third year of the Bachelor programme. As part of this process, teachers are encouraged to consider how marking schemes can be used most effectively in order to indicate a range of outcomes utilising the whole of the available scale.

3. Student profiles

Standard 3.1. There are clear criteria for student admission, based on an assessment of their artistic/academic suitability for the programme.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**

Recommendations / suggestions for further enhancement:

None

Standard 3.2. The programme has mechanisms to formally monitor and review the progression, achievement and subsequent employability of its students.	**Fully compliant (Bachelor)/ Substantially compliant (Dutch and English Master)**

Recommendations:

- It is recommended that efforts to ensure that Masters's students complete their studies within expected timeframes are prioritised, including finalising the restructure of the Master's project units.

Suggestions for further enhancement:

- The programme is encouraged to continue with its plans to re-establish the alumni feedback committee in order to formalise opportunities for graduate input into the development of the programme, and explore opportunities for alumni to provide professional advice and workshops to students.

4. Teaching staff

Standard 4.1. Members of the teaching staff are qualified for their role and are active as artists/pedagogues/researchers.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**

Suggestions for further enhancement:

- The review team suggests that the programme explores ways to connect the research culture within the programme with KASK & Conservatorium's infrastructure for supporting and promoting research.
- The programme may contribute to the School's efforts to ensure that the learning from the Nomadic School of Art is preserved and use this resource to inform the introduction of different social contexts within the curriculum.

Standard 4.2. There are sufficient qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the programme.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**

Suggestions for further enhancement:

- The review team suggests the programme to continue working to decolonise the curriculum to bring more diverse teachers onto permanent contracts as opportunities arise, so that the different backgrounds and perspectives currently contributed by guest teachers are embedded within the core of the programme.

5. Facilities, resources and support

Standard 5.1. The institution has appropriate resources to support student learning and delivery of the programme.	**Substantially compliant (all programmes)**

Recommendations:

- The programme should seek to acquire more specialist spaces and facilities, either through the realisation of the Drama Cluster, or by other means.

Standard 5.2. The institution's financial resources enable successful delivery of the programme.	**Substantially Compliant (all programmes)**

Recommendations:

- The programme should continue to consider ways in which it can reduce costs to ensure its sustainability, for example restructuring the Master programme in order to encourage timely completion.

Standard 5.3. The programme has sufficient qualified support staff.	**Substantially compliant (all programmes)**

Recommendations:

- The review team recommends that the programme continues to explore opportunities to partner with other institutions to increase the provision of technical support.

6. Communication, organisation and decision-making

Standard 6.1. Effective mechanisms are in place for internal communication within the programme.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**

Suggestions for further enhancement:

- The programme is advised to consider embedding the practice of 'closing sessions' across the programme and provide additional guidance to support guest teachers to embed reflective practice.
- The review team encourages the programme to reinstate these opportunities as planned, within the organisational care track.

Standard 6.2 The programme is supported by an appropriate organisational structure and decision-making processes.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**

Suggestions for further enhancement:

- The programme is encouraged to continue its efforts to ensure that the DRAG initiative is sustained and that the Training Programme Committee continues to engage with this group. Further, the programme may wish to consider how conversations between these bodies can be formally captured in programme action plans.

7. Internal quality culture

Standard 7. The programme has in place effective quality assurance and enhancement procedures.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**

Recommendations/Suggestions for further enhancement: None	
8. Public interaction	
Standard 8.1. The programme engages within wider cultural, artistic and educational contexts.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**
Suggestions for further enhancement: • The programme may wish to explore how to embed further opportunities for students to make work in different social contexts within the programme's curriculum.	
Standard 8.2. The programme actively promotes links with various sectors of the music and other artistic professions.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**
Suggestions for further enhancement: • The review team encourages the programme to continue to develop structural partnerships in order to further develop its networks and enhance student engagement with a range of performing arts organisations.	
Standard 8.3. Information provided to the public about the programme is clear, consistent and accurate.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**
Suggestions for further enhancement: • The review team advises the programme to consider expectations and guidelines around contextual information for public performances in order to ensure an ethical approach to audience engagement.	

Conclusion

The review team found the drama programme at KASK & Conservatorium to be a distinctive offer, with its broad approach to the development of drama artists creating an environment in which unique and talented artists are encouraged to develop individual and wide-ranging profiles. This was particularly evident from the meetings with alumni and members of the profession, who emphasised the impact of KASK Drama graduates on the creative and performing arts in Ghent, Flanders and the wider region.

Teachers and students are committed to the programme's shared ethos, in particular the fluid approach to making and playing, with a strong critical underpinning and a focus on embodied learning. The review team was privileged to see a range of student work during the site-visit and was particularly impressed by the physicality that students develop through their training, a strength that the professional field also recognises and values. It was pleasing to hear that the programme is moving towards an increased focus on collaborative working that will support the types of collective work through which a number of alumni are having a significant impact in their field.

Through its own process of critical reflection, the programme identified a tension between the 'culture of care' that it aims to instil, the intensity of the training and the ambition of students. It was clear to the review team that students and staff were part of a respectful and caring community, however the risk of overload did emerge as a theme and through its recommendations the review team encourages the School and the Training Programme Committee to continue its work to identify way in which it can achieve a balance between these conflicting demands.

The broad approach within the programme and the ability of the core programme team to adapt to individual students' interests promotes a diversity of approach, viewpoints and contexts within the curriculum. Within its theoretical modules, the programme is actively working to decolonise the curriculum, however teaching staff acknowledge that there is more work to be done, in particular to diversify the core teaching team. As peers, the review team recognise this as a key concern within arts education across Europe and are reassured to see that this is an important issue for staff at KASK & Conservatorium.

As outlined in the report, there are some barriers to international participation in the programme, with take-up of English Master's and incoming exchange places low. In addition very few students participate in outgoing international exchanges. There are points in the programme at which international mobility is possible, however the Training Programme Committee may wish to reconsider its approach in this area and the review team has recommended pausing the English Master's until there is greater clarity. Part of the rationale behind this recommendation is the pressure on space and resources within KASK & Conservatorium and the need for additional specialist drama teaching and performance spaces in order to ensure the sustainability of the programme. This would be addressed by the planned Drama Cluster, however at the time of the review there was no confirmed timeline for this new facility to be completed.

The programme is facing some financial challenges due to restrictions on public funding streams but is proactively considering how to make the most effective use of its resources in order to continue to deliver a high quality learning experience while also reducing the burden on staff and students and securing their wellbeing. Reducing the completion time for Master's

students and streamlining assessment processes will be central to this. The review team is confident that the programme will continue to move forward collaboratively, engaging

students, alumni and professionals as critical friends as it continues to evolve to meet the demands of current educational and professional contexts.

Finally, the review team would like to thank KASK Drama for making the visit productive and enjoyable through candid and positive conversations, and through the provision of a critically reflective self-evaluation document, which enabled a detailed and thorough review to take place.

Annex 1. Site-visit schedule

Meeting
Review Team meeting
Break/Lunch/Dinner or Social activities/free time

Day 1 – 22 May 2023			
Time	**Meeting (working session)**	**Participants of the meeting (names and positions of the participants from the visited institution)**	**Location**
	Arrival of Review Team members		
16:00-19:30	**Preparatory meeting of the Review Team**	Review Team alone	Malfait
19:30-21:00	Dinner	Review Team alone	Brasserie HA' (Handelsbeurs) Kouter 29, BE 9000 Gent
21:00-22:00	Performance	Performance by Master Drama or BA 3 Drama (DP 3 project)	LOD studio Bijlokesite, guidshuizenlaan 2, 9000 Gent (or on campus)

Day 2 – 23 May 2023			
Time	**Meeting (working session)**	**Participants of the meeting (names and positions of the participants from the visited institution)**	**Location**
8:30-9:00	**Review Team meeting**		Malfait
9:00–10:30	**Meeting 1** *Meeting with a delegation of members of the Training Programme Committee*	• Jan Steen (Chair TPC) • Frederik Le Roy (head of department Film, Photography and Drama) • Bauke Lievens • Geert Belpaeme • Paolo Bartoletti • Mieja Hollevoet • Rinus Chaerle (student member) • Fiene Zasada (student member) • Manizja Kouhestani (student member)	Baertsoen
10:30-10:45	**Review Team meeting: Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary (debriefing)**		Malfait
10:45-11:00	Break		Malfait
11:00-12:00	**Meeting 2** Meeting with senior administrative staff/QA office	• Valérie Smet (Quality Assurance) • Pascal Desimpelaere (Student affairs) • Annelies Vlaeminck (student counselor) • Frauke Velghe (Internationalization) • Katrien Vuylsteke Vanfleteren (Research) • Dries De Wit (Finance) • Rilke Broekaert (HR) • Ilse Den Hond (Communication) • Joke Vangheluwe (Policy)	Baertsoen
12:00-12:15	**Review Team meeting: Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary**		Malfait

12:15-13:15	Lunch	Review Team alone	KASKcafé
13:15-14:45	**Meeting 3** Meeting with teachers/lecturers	Core lecturers of representative course units (OLODS): • Simon De Winne • Séba Hendrickx • Kristof Van Baarle • Carolina Maciel de França • Luanda Casella • Helena De Preester • Bauke Lievens • Frederik Le Roy • Willem De Wolf	Baertsoen
14:45-15:00	**Review Team meeting: Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary (debriefing)**		Malfait
15:00-16.00	**Guided tour - Review of the facilities** (studios, venues, practice facilities, libraries etc.) and / or *attendance of performance or other public presentations by student's work and/or observations of classes*	Short tour and performance during the tour (BA1, BA2)	
16:00-16:15	Break		Malfait
16:15-17:45	**Meeting 4** *Meeting with students*	• Domien Huybrechts (Ba1) • Julie Igwesi (Ba1) • Dorelia Schraven (Ba2) • Milan Mitera (Ba2) • Titus Smessaert (Ba3) • Armin Mola (Ba3) • Madonna Lenaert (Ma) • Sjoerd Koolma (Ma)	Baertsoen
17:45-18:00	**Review Team meeting: Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary (debriefing)**		Malfait

18:15-19:15	*Attendance of concerts or other public presentations by student's work and/or observations of classes and/or tour of the facilities*		LOD studio Bijlokesite, guidshuizenlaan 2, 9000 Gent (or on campus)
19:30-20:00	**Review Team meeting** *Reflection on day 2 and preparations for day 3*	Review team alone	Malfait
20:00	Dinner	Review Team alone	Kruidtuin Kortrijksesteenweg 27, 9000 Gent
Day 3 – 24 May 2023			
Time	**Meeting (working session)**	**Participants of the meeting (names and positions of the participants from the visited institution)**	**Location**
9:00-9:15	**Review Team meeting**		
9:15–10:15	**Meeting 5** *Meeting with Industry Professionals*	Diverse roles and sectors where our students can be employed. • An-Marie Lambrechts • Manuel Haezebrouck • Charlotte Desomviele • Liv Laveyne • Bram Coeman • Sara De Bosschere	Baertsoen
10:15-10:45	**Review Team meeting: Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary (debriefing)**		Malfait
10:45-12.00	**Meeting 6**	• Anna Franziska Jäger • Dounia Mahammed	Baertsoen

	Meeting Alumni	• Mourad Baaiz • Mira Bryssinck • Simon Baetens • Mats Van Droogenbroeck • Naomi Van der Horst • Carine Van Bruggen • Louise Bergez	
12:00-12:30	**Review Team meeting: Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary (debriefing)**		Malfait
12:30-13:30	Lunch		KASKcafé
13:30-14:30	**Meeting 7** *Round-up meeting with the management of the institution*	• Filip Rathé (Dean) • Frederik Le Roy (Chair of department of Film, Fotography and Drama) • Jan Steen (Chair TPC)	Baertsoen
14:30 – 16:30	**Review Team meeting – Preparation for the feedback meeting** *(Review Team alone)*		Malfait
16:30-17:30	**Meeting 8** **Feedback to the institution**		Cirque
17:30-19:00	**Informal reception**		KASKcafé
17:30-19:00	Free time (or departure of Review Team members)		

Annex 2. List of documents provided to the review team

Self-evaluation Document and appendices:

- Annex 1. Organisational chart
- Annex 2. Number of students
- Annex 3. Curriculum Drama programme
- Annex 4. Curriculum tables and learning outcomes
- Annex 5. Number of students completing within the normal duration of the Drama programme
- Annex 6. Numbers regarding outgoing and incoming students and teachers
- Annex 7. Numbers regarding admission tests
- Annex 8. Admission tests- examples of reports and feedback reports
- Annex 9. Data on student progression and achievement
- Annex 10. Examples of appreciation reports students (Example 9 in English)
- Annex 11. Numbers regarding employability of alumni
- Annex 12. Sample of alumni
- Annex 13. Teaching staff
- Annex 14. Overview influx guest-teachers
- Annex 15. Technical facilities
- Annex 16. Action plan Drama 22-23

Additional documents:

- Key points educational plan KASK
- Domain Specific Learning Outcomes Drama
- Educational Plan 8 points
- Scholarships non-EU students
- Overview research projects
- Vision text internationalisation
- Deliberation approach KASK & Conservatorium
- Manual external jury
- Dramacluster
- Quality Enhancement Plan KASK & Conservatorium
- Overview research projects
- Onderwijs – en examenregelement
- Evaluatiebeleid HoGent
- Policy on supporting services School of Arts HoGent
- Omkaderende Diensten School of Arts HoGent
- View on education School of Arts
- View on quality enhancement School of Arts
- Vision on the Internationalisation at KASK & Conservatory
- Nomadic School of Arts documents
- Schedules BA and MA

- Fanzine – The Reflecting Light Research Group
- List of Master seminars

Annex 3. Definitions of compliance levels

- **Fully compliant.** *A standard is fully compliant when the approaches, structures or mechanisms relevant to that standard are fully implemented in a coherent and consistent way.*
- **Substantially compliant**. *A standard is substantially compliant when the standard is in place, while minor gaps have been observed but the manner of implementation is mostly effective. In such cases Review Teams are asked to include a recommendation as to how full compliance can be achieved.*
- **Partially compliant**. *A standard is partially compliant when the standard is in place, while significant gaps have been observed or the manner of implementation is not sufficiently effective. In such cases Review Teams are asked to include a recommendation as to how full compliance can be achieved or a condition*.*
- **Not compliant**. *A standard is not compliant when the approaches, structures or mechanisms relevant to that standard are lacking or implemented inadequately. In such cases Review Teams are asked to include a strong recommendation or a condition*.*

  *(*Please note that conditions can only be formulated in accreditation reports and not in quality enhancement review reports.)*

[i] Unless otherwise stated, levels of compliance and recommendations are given for all reviewed programme levels.

Jacques Moreau
Chair of the Board
MusiQuE - Music Quality Enhancement

Prof. Filip Rathé
Dean
KASK & Conservatorium
School of Arts of HOGENT and Howest
Louis Pasterlaan 2
9000
Ghent Belgium

Brussels, 23 January 2024

Subject: Programme Quality Enhancement Review of the Drama Programme 2023

Dear Colleague,

In 2023, KASK & Conservatorium, the School of Arts of HOGENT and Howest, engaged in a Programme Quality Enhancement Review of its Drama Programme with MusiQuE – Music Quality Enhancement. On behalf of the Board of MusiQuE, I have pleasure in writing to you concerning the outcomes of the review procedure.

Stages of the procedure and Review Team composition

The review followed a three-stage process:

1. KASK & Conservatorium wrote a self-evaluation report (SER) based on, and structured according to, the *MusiQuE Standards for Programme Review* (see MusiQuE Standards).
2. An international Review Team studied the self-evaluation report and conducted a site-visit at KASK & Conservatorium from 22nd to 24th May 2023. This comprised of meetings with Jan Steen, Chair of the Training Programme Committee, Frederik Le Roy, Head of Film, Photography and Drama department, Senior Administrative Officers from Academia and Administration, Students, Teachers, former Students, Representatives from the Profession and Regional Partners from the sector, as well as a guided tour on campus and several performances. The Review Team used the *MusiQuE Standards for Programme Review* noted above as the basis of its investigations.
3. The Review Team produced a report, structured following the *MusiQuE Standards for Programme Review*.

The international Review Team was composed by Mist Thorkelsdottir, University of Southern California (Review Team Chair); Laura Witt, Royal Academy of Dramatic Art London (Review Team Secretary), Jeroen Fabius, Amsterdam University of the Arts, Konstantina Georgelou, Utrecht University and Izah Hankammer (student), Fontys Dance Academy. All Review Team members have filled in and signed a questionnaire to avoid any conflict of interest.

Outcome of the procedure: review report

The report of the Review Team, after being adjusted in line with the comments sent by the KASK & Conservatorium on the draft of the report, has subsequently been scrutinised by the MusiQuE Board on 11th January 2024 to ensure its consistency with, and relevance to the MusiQuE Standards. I can confirm that the MusiQuE Board is satisfied that the review has been undertaken in compliance with the MusiQuE standards and procedures as described in the MusiQuE Standards.

In the case of a Quality Enhancement Review, the result of the review procedure is the final report itself, which includes the list of the MusiQuE standards met, substantially met and not met, highlights the institution's strong points, and provides advice and suggestions/recommendations for change. This report is attached and includes, on page 47-51, a summary of compliance with the MusiQuE standards.

The main aims of the MusiQuE Quality Enhancement Reviews are to provide an opportunity for institutions to engage with quality enhancement issues outside the constraining framework of a formal review; to stimulate the process of internal reflection on quality issues and, where relevant, to assist institutional leaders in implementing quality-related reforms; and to bring fresh ideas and wider perspectives into institutions, encouraging the principle of 'many correct answers' to questions concerning the pursuit of quality in higher music education.

The attached report can therefore serve as an advisory and informative document for institutions; it is not a substitute for existing national legal requirements for external quality assurance. Nevertheless, we hope very much that the observations and recommendations included in the report will be of assistance to your institution in its quality enhancement activities, confirming the strengths of your current achievements by their recognition of good practice and guiding your future endeavours through their suggestions for further development.

Publication of the report on MusiQuE website and MusiQuE logo for reviewed institutions

Please note, that the report will be published in full version on the MusiQuE website under the section Completed reviews. In addition, the present letter entitles you to publish on your website the attached MusiQuE logo together with the text: *"The Drama Programme delivered by KASK & Conservatorium has been reviewed in 2023 according to the internationally recognised standards of MusiQuE."* As the periodicity of MusiQuE review

procedures is six years, the logo and text above may be published until 23rd January 2030.

MusiQuE Follow-up Processes

In the framework of the MusiQuE Quality Enhancement Reviews, a peer-reviewed follow-up process is provided to institutions and programmes in order to assist them in the post-site-visit process and to enable MusiQuE to assess its impact. You will therefore find attached the *Template for MusiQuE Follow up Procedures,* which, under each Standard, lists the recommendations and issues pointed out by the Review Team as elements to be developed / further developed.

We would like to recommend that your institution makes use of this opportunity of a follow-up process provided by MusiQuE and fills in the second section under each Standard of the template by 23rd January 2026, with short reports of the actions undertaken for each element of improvement and each recommendation. One or more members of the Review Team which visited your institution in 22th-24th May 2023 will then be asked to study the template filled in by the institution, as well as the evidence provided, and to fill in the third section under each Standard of the *Follow-up Template* with comments and, if appropriate, further recommendations.

I would like to thank you and your colleagues for your hard work in relation to the formulation of the self-evaluation report and the excellent organisation of the site-visit. Please accept my congratulations on the outcomes of the procedure on behalf of the entire MusiQuE Board.

Yours faithfully,

On behalf of the MusiQuE Board

Jacques Moreau, Chair

Executive summary

Report

Programme quality enhancement review

KASK & Conservatorium, the School of Arts of HOGENT and Howest

Drama Programme

(Ghent, Belgium)

Site-visit: 22-24 May 2022

Introduction

KASK & Conservatorium forms part of the School of Arts of University College Ghent (HOGENT), which is affiliated with the Association of Ghent University and Howest University College. KASK & Conservatorium has a student body of 2,000 and a faculty staff of 500 in addition to technical and professional services staff[1]. The Royal Academy of Fine Arts (KASK) was founded in 1751 and the Royal Conservatory (Conservatorium) in 1835, with drama training having been established within the Conservatorium in 1860[2]. In 2009-10, the drama programme was integrated into KASK and now sits within the Department of Film, Photography and Drama. It comprises a three-year Bachelor's degree taught in Dutch,

[1] *SER,* p.5
[2] *SER,* p.6

a one year Master's degree taught in Dutch and one year Master's degree with an identical curriculum taught in English[3].

Under the leadership of Sam Bogaerts, Chair of the Drama Training Programme Committee from 2005 to 2013, a new curriculum was developed and implemented in 2007-2008. A further major review of the programme was undertaken in 2013 with significant changes to curriculum, teaching staff and infrastructure being made. The programme as it currently stands has adopted a 'broad profile', aimed at creating drama artists, rather than graduating students in specific disciplines such as acting or directing[4].

In the past ten years the programme has been through a period of consolidation and this enhancement review has been undertaken with the aim of testing the programme's currency and taking the opportunity to identify and address any issues or areas for enhancement in partnership with stakeholders including staff, students, professionals and alumni. In preparation for this review, the programme undertook a number of semi-structured conversations with students and teachers, both together and separately, based on the MusiQuE standards[5]. Through this process, the programme's main stakeholders identified some of the challenges, opportunities and potential actions for its future development, which were then integrated into a self-evaluation document.

The Flanders region operates a three-cycle degree structure, with accreditation of programmes and review of institutions overseen by NVAO (the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders). HOGENT was last reviewed in 2022[6]. KASK & Conservatorium is one of four institutions in Flanders offering drama degrees at Bachelor's and Master's levels, the others being in Antwerp, Brussels and Leuven.

The procedure for the review of the drama programme followed a three-stage process:

- KASK & Conservatorium prepared a self-evaluation report (SER) and supporting evidence, based on the *MusiQuE Standards for Programme Review*
- An international review team composed by MusiQuE reviewed the SER and supporting documents and conducted a site-visit at KASK & Conservatorium from 22nd to 24th May 2023. The site-visit comprised meetings with the Training Programme Committee, teachers, administrative and technical staff, students, alumni and members of the professional field. The review team used the *MusiQuE Standards for Programme Review* as the basis of its investigations.
- The review team produced the review report, structured to align with the standards mentioned above.

[3] The Dutch and English Master's are distinct programmes with the same content but different languages of delivery and assessment. It is a requirement of the Flanders education system that all institutions offering a degree programme taught and assessed in English must offer an equivalent programme taught and assessed in Dutch.
[4] *SER,* p.6
[5] *SER,* p.4
[6] *SER,* p.7

Summary of the compliance with the Standards and recommendations

The review team concludes that the Drama programmes at KASK & Conservatorium comply with the *Standards for Programme Review* as follows:

1. Programme's goals and context	
Standard 1. The programme goals are clearly stated and reflect the institutional mission.	**Fully compliant (Bachelor and Dutch Master) /** **Partially Compliant (English Master)**
Recommendations: • The review team recommends pausing the English language Master's programme until such time as a clear market and strategy for integration with the Dutch language programme can be established. **Suggestions for further enhancement:** • The programme could acknowledge and articulate more strongly its key strengths, for example embodiment, theory and critical thinking.	
2. Educational processes	
Standard 2.1. The goals of the programme are achieved through the content and structure of the curriculum and its methods of delivery.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**
Suggestions for further enhancement: • The programme is encouraged to continue to focus on reducing load and implementing a culture of care within the first two years of the training programme, possibly through a rebalancing of workload across the first three years. • The programme is encouraged to find ways to better integrate collaboration with students from other programmes at KASK & Conservatorium within the drama programme.	
Standard 2.2. The programme offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international perspective.	**Substantially compliant (all programmes)**
Recommendations: • The programme should consider how alternative models of delivery might make it possible for international students to integrate into the drama department.	

- The review team recommends that the programme considers how to build a level of flexibility into the curriculum that would allow more students to participate in international exchange programmes, such as Erasmus+.

Standard 2.3. Assessment methods are clearly defined and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes.	**Substantially compliant (Bachelor)/Fully compliant (Dutch and English Master)**

Recommendations:

- It is recommended that the Bachelor programme establishes clear boundaries for performance assessments in the first two years of the programme to ensure that expectations are clear for students and the focus on process is maintained in line with the stated learning outcomes.

Suggestions for further enhancement:

- The review team suggests that the final competencies for Bachelor and Master project units are reviewed in order to strengthen the assessment criteria associated with collaborative working.
- The review team encourages teaching staff to continue to seek a balance between critical and supportive feedback that best supports students' trajectories, particularly as they move from the second year to the third year of the Bachelor programme. As part of this process, teachers are encouraged to consider how marking schemes can be used most effectively in order to indicate a range of outcomes utilising the whole of the available scale.

3. Student profiles

Standard 3.1. There are clear criteria for student admission, based on an assessment of their artistic/academic suitability for the programme.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**

Recommendations / suggestions for further enhancement:

None

Standard 3.2. The programme has mechanisms to formally monitor and review the progression, achievement and subsequent employability of its students.	**Fully compliant (Bachelor)/ Substantially compliant (Dutch and English Master)**

Recommendations:

- It is recommended that efforts to ensure that Masters's students complete their studies within expected timeframes are prioritised, including finalising the restructure of the Master's project units.

Suggestions for further enhancement:

- The programme is encouraged to continue with its plans to re-establish the alumni feedback committee in order to formalise opportunities for graduate input into the development of the programme, and explore opportunities for alumni to provide professional advice and workshops to students.

4. Teaching staff	
Standard 4.1. Members of the teaching staff are qualified for their role and are active as artists/pedagogues/researchers.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**

Suggestions for further enhancement:

- The review team suggests that the programme explores ways to connect the research culture within the programme with KASK & Conservatorium's infrastructure for supporting and promoting research.
- The programme may contribute to the School's efforts to ensure that the learning from the Nomadic School of Art is preserved and use this resource to inform the introduction of different social contexts within the curriculum.

Standard 4.2. There are sufficient qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the programme.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**

Suggestions for further enhancement:

- The review team suggests the programme to continue working to decolonise the curriculum to bring more diverse teachers onto permanent contracts as opportunities arise, so that the different backgrounds and perspectives currently contributed by guest teachers are embedded within the core of the programme.

5. Facilities, resources and support	
Standard 5.1. The institution has appropriate resources to support student learning and delivery of the programme.	**Substantially compliant (all programmes)**

Recommendations:

- The programme should seek to acquire more specialist spaces and facilities, either through the realisation of the Drama Cluster, or by other means.

Standard 5.2. The institution's financial resources enable successful delivery of the programme.	**Substantially Compliant (all programmes)**

Recommendations:

- The programme should continue to consider ways in which it can reduce costs to ensure its sustainability, for example restructuring the Master programme in order to encourage timely completion.

Standard 5.3. The programme has sufficient qualified support staff.	**Substantially compliant (all programmes)**

Recommendations:

- The review team recommends that the programme continues to explore opportunities to partner with other institutions to increase the provision of technical support.

6. Communication, organisation and decision-making

Standard 6.1. Effective mechanisms are in place for internal communication within the programme.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**

Suggestions for further enhancement:

- The programme is advised to consider embedding the practice of 'closing sessions' across the programme and provide additional guidance to support guest teachers to embed reflective practice.
- The review team encourages the programme to reinstate these opportunities as planned, within the organisational care track.

Standard 6.2 The programme is supported by an appropriate organisational structure and decision-making processes.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**

Suggestions for further enhancement:

- The programme is encouraged to continue its efforts to ensure that the DRAG initiative is sustained and that the Training Programme Committee continues to engage with this group. Further, the programme may wish to consider how conversations between these bodies can be formally captured in programme action plans.

7. Internal quality culture

Standard 7. The programme has in place effective quality assurance and enhancement procedures.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**

Recommendations/Suggestions for further enhancement:

None
8. Public interaction

Standard 8.1. The programme engages within wider cultural, artistic and educational contexts.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**

Suggestions for further enhancement:

- The programme may wish to explore how to embed further opportunities for students to make work in different social contexts within the programme's curriculum.

Standard 8.2. The programme actively promotes links with various sectors of the music and other artistic professions.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**

Suggestions for further enhancement:

- The review team encourages the programme to continue to develop structural partnerships in order to further develop its networks and enhance student engagement with a range of performing arts organisations.

Standard 8.3. Information provided to the public about the programme is clear, consistent and accurate.	**Fully compliant (all programmes)**

Suggestions for further enhancement:

- The review team advises the programme to consider expectations and guidelines around contextual information for public performances in order to ensure an ethical approach to audience engagement.

Conclusion

The review team found the drama programme at KASK & Conservatorium to be a distinctive offer, with its broad approach to the development of drama artists creating an environment in which unique and talented artists are encouraged to develop individual and wide-ranging profiles. This was particularly evident from the meetings with alumni and members of the profession, who emphasised the impact of KASK Drama graduates on the creative and performing arts in Ghent, Flanders and the wider region.

Teachers and students are committed to the programme's shared ethos, in particular the fluid approach to making and playing, with a strong critical underpinning and a focus on embodied learning. The review team was privileged to see a range of student work during the site-visit and was particularly impressed by the physicality that students develop through their training, a strength that the professional field also recognises and values. It was pleasing to hear that the programme is moving towards an increased focus on collaborative working that will support the types of collective work through which a number of alumni are having a significant impact in their field.

Through its own process of critical reflection, the programme identified a tension between the 'culture of care' that it aims to instil, the intensity of the training and the ambition of students. It was clear to the review team that students and staff were part of a respectful and caring community, however the risk of overload did emerge as a theme and through its recommendations the review team encourages the School and the Training Programme Committee to continue its work to identify way in which it can achieve a balance between these conflicting demands.

The broad approach within the programme and the ability of the core programme team to adapt to individual students' interests promotes a diversity of approach, viewpoints and contexts within the curriculum. Within its theoretical modules, the programme is actively working to decolonise the curriculum, however teaching staff acknowledge that there is more work to be done, in particular to diversify the core teaching team. As peers, the review team recognise this as a key concern within arts education across Europe and are reassured to see that this is an important issue for staff at KASK & Conservatorium.

As outlined in the report, there are some barriers to international participation in the programme, with take-up of English Master's and incoming exchange places low. In addition very few students participate in outgoing international exchanges. There are points in the programme at which international mobility is possible, however the Training Programme Committee may wish to reconsider its approach in this area and the review team has recommended pausing the English Master's until there is greater clarity. Part of the rationale behind this recommendation is the pressure on space and resources within KASK & Conservatorium and the need for additional specialist drama teaching and performance spaces in order to ensure the sustainability of the programme. This would be addressed by the planned Drama Cluster, however at the time of the review there was no confirmed timeline for this new facility to be completed.

The programme is facing some financial challenges due to restrictions on public funding streams but is proactively considering how to make the most effective use of its resources in order to continue to deliver a high quality learning experience while also reducing the burden on staff and students and securing their wellbeing. Reducing the completion time for Master's

students and streamlining assessment processes will be central to this. The review team is confident that the programme will continue to move forward collaboratively, engaging students, alumni and professionals as critical friends as it continues to evolve to meet the demands of current educational and professional contexts.

Finally, the review team would like to thank KASK Drama for making the visit productive and enjoyable through candid and positive conversations, and through the provision of a critically reflective self-evaluation document, which enabled a detailed and thorough review to take place.