

Assessment Report – Bachelor Programme in Dance

Assessment group (name, title, organisational affiliation):

Steven de Belder, Coordinator of the Training (BA) and STUDIOS (MA) programmes, P.A.R.T.S. (Performing Arts Research and Training Studios), Belgium; Shirley Harthey Ubilla, Assistant Lecturer of Dance, SKH; Freddy Houndekindo, dancer, choreographer, Cullberg.

Chair of the group: Steven de Belder

Student/doctoral student participation has taken place in the following ways: Aleksandr Belov, student at the MA programme Film and Media – the Art of Impact has been fully involved in the assessment panel's work and report.

Submission date for the assessment report: 8/4/2026

Educational evaluations are part of the quality system of Stockholm University of the Arts (SKH). The purpose of the evaluations is to generate regular and systematic knowledge that is needed to ensure and develop the quality of the university's educations. A educational evaluation consists of four steps: start-up, self-evaluation, external reviews and measures. All educations at first cycle, second cycle and third cycle leading to a degree must be evaluated. Programmes will be evaluated on a six-year cycle, meaning that each programme will be evaluated every six years. All programmes will be assessed against criteria based on the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG). Each programme evaluated will be assessed against all criteria.

The Template for the assessment report is part of the Guidelines for educational evaluations and is mandatory to use. The template mirrors the Template for the self-evaluation report.

The basis for assessment is the Self-evaluation report and mandatory appendices: general study plan (third cycle), programme syllabus (first cycle and second cycle) and overview of qualitative targets.

Based on the criteria (see section 2.2 of the Guidelines for Educational Evaluations), the Assessment Report should include recommendations, strengths as well as areas for development, which aims at improving the education. A recommendation must be problem-based and thus differs from more general tips and advice, which may be included in the assessment under each criterion but not in the overall assessment. The assessment group's judgement should be clearly justified and preferably illustrated with examples. The assessment should **not** result in a rating of the entire education.

The report should not exceed of 15-25 pages, including 'template text'. Before the Assessment Report is submitted to SKH, the education that has been assessed must be given the opportunity to correct any factual errors and misconceptions. This is done via the responsible Administrative Officer.

The final report must be submitted by the chair of the assessment group to the SKH, i.e. to the responsible Administrative Officer.

Summary of strengths and areas for development according to the self-assessment

- Summary of the strengths and development areas identified in the self-assessment.

The summary presents a concise introduction of the programme and its key features as well as key challenges, that deal both with the content of the program and its basic conditions.

This programme is tackling many difficult questions with very limited resources. These questions, about what dance is and can be, who has access to it, who is transmitting it and how, and towards which field, reach out far beyond the scope of an individual university programme, and the assessment committee strongly values the courage and commitment of the people in the programme to keep addressing these, also when that includes self-reflection and self-criticism, and when the existing structures in the university don't always seem adapted (yet) to the answers that are proposed. The assessment group acknowledges that the program is treading new terrain, which inevitably goes hand in hand with trial and error and facing inconsistencies when trying to reconcile the past and the future. All recommendations the assessment group makes in this document have to be seen in this light: they support the main vision of the program and hope to contribute to its realisation, sometimes from the perspective of aligning it with existing structures and expectations, sometimes by supporting the call to adapt those.

The assessment group strongly supports the priorities for future development that the program sets for itself, as these are all elements that are in the service of further realising the idea of educating dancers into dancing citizens. Not all elements are solely in the hands of the programme itself, and will depend heavily on support from the university, both in financial terms and in adapting or allowing to adapt structures or systems that slow down or complexify the reforms that the programme wants to pursue.

Introduction

About the education

Organisation of the education and key figures

Strengths

The assessment group recognizes a significant pedagogical shift initiated during Kristine Slettevold's directorship (2010–2020), moving from a conservatory model oriented toward company dancers to a model aligned with the realities of a freelance and independent dance field. This transition has fostered versatility, adaptability, and exposure to a wide range of artistic practices through the integration of international guest teachers and evolving choreographic formats across the three years of study.

Under the leadership of Zoe Poluch (since 2020), the programme has further developed a critical and reflective dimension. This includes a strengthened engagement with the historical, geopolitical, cultural, economic, and aesthetic conditions shaping contemporary dance, as well as a critical examination of the dominance of North American and European experimental concert dance traditions. The recent renaming of the programme to “Bachelor Programme in Dance” signals an important expansion beyond performance toward a broader understanding of dance practices and professional roles. This change enables students to consider how dance knowledge can be applied across a wider range of contexts.

The programme’s engagement with the Diversity in European Dance Higher Education initiative has contributed to a diversification of dance techniques and cultural perspectives within the curriculum. The SER demonstrates a thoughtful and reflexive approach to the inclusion of non-dominant dance practices, emphasizing contextual understanding and resisting decontextualized appropriation. This holistic approach represents a strong ethical and pedagogical commitment.

The “dancing citizen”, emerging from the DDE framework, reflects an engagement with social justice, positionality, and decolonial and Indigenous perspectives. This orientation signals a move beyond performer-centric training toward a broader societal and ethical positioning of dance practice. This overall reorganisation connects the programme to wider tendencies within dance and the arts, positioning it as a forerunner in applying these principles within academic education and in working to close the gap between institutional frameworks and evolving artistic practices.

The assessment group also acknowledges the programme’s ambition to provide students with a broad orientation across practices and methodologies, supporting the development of individual artistic direction and critical awareness. In the context of increasingly precarious conditions within the freelance dance sector, this broad orientation further strengthens the programme’s relevance by supporting diversified career pathways.

The assessment group further acknowledges the considerable economic challenges the BA programme has faced, and how these have translated into a reduction of the pedagogical team and its capacity to function sustainably. This situation negatively affects both staff and students and compromises the feasibility of the programme as currently conceived. In light of this, the assessment group recommends that the BA programme seek structural support within the university. Regarding the program's reach for admission, we strongly encourage the development of scholarship or accessibility schemes that would enable students from a wider range of backgrounds to engage in a programme combining artistic excellence with social engagement.

Further development

While the diversification of practices and perspectives is a clear strength, the assessment group finds that the programme would benefit from articulating a more explicit position regarding its core understanding(s) of dance. Greater clarity about which practices, techniques, and knowledge forms are central to the programme would strengthen its identity and pedagogical coherence.

Relatedly, the current breadth of content, technique, and method risks leading to an over-generalization of both technical and theoretical training. This may leave students insufficiently specialized for a professional field that increasingly demands both versatility and depth. A clearer balance between breadth and depth is recommended.

A key structural concern relates to staffing. The current reliance on a limited number of permanent staff, combined with a high number of guest teachers, places significant responsibility on the head of the programme. While this enables a strong curatorial vision, it also creates vulnerability and concentrates decision-making. The multiplicity of voices represented in the teaching is, in practice, mediated through a single leadership position, which presents a structural paradox.

The assessment group therefore recommends exploring more collective forms of pedagogical leadership. If institutional constraints limit the expansion of permanent staff, the establishment of a committee of guest and affiliated teachers could support shared reflection, continuity, and development of the programme's pedagogical principles.

Furthermore, the limited continuity among teaching staff means that the programme's multiplicity of approaches is primarily experienced at the level of the student, rather than as a shared pedagogical dialogue among teachers. Strengthening opportunities for exchange and joint reflection among teachers would enhance coherence and mutual development. To better connect the programme's articulated values with teaching practice, the assessment group suggests the development of a shared "teaching lab". This could provide a structured space for teachers to present and observe each other's pedagogical approaches, and to relate these more explicitly to course goals and assessment criteria. Such an initiative could be linked to the committee structure proposed above.

In alignment with recommendations from the Diversity in European Dance Higher Education initiative, the assessment group further supports the establishment of a Diversity and Equality committee involving permanent staff, guest teachers, and students.

Finally, the assessment group notes that updated information regarding student enrollment lacked clarity. Notwithstanding this, the group identifies a need for more explicit and targeted outreach strategies. This includes broadening recruitment to underrepresented groups, such as cis-men, practitioners of non-dominant dance forms, and neurodivergent individuals. Consideration should also

be given to where and how outreach takes place, who represents the institution in these contexts, and how trust can be built with different communities.

Assessment report

- 1. the education fulfils the requirements of the Higher Education Act and of the degree descriptions in the ordinances related to the Act, i.e. the intended learning outcomes correspond to the qualitative targets and they are examined in a legally secure manner**

Description and analysis of the education's strengths and areas for development in relation to the criterion and any recommendations for appropriate development work.

Strenghts

The SER describes the construction of the program and its evolution over the 6 semesters in great detail, pointing out both the continuity and the changes/evolution in recurrent courses.

In general, there is a good alignment between the qualitative targets, the learning outcomes and the actual course contents and goals, because the QT and ILO are quite broadly defined. The mapping between QT and ILO shows that most QT's are relevant in several courses, providing a multiplicity of perspectives on the individual targets. The SER remarks that the recent developments in how the programme is composed and delivered are not very well reflected in the formulation of the learning outcomes, which are very much based on an individual perspective and do not take into account aspects of collaboration and relationality. The assessment group agrees that it is time to adapt the learning outcomes to the reality of the programme content, and believes that the QT's leave enough space for interpretation to focus on these new elements.

Over the past years (an evolution that started before the period under revision), the program has worked on redressing the balance between continuity and diversity. The main recurring courses 'Dance, practice and theory', 'Performative practice and theory' and 'Choreography, practice and theory' take up almost 75% of the total volume of credits, and each of them includes a wide variety of approaches and teachers. The programme is readressing its eurocentric legacy by widening the diversity of students, teachers and approaches of dance, while simultaneously addressing the organisational fragmentation that resulted from the habit of inviting guest teachers for very short intensive workshops. This is clearly an operation that is in process and has not yet found its balance.

The fragmentation of large single courses into sections delivered by multiple teachers offering quite diverging contents and methodologies, is clearly a challenge for the format of examination. The programme makes good efforts to define the different components such that they relate to the different contents and the connections between them, which contributes to the students' ability to analyse and contextualise different experiences and to reflect upon their own learning

processes. The examinations are carried out by the Head of the programme, visiting teachers when possible and sometimes also PhD students.

Recommendations

The assessment group would recommend the programme to define more clearly how it sees the ideal balance between offering a broad perspective of what ‘dance’ can be, and still be specific and concentrated enough so that students can acquire specific skills in different dance forms to the extent that they are able to actively use them in professional settings that require a certain degree of experience in a specific style/approach, or in settings where they would need a higher degree knowledge and engagement with their own artistic or theoretical interests...

In its different structures and approaches, the program clearly encourages and supports the students to find and articulate their own interests and actively engage with their individual dance backgrounds, but the assessment group wonders if the amount of time and the consistency that is devoted to singular practices is enough to bring the students to a level of specificity in forms and approaches that they do not have prior experience with, given that many of these forms are learnt through repetition and routine.

In order to tackle this issue, which is also reflected in the SER’s comment that some students feel under-supported when it comes to exposure by teachers to existing knowledge and experience, the assessment group suggests the following measures (which can also be combined):

- include elective formats where smaller groups can go deeper into specific approaches;
- collaborate with other institutions (inside and outside SKH) to offer specific approaches as electives;
- reduce the amount of different approaches/teachers within a single course and develop a clearer view of the approaches the program chooses to include and those the program chooses *not* to include, because it cannot include everything but still finds collective learning processes an important base for the program’s identity. This option would also allow teachers more sustained time with the students, and potentially create the conditions for a deeper engagement of these teachers with the programme broadly, which is clearly a wish of the programme.
- give a clearer view for students about which practices are part of the core of the program (and how much time will be devoted to them), which practices can be studied as elective, for which practices there is in-house knowledge and support and for which practices the school knows where to refer to outside expertise (and for which ones not).
- consider the inclusion of a course (or section of a course) in the 1st year that deals with learning processes that transcend individual practices or brings them into active relation - so that people not only learn to value their own dance histories, archives and interests, but also how to nourish and develop them in relation to the other dance histories, archives and interests that are carried by their teachers and their peers. This could also help students bridge contrasting

approaches and develop tools for personal and collective development when the expert on a specific approach is not present.

In the case of the large courses with many teachers, there seems to be a gap between the actual content and its delivery by the teachers, and the way these different practices are summarised in the examination format, which seems mainly the task of the Head of the programme, sometimes ‘outsourced’ to other collaborators or PhD students. There is no doubt that the Head of the programme has a good knowledge of what the individual teacher has done in their classes and is able to take that knowledge along in the formulation of the examination tasks. But what tends to get lost in this translation is the learning process itself as observed by that particular teacher (and on a different level, the notion of ‘artistic process’ as such that seems so important in a lot of taught practices). Especially in the field of dance (or art in general) today, where taught contents are so intimately connected to the artistic practice of the individual teacher, it is a lack when the artist/teacher does not have a structural voice in the assessment of how a student has acquired the contents of the class. By extending teaching periods and reducing the amount of different teachers, which the programme intends to do, there will be more opportunities for the teachers to be more actively involved in the examination process. And it would be good if the programme can reflect further on integrating the evaluation by the teachers who cannot be present in the examination process (because of agenda or budget limitations, or because they come from abroad). Is there room to replace a part of examination by continuous evaluation by the teachers, actively connecting their particular course content to the broader learning outcomes of the course they are part of?

The difficulties with irregular presence of students, which are described in other chapters, also have their effect on the examination process. The teachers and/or Head of the programme have a lot of work to define catch-up tasks to allow people who are less present during the classes to prepare properly for the examination, which the assessment group believes becomes more heavy given the relative distance between the teaching and the examination. The assessment group wonders how the students can be made more accountable without creating extra work for the teachers or the Head of the Programme, but admits it doesn’t have a clear view on how this could be done - also by lack of thorough knowledge of larger frames of what is possible or not within SKH or the Swedish system in general.

Summary

- define more clearly the balance between a broad perspective on dance and devoting enough time to allow the students to go deep into specific skills;
- include elective dance-related courses in the programme;
- collaborate with other institutions who can offer elective dance-related courses;
- reduce the amount of teachers;
- develop a clear vision of what the programme includes and how much time is spent to that, and what the programme does not include;
- include a course in the 1st year that deals with learning processes.

2. that teaching supports students'/doctoral students' learning

Description and analysis of the education's strengths and areas for development in relation to the criterion and any recommendations for appropriate development work.

Strengths

The programme demonstrates a clearly student-centred pedagogical approach in which teaching supports both individual and collective learning processes. Students are positioned as active participants and co-creators of the learning environment which is reflected in an emphasis on dialogue, self-reflection and critical engagement with different pedagogical approaches. Course plans and examinations consistently encourage students to reflect on their learning processes, including identifying challenges and strategies for development.

The programme shows a strong commitment to creating an inclusive and relational learning environment. Perspectives on *culturally relevant teaching* are integrated, allowing students' experiences and backgrounds to inform the learning process and strengthen engagement.

Close and continuous contact with the head of the programme enables early identification of students' needs and access to appropriate support structures. Mentorship and supervision are well embedded through regular individual meetings and additional supervisory formats, contributing to students' ongoing development. The programme also actively connects students to artistic and professional contexts, strengthening the relevance of their education.

The teaching structure, including daily training and recurring workshops, provides continuity in both artistic and physical development across different dance practices. Regular elements focused on sustainability, such as ergonomics and injury prevention, further support long-term learning.

Peer-to-peer learning is a central pedagogical component. Students practice in giving and receiving feedback, collaborating across constellations and taking shared responsibility for learning processes. This is also integrated into examinations, supporting independence and critical reflection.

Interdisciplinary opportunities, including collaborations within the performing arts field, elective courses and participation in research contexts, broaden students' perspectives and situate their practice within a wider artistic and academic framework.

Recommendations

One area for further development is clearer communication regarding the balance between stability and adaptation in the programme. Since elements such as teaching staff, onboarding and offboarding processes, and parts of the course content are adapted to each cohort, it would be valuable to more explicitly demonstrate how consistency is maintained in relation to programme learning

outcomes and qualitative targets. A clearer distinction between the programme's stable core—such as learning outcomes, examination formats, and passing requirements—and adaptable elements, as well as how these are documented and quality-assured would strengthen transparency.

Continuity in teaching is another challenge. Guest teachers do not always follow a cohort across the full programme which may limit progression. The assessment group supports the programme's own identification of this issue and recommends establishing a recurring group of teachers connected to each cohort. Such a structure could strengthen continuity, improve the tracking of student progression, deepen engagement and provide greater stability for both students and teachers. This could also constitute a structural development that supports the university's ongoing commitment to diversity and inclusion, provided that the selection of guest teachers reflects these values.

Attendance and student responsibility remain a complex challenge. While expectations are communicated at auditions, differing interpretations of self-care in relation to attendance may create imbalance within the student group and affect the learning environment. The assessment group recommends developing a clearer framework that balances student responsibility with self-care. This includes clarifying that self-care can/may be interpreted differently depending on individual, cultural and pedagogical perspectives, as well as formulating concrete principles that help students take responsibility both for themselves and for the group. Such a framework would help strengthen student responsibility without compromising wellbeing. It is also recommended clarifying expectations regarding participation and making explicit how attendance and responsibilities relates to learning outcomes. A stronger alignment between effort, participation and achievement could support a more cohesive study culture.

Onboarding and offboarding processes would benefit from further formalization. When continuity between teachers is limited, these processes are essential for maintaining progression. The assessment group recommends structured onboarding with clear goals and expectations, as well as scheduled offboarding sessions that include feedback and opportunities for reflection. Introducing mid-process evaluations to revisit and adjust initial goals could further strengthen continuity and support progression throughout a course or project. For these procedures to be effective, they need to be embedded within a clear structural framework.

The assessment group therefore recommends that the programme considers:

- clarifying and communicating the balance between stable core elements and adaptable components of the programme, including how these are documented and quality-assured
- strengthening continuity in teaching by establishing a recurring group of teachers connected to each cohort to better support student progression
- developing a clearer framework for attendance and student responsibility that balances self-care with collective accountability and aligns participation with learning outcomes

- formalizing onboarding and offboarding processes, including clear goal-setting, structured feedback and reflection as well as mid-process evaluations to support continuity and progression.

3. the content and form of teaching are based on artistic and/or scientific grounds and proven experience

Description and analysis of the education's strengths and areas for development in relation to the criterion and any recommendations for appropriate development work.

Strengths

The programme of the Bachelor in Dance is based on a strong foundation that approaches dance as an inherently diversified and global phenomenon and has the strong intention of undoing the hegemonic tendencies within the common understanding of 'contemporary dance' and open up to a broader field of dance practices that do not necessarily come out of or lead into dance as a practice that finds its main purpose in the context of concert dance. This shift started already years ago, but the programme's participation in the international Diversity in Higher Dance Education research project has clearly strengthened this starting point and has offered it a stronger theoretical foundation and many practical tools and recommendations to push the realisation of this programme even further. Another important principle is that 'dance', in whatever context or form it appears, is always integrated and connected, to contexts, to other art forms, to other practices. This connects the programme to a wider current tendency within dance and the arts in general, but also makes it a forerunner by working to apply these principles within the field of academic education and to work on closing the gap between the old institutional understanding of dance and the new ways dance is practiced and lived in the art scene and society in general.

The main pedagogical approaches that follow from these general principles are used across the programme in the definition of courses, the selection of teachers, the determination of pedagogical approaches, the approach of students' learning and the interweaving of these elements. The SER describes the main perspectives through which the general aim is transmitted, including integration, positionality, culturally relevant pedagogy, reparations and multi-modality. It gives several concrete examples of practice-based, multimodal and integrative approaches that can be understood as proven experience within a dance(pedagogical) context. That the programme is grounded in artistic practice is evident through the continuous creating, experimenting, and sharing of practices.

From the selection of biographies of the teachers and the class descriptions that were provided, it is clear that all the teachers' practices are very well grounded in artistic and/or academic practice and that both the artistic background of the teachers and their pedagogical practices can be considered as very consistent with the general principles that drive the programme. One can say that the programme is experimental in the way it brings together a multiplicity of approaches and in the

way it seeks a new balance between the transmission of knowledge and practice and valorising the students' own archives, backgrounds and interests, but at the same time the constructing elements, in their multiplicity, are grounded.

The Head of the Program has a pivotal role in this construction: she is the curator who determines which artistic or pedagogical practice fits into the programme, and she is responsible for making sure that individual teachers are made aware of the larger context they will teach in, from the general principles to the very practical details about the student group and the immediate pedagogical context (which teachers are teaching in the same period).

Recommendations

The assessment group wants to repeat that the delivery of the programme is based on a strong and broad vision on the education in its wider field and on the relentless efforts of the Head to align the different incoming teachers to it, but if this construction is dependent on one person's dynamism, it is also quite vulnerable. There is not only the question at what point the workload for one person threatens to become too much (the Head's workload is mentioned in several chapters of the SER), but even when there would never be an issue with her resilience, it remains a paradox that the multiple voices and approaches that the program brings together are all 'filtered' through a single person.

Based on the general aspirations of the programme, the assessment group thinks that the ideology of diversity and inclusivity needs to be implemented more structurally to have substance in the curriculum. It is clearly manifested in the theory courses, the profile of the students and of the guest teachers, but to realise itself effectively it has to be translated structurally. Ideally, the leadership of the programme should be multi-voiced and directly embody more of the diversity that is reflected in the programme structure and pedagogies. If the general institutional structure and/or budgets currently do not allow to implement that, the assessment group recommends installing a committee with a number of recurrent teachers who represent diverse origins and practices, who share discussions and reflections about the implementation of the principles and their further development. This group could also develop a policy or procedure to deal with tensions that may arise from the contrast between different pedagogical cultures - the intention 'to take time to hear all sides' that the SER expresses in such an event is evidently just a first step in dealing with such issues.

The fact that a multiplicity of people and approaches to dance are brought together under a set of general principles, doesn't mean that these principles are actively 'shared' among the teachers as a group, since the continuity of presence of teachers is limited. It is only on the level of the student experience that the pedagogical and artistic multiplicity becomes a fact, but for individual teachers this may not be very visible since their time with the students is limited, especially when they teach only once to a cohort. There is a potential for teachers to strengthen their pedagogical and artistic approach by learning more about how their individual approach comes together within the totality of different visions and approaches. The programme is aware of this and suggests making time for lateral competence development among

the teachers. The assessment group's suggestion is to do this via a shared "teaching lab" (1–2 times per semester) where teachers bring a teaching activity, test/observe each other, and write a short summary of purpose, method, what worked, what will be adjusted, and the link to course goals and assessment. This competence development is even more relevant if shared by a group of teachers who themselves embody diverse values and backgrounds, mirroring the complexities and qualities of a cohort. This would make professional experience systematically tested and shared.

It can also be very interesting to connect this type of activity to the committee suggested above (which would consist of a smaller group of people, but who would by definition also be the target group of the teaching lab), to connect reflection about the programme's values and protocols with the actual teaching experience.

The SER also points out that certain pedagogical approaches that are connected to diverse dance practices and stress collectivity and an all-in approach risk coming into conflict with a general culture that stresses speed, flexibility and self-care. This raises a number of questions on how the program could deal with such issues, questions which the program doesn't have a clear answer to yet. The proposed practice sharing between teachers could be a tool for tackling these, and from the point of view of this chapter's focus that is a relevant perspective: by sharing practices and questions teachers can learn from each other how they deal with different expectations from students' side. But this solution clearly also has its limits, and the SER explicitly asks if a line should be drawn somewhere, stating that certain pedagogical approaches may just not fit into the framework set out by the school. Pragmatically, that can make a lot of sense. Structurally, this question pushes the institution to become more transparent as to which kinds/definitions of dance it wishes to pass on and which ones not. That is also a form of positionality.

Still, this question points to another dimension as well: in certain cases the relevance of the artistic content and experience of the teacher do not seem to match the students' expectations and values. Teachers could adapt to this mismatch, by learning from other teachers as suggested above. But the responsibility should not only be on the teachers' shoulders, and the programme should question what it can do to prepare the students for a broader range of practices than those they have been raised and educated in. How can it be avoided that a specific understanding of the notion of self-care and the notion of positionality lead to a collection of 'islands' where people only trust their own perception and act accordingly? This is a question that is much bigger than the programme and the assessment group must admit it doesn't have the full answer to it, but one suggestion can be to also include student representation in the lateral learning processes suggested, to bridge the gap between the two perspectives and bring more transparency and exchange.

Beyond that, the assessment groups encourages the programme to reflect further on how it can establish a common positive learning culture.

Summary of the recommendations:

- install a reflection committee with regular guest teachers who represent the diversity the programme strives for
- develop a policy or procedure to deal with tensions produced by conflicting pedagogical cultures
- install a ‘teaching lab’ where teachers can share their practices and learn from each other, including student representation
- define the programme’s position in regards to different pedagogical cultures
- reflect further on establishing a common learning culture

4. that the education is useful for the students/doctoral students and their future careers

Description and analysis of the education's strengths and areas for development in relation to the criterion and any recommendations for appropriate development work.

Strengths

The programme demonstrates a clear ambition to prepare students for their future professional lives by combining artistic depth with professional orientation. The SER presents several complementary pathways towards professionalization including career diversification, entrepreneurship, engagement with the professional field, writing practices and recurring public contexts where students are given opportunities to present and test their work.

A key strength is the integration of these elements through the concept of the *dancing citizen*, which provides a coherent framework for addressing dance’s role in society. Within this framework, critical reflection and perspectives on power are central, supporting a balance between maintaining artistic specificity and exploring how dance knowledge can be applied and activated in other contexts.

The programme also offers well-functioning ways of introducing students to the complexity of the dance and choreography field, including entrepreneurship workshops and ongoing encounters with professional artists, producers and institutions. This contributes to a nuanced understanding of the performing arts field and its working conditions.

Recommendations

The programme shows a clear ambition to broaden students’ career paths beyond traditional concert dance towards more diversified and socially engaged practices. The assessment group sees potential to further strengthen the connection between this vision and the programme’s structure. Current entrepreneurship components largely reflect a traditional production logic within the independent performing arts sector. To better align with the programme’s ambition for career diversification, these components should more explicitly include alternative ways of organizing and practicing dance knowledge, for example in pedagogical, social, healthcare or cross-sectoral contexts. At present, engagement with such fields appears to rely on

individual student initiative, suggesting that the programme could take a more proactive role in structuring and making these possibilities visible.

A more collectively articulated understanding of the expanded range of professional pathways available to graduates beyond (or in addition to) performing, would also strengthen the programme. This includes clarifying how these pathways relate to the inclusion of non-dominant dance forms, particularly where these may still rely on training and performance models similar to those found within contemporary dance.

Field studies are currently offered as an optional element during the later part of the programme and are described as a valuable opportunity for students to explore new contexts and develop initiative. The assessment group considers that this component could be given a more central and pedagogically integrated role. By making field studies mandatory, introducing them earlier, and offering them repeatedly throughout the education, stronger conditions for progression would be created. This would allow students to test, re-evaluate and deepen their understanding of how dance knowledge can be applied in different contexts and to integrate these experiences into their continued learning. One possible approach would be to embed field studies within existing courses such as *Dance, Practice and Theory 1–3*, *Performative Practice and Theory 1–2*, and *Choreography, Practice and Theory 1*, where they could be aligned with each course's specific focus and learning outcomes. Introducing at least one field study component within each of these course strands could provide continuity while allowing students to engage with different contexts from distinct pedagogical perspectives. Alternatively, the programme could consider establishing field studies as a dedicated course with a clear progression across the education. Regardless of format, a more structured integration (including clearer framing of contexts, duration and potential collaborations) would strengthen the pedagogical value of field studies and their contribution to student learning.

The assessment group also identifies that the programme would benefit from more clearly specifying how its ambitions regarding career diversification are implemented in practice. This includes clarifying which professional roles and career paths the programme prepares students for as well as what structures support their transition into working life. Making alumni trajectories more visible, for example through systematic follow-up and by providing examples of former students' career paths, could further strengthen this connection.

The assessment group therefore recommends that the programme considers:

- making field studies a mandatory component of professional preparation
- introducing field studies earlier and ensuring continuity across the programme by integrating them in a way that to support student progression
- broadening entrepreneurship teaching to include diverse professional contexts
- inviting alumni and guest teachers who apply their dance knowledge in other types of practices, particularly outside the traditional concert dance context, in order to make a broader range of career paths visible.

- systematically following up alumni career trajectories from 2020 to identify tendencies in career paths and inform programme development.

5. that those involved in the education have up-to-date subject and higher education pedagogical/subject didactic skills

Description and analysis of the education's strengths and areas for development in relation to the criterion and any recommendations for appropriate development work.

Strengths

The head of programme, Zoë Poluch, has extensive and internationally anchored expertise as a dancer and choreographer as well as experience in artistic research and pedagogical contexts. This strong subject knowledge, combined with clear international networks and continuous awareness of developments in the field, ensures that the programme remains current and relevant.

A stable academic foundation is ensured through assistant professors and PhD students who regularly contribute through teaching, workshops, performances, examinations and seminars. This strengthens both continuity and research integration within the programme.

An experimental, critical and curious pedagogical approach characterizes the learning environment, creating conditions for both artistic and pedagogical development. The programme remains up to date through a large proportion of guest teachers with diverse roles in the field (dancers, choreographers, educators, producers, researchers), providing students with a dynamic and challenging engagement with the concept of the *contemporary*, as well as how artistic and pedagogical practices can enrich and develop each other.

A conscious balance between local and international perspectives is maintained by combining Swedish/Nordic and international guest teachers. This provides students with both local grounding and a broader, global understanding of the contemporary dance field.

Teaching is flexible and responsive with guest teachers often adapting their content and methodology to course requirements, students' needs and their own artistic and pedagogical approaches. This creates a dynamic and individualized learning experience for students.

Recommendations

The programme is marked by a vulnerable organizational structure in which much of the curation, planning, course responsibility and assessment concentrated in the role of the head of programme, with limited internal collegial support from SKH Dance. Responsibility and workload are particularly high when two cohorts run in parallel which may affect sustainability, continuity and the long-term development of course content, progression, and the programme's identity. The limited internal staffing, combined with a lack of clearly shared leadership, constrains collegial

curation and quality assurance, especially in a programme largely sustained by guest artist-teachers. To reduce vulnerability and strengthen long-term programme ownership, responsibilities need to be distributed across several roles and embedded within a clear organizational structure. The assessment group therefore strongly supports strengthening co-leadership within a transparent framework that is clear to all involved (including part-time or temporarily employed).

The SER notes that there is not always a direct alignment between a teacher's artistic profile and their pedagogical practice. For students this can constitute a valuable learning experience, fostering awareness of the relationship between form and content with dialogue and reflection as key tools. This experimental dimension aligns with the programme's positioning within contemporary dance. At the same time, it may give rise to misunderstandings or tensions when students encounter pedagogical approaches that are perceived as less "open" or "experimental". In this respect, the programme is encouraged to further articulate how such frictions are pedagogically supported and contextualized for both students and teachers. As it stands, explicit engagement with pedagogical perspectives, particularly through courses such as *Method* and *Workshop*, appears primarily in the third year. Introducing engagement with pedagogical approaches earlier in the programme could better equip students to navigate the diversity of teaching they encounter throughout their studies. This development is also closely connected to the programme's emphasis on the concept of *the dancing citizen*. In order for students to meaningfully apply their dance knowledge across different contexts and fields, they would benefit from encountering a wider range of pedagogical practices, including those led by practitioners with a specific focus on teaching and learning processes. Strengthening this dimension throughout the programme could support students in developing both their artistic and pedagogical agency. In addition, the proposed *teaching lab* format in chapter 3 could provide a valuable structure for making pedagogical approaches more explicit and shared among teachers. By creating space for collective reflection on teaching methods and their relation to course goals, such a forum may also help contextualize differences in pedagogical practice for students, thereby supporting a more coherent understanding of the programme's diverse approaches.

It would also be valuable to clarify how student input is collected and used in the selection of guest teachers, for example, whether this takes place through informal dialogue, structured processes such as evaluations or meetings, or documented mechanisms that include feedback to students. Such clarification would make it more transparent how students input influences decision-making and to what extent it informs concrete choices within the programme.

The assessment group therefore recommends that the programme considers:

- distributing course responsibility, assessments and planning tasks among a broader group of staff, including through additional employment within SKH Dance.
- establish a collegial structure (e.g., a programme council including teachers, students and head of programme) to support shared decision-making on content, progression and guest teacher selection,

strengthening collective ownership and reducing organizational vulnerability.

- Develop a strategy to address the tension between artistic profile and pedagogical practice among guest teachers, including reconsidering when and how the pedagogical perspective is introduced in the programme.
- Clarifying and documenting student influence in the selection of guest teachers and other pedagogical decisions, ensuring transparency and clear feedback mechanism.

6. students/doctoral students have a say in the planning, implementation and monitoring of education

Description and analysis of the education's strengths and areas for development in relation to the criterion and any recommendations for appropriate development work.

Strengths

The self-evaluation report identifies several concrete channels through which students can influence the programme, including course evaluations, exit interviews, regular class meetings, individual meetings with the head of programme, and in some cases input regarding guest teachers and supervisors. This suggests that student influence is understood as something that takes place through several different forms rather than through a single formal mechanism.

A strength of the described approach is the emphasis on close and continuous dialogue between students and the head of programme. In an artistic educational context, such dialogue can be particularly valuable, as it creates opportunities for concerns, needs and reflections to be voiced in relation to both individual development and the collective learning environment. The report also indicates an emerging ambition to involve students in the planning and organisation of certain public-facing events, which could support a broader understanding of professional preparation beyond performance alone.

Recommendations

At the same time, the report would benefit from a clearer description of how student influence is introduced and explained to students at the beginning of the programme. It remains unclear whether there is a structured onboarding process that makes explicit what students can influence, through which channels, within what timeframes, and with what kinds of expected outcomes.

The relation between informal dialogue and concrete influence on planning, implementation and follow-up also needs to be articulated more clearly. The report would be strengthened by describing how student suggestions are collected, who makes decisions, according to which criteria, and how those decisions are communicated back to students. In particular, it would be important to clarify

whether there is a formal closure of the feedback loop, so that students can see how their input has been considered and what changes it has or has not led to.

In this context, the programme could also consider more immediate ways of responding to student feedback. For example, when one course ends and the same cohort moves on to the next, the course coordinator could return to the main points raised in the evaluation and explain how they may be taken into account the next time the course is taught. Even if larger changes can only be made later, this would help students see how their feedback is being considered and would strengthen transparency and trust in the programme's way of working. The long time between course evaluation feedback and implemented changes may weaken the perceived impact of student influence and make follow-up less visible. Even if some structural constraints are difficult to avoid, the programme could consider intermediate forms of communication or follow-up in order to make this process more transparent.

The report could also further develop the understanding of student influence beyond the level of preference or request, toward forms of co-responsibility and shared shaping of the educational environment. One way of supporting this could be to consider more formal structures for shared discussion and decision-making, such as a programme council including students, teachers and the head of programme as discussed in Chapter 5. Student participation in the planning and organisation of public events could also be articulated more clearly within the programme structure, so that such involvement is recognised as part of the educational process.

These questions are closely connected to the programme's approach to monitoring and feedback systems, as discussed in Chapter 8, where the processing and use of feedback are addressed in more detail.

Summary

- Clarify how student influence is introduced and explained at the start of the programme, including onboarding, channels of participation, and expected outcomes.
- Make decision-making processes more transparent, especially how student input is collected, processed, and communicated back to students.
- Strengthen the closure of feedback loops so that students can see how their feedback has been considered and what changes it has led to.
- Introduce more immediate and visible follow-up practices to reinforce trust and the perceived impact of student participation.
- Develop student influence beyond individual feedback toward shared responsibility and co-shaping of the educational environment.
- Consider more formal structures for dialogue and decision-making, such as a programme council.
- Integrate student involvement in activities such as public events more clearly into the educational framework.

See also Chapters 5 and 8 for related recommendations.

7. that the study environment is accessible and appropriate for all students/doctoral students

Description and analysis of the education's strengths and areas for development in relation to the criterion and any recommendations for appropriate development work.

Strengths

The self-evaluation report demonstrates that accessibility and appropriateness of the study environment are taken seriously and approached as an ongoing area of transformation rather than as a finished achievement. A strength of the report is that it does not reduce accessibility to a narrow technical question, but addresses it in a broader sense that includes diversity, discrimination, belonging, health, institutional culture, and access to participation within the educational environment.

The report shows that the programme has engaged in several substantial initiatives in recent years to strengthen its capacity to host a more diverse student population. These include staff workshops and competence development around discrimination, conflict awareness and consent, the Lectures and Conversations about Racism and Resistance series, the focus group with the local Stockholm street dance community, collaborations with Gatuverket, and participation in the Erasmus-funded project Diversity in European Higher Dance Education. Together, these initiatives indicate a willingness to examine existing norms and to open the programme to wider perspectives and communities.

Another strength is the report's relative honesty in identifying institutional and pedagogical limitations. It acknowledges that the programme and the wider field still lack sufficient capacity to host diversity, and that this concerns not only norms of whiteness, but also underexplored questions such as ableism and access for differently abled students. The report also points to fragmentation across the institution and between study levels, and to students' need for stronger support in relation to physical and mental health. This level of self-reflection is valuable, as it shows awareness that accessibility is shaped not only by admissions and policy, but by the lived conditions of studying.

The report also suggests that there is already some flexibility in how students' different backgrounds, practices and archives can enter the educational process. This openness can be an important condition for making the study environment more relevant and responsive to a heterogeneous student group, especially in an artistic education where students bring different embodied practices, cultural references and professional trajectories.

Recommendations

At the same time, the report would benefit from a clearer description of how accessibility and inclusion are enacted in the everyday life of the programme, beyond projects, workshops and temporary initiatives. It would be important to understand more concretely what inclusion looks like in daily teaching situations, studio practices, feedback cultures, group work, course content and assignments, and what kinds of adjustments are available for students with different needs across courses. A stronger account of these everyday pedagogical practices would make the programme's approach more visible and more assessable.

The report raises the possibility of more individual study pathways in response to a more heterogeneous student population. This is a relevant and potentially productive direction, but it would benefit from more systematic reflection. It remains unclear on what levels such pathways could be developed, which kinds of needs they are intended to support, and how they would relate to the collective core of the programme. The programme should be encouraged to articulate more clearly what it seeks to host, what it cannot host within its present conditions, and how such choices are made and communicated.

A further area for development concerns outreach, recruitment and representation. The report notes persistent challenges regarding diversity in recruitment, including the predominance of cis female applicants, and points to the absence of sufficiently developed approaches to disability inclusion. These observations indicate the need for broader and more explicit outreach strategies, as well as reflection on where outreach takes place, who represents the institution in such contexts, and what forms of trust-building are needed for different communities to see the programme as relevant and accessible.

Moreover, the current reliance on fully online auditions raises a number of important questions. While this approach can increase accessibility and lower barriers to entry for applicants from different geographical and socio-economic backgrounds, it may also limit the programme's ability to assess embodied practice, physical presence and relational capacities that are central to dance education. Given the three-year commitment required from both students and the institution, and the strongly physical and practice-based nature of the programme, it could be valuable to reflect on whether a fully online format provides sufficient grounds for selection. As far as the assessment group is aware, many European institutions continue to require on-site auditions, at least for applicants based within the EU, while maintaining online options for those applying from outside Europe or under specific circumstances. Reconsidering the current format in this direction could help balance accessibility with a more comprehensive evaluation of applicants' artistic and physical practice.

The question of ableism appears especially important and underdeveloped. As the report itself suggests, this is not a superficial issue but one that may require a deeper rethinking of assumptions embedded in contemporary dance education. The programme would benefit from sustained research into existing practices and

models in dance education that address disability and ableism, in order to identify relevant approaches, collaborations and possible structural changes.

Student wellbeing support also emerges as a significant concern. The report describes insufficient support in relation to physical and mental health, difficulties navigating health services, and cases where minority-related stress is not easily or consistently addressed. The programme and institution should therefore continue to strengthen health-related support structures and work to ensure that students have access to timely, affordable and culturally sensitive psychological and medical support. This would also help reduce the burden currently placed on course leaders and teachers as informal support figures. These issues go beyond the programme itself and should be addressed at university level. The university needs to take clearer responsibility for improving student support and ensuring that adequate support services are available and accessible to students across the institution.

Related to this, teacher and staff preparedness could be strengthened further. In addition to competence development on diversity-related themes, it would be valuable to ensure that teachers are equipped to recognise signs of stress, exclusion or health-related difficulties, and that they are familiar with a clear and sensitive referral pathway for directing students toward appropriate support.

Finally, the report's discussion of fragmentation within the institution suggests a need to strengthen connections across programmes, study cycles and learning formats. Greater exchange between BA, MA and PhD levels, and between adjacent subject areas such as dance, dance pedagogy and possibly other performing arts fields, could help counter feelings of isolation and support a more connected educational environment. Structured opportunities for students to meet, present their work and explore collaborations across programmes may contribute to a stronger sense of institutional belonging and shared learning.

Summary

- Provide a clearer and more concrete account of how accessibility and inclusion are enacted in everyday pedagogical practice, including teaching, feedback, and adjustments for diverse student needs.
- Further develop and clarify the role of individual study pathways, including their scope and their relation to the collective structure of the programme.
- Strengthen outreach, recruitment, and representation strategies, particularly in relation to diversity and disability inclusion.
- Reconsider the reliance on fully online auditions, as it may limit the assessment of embodied and practice-based competencies.
- Explore hybrid audition formats as a way to balance accessibility with more comprehensive evaluation.
- Engage more deeply with questions of ableism and continue developing inclusive pedagogical frameworks.
- Strengthen student wellbeing support, with attention to institutional responsibility at the university level.
- Clarify and support staff roles in responding to student needs through more structured support systems.

- Improve connections across programmes and study levels to reduce fragmentation and support a more cohesive educational environment.

8. continuous monitoring and development of the education, supported by course evaluations and, for doctoral students, individual study plans

Description and analysis of the education's strengths and areas for development in relation to the criterion and any recommendations for appropriate development work.

Strengths

In this programme there is a relatively small group of students, one or two cohorts at a time, that moves through a predominantly collective programme with few parallel options that are organised by the programme itself. The amount of permanent staff is very small, which creates a situation where the Head of the Programme is in ongoing personal contact with both the students and the teachers. True to the ethos of the programme, which values different perspectives and is interested in an interactive rather than top-down relationship between teachers and students and which is aware of its experimental nature, the responsible for the programme has a strong interest in keeping up the dialogue with both students and teachers on how they experience the programme. This makes the monitoring of the courses an ongoing process with a strong degree of informality. The assessment group sees the limitations of that approach, but also wants to stress that the informality is also an asset that highlights the interest and care of all involved in continuously wanting to increase the application of its core principles and improve the quality of the way these unfold in pedagogical practice.

The SER rightfully stresses that the notion of ‘monitoring’ is at least partially in contradiction with the values that the programme defends. The programme wants to focus on sharing practices rather than passing them on from top to down, it wants to create spaces in which participants also learn from one another, because it believes that the further development of the education will come as much from these lived interactions than from formalised processes.

Despite the obvious friction of these ideas with the expectations and systems that are in place at the university, the SER points out that it wants to keep searching to both approach these expectations and to modify them so that the university’s expectations and systems can become useful tools for the programme on the longer term, if only to become a resource that can be implemented and used beyond the individuals who are currently engaged in the programme. This should clearly not be a purely quantitative approach that erases individuality and context, but include a qualitative one that is sensitive to context and differences.

Recommendations

The program acknowledges that there is not a system where teachers can feedback the students, and that it is in the process of developing a feedback form that would be part of the teachers' offboarding process. While that is useful, the program could think of taking a step further and integrate that in the student assessment system - given that so much of the concrete content that is brought into the programme is intimately connected to the teachers' artistic practice, the teacher's validation of how a student has dealt with a course content so linked to their practice and vision is an essential element of judging the learning outcomes. Keeping individual feedback from teacher to student outside the assessment system risks becoming a labour-intensive but undervalued practice.

Despite the strong relevance of the informal nature of monitoring, the current systems are being used and there is no doubt that they can also bring elements to the foreground that an informal system cannot catch, and through accumulation they can provide a longer perspective. It is however not very clear how the anonymised feedback forms for students and teachers are used. The assessment group has the impression that it is not clear to the students who receives and processes anonymous feedback forms. The program should pressure the university to install an ombudsman, and if that is not possible, the assessment groups recommends the program to appoint someone who is not teaching (or not much) but who has a connection to the program in that role. Given that the head of the program also has a lot of teaching and coaching interactions with the students, it would be good that the system of anonymous feedback (of which it is not clear how much it is used) also applies to that position, to give everyone the option to speak freely about all aspects of the learning process.

What could also be clarified is how exactly feedback is processed: who collects it, who interprets it, which measures does it inspire? Towards both students and teachers, the assessment group recommends to install a practice of 'closing the loop' (at the end of a course, a term, a generation), to be transparent about the feedback received, how it is interpreted, what change it will lead to and what change it will *not* lead to, or not immediately, and why. This can increase trust in the feedback system, because the stakeholders will see more clearly the consequences or effects of their feedback. In a next course review process, the programme could then also give examples of adjustments that were based on feedback, which is now missing from the SER.

The tension between the unificatory dimension of the ILO's and the actual fragmentation of their actual delivery by different teachers offering potentially different approaches within the same course clearly affects the efficacy and meaningfulness of the course evaluations by the students, again because in many cases the content of a course is intimately linked to the teacher's practice. The program could advocate on the level of SKH to have more independence to adapt the course evaluation system - from using the same system but by applying it per teacher instead of per course, up onto transforming the entire system to include the

values that the program finds crucial but which are not reflected in the current evaluation system.

When adapting the structure of course evaluations by students, the assessment group suggests asking how much a student has participated in the course they are evaluating, to give more context to the feedback.

Another perspective that is not clear and maybe not present at all in SKH's system of course monitoring, is the perspective from outside. Given that many of the guest teachers come from outside SKH and have a strong connection to the professional field, it would be worthwhile to include this perspective in the monitoring system. This probably already happens informally through the contacts of the Head and the guest teacher, and it is of no great use adding a formal layer to that, but it can be interesting to identify and use that information (and show that) in the monitoring process (or in the self evaluation).

In response to the growing importance of the horizontal aspect of learning, the SER proposes to integrate a horizontally organised course where teachers and students learn together. This is a great idea that corresponds strongly to the ethics the program wants to promote, and such a course can correspond well in different ways to the QT's. But keeping it out of the assessment system, as the SER suggests, risks to devalue it. Self-evaluation or peer-to-peer evaluation could be a tool for assessing it. Because it needs to be validated in order to be part of a credited course, one cannot rule out altogether a hierarchical endpoint, but it is better that this dynamic, unavoidable in the university system, is explicitly recognised, while at the same time one can reduce it to the smallest observation that the self evaluations or peer-to-peer evaluations have been executed/submitted.

Summary

- include teacher's feedback on the students in the assessment procedure
- pressure SKH to install an ombudsman function or install one within the programme
- clarify who is responsible for the processing and follow-up of course evaluations
- clarify to the students what happens (and what not) with the feedback received
- include indication of how much a student has participated in the evaluation forms
- make the feedback from the professional field (through guest teachers) more visible
- include fully horizontal learning processes in the assessment system

9. applies only to third-cycle courses and study programmes:

- **doctoral students have access to an active research environment with sufficient subject depth, breadth and scope**
- **doctoral students have the opportunity to collaborate with national and international researchers and with the surrounding community**

Description and analysis of the education's strengths and areas for development in relation to the criterion and any recommendations for appropriate development work.

Not applicable.

10. Other

Any descriptions, analyses and values regarding, for example, internationalisation, widening participation, sustainable development and gender equality.

No specific comments unless already mentioned elsewhere

11. Other comments from the assessment group

No comments

12. Overall

The assessment group should summarise below in a clear and concise manner its previously expressed considerations, opinions, and summarise its previously expressed proposals for action. The summed assessment should also provide feedback on good practices and areas for development.

Summary

The BA programme in Dance has a distinct artistic profile that wants to look at dance and dance in a much broader way than in the past. Away from the self-evident domination of Western contemporary dance, whilst retaining elements of it that fit into a broader and more inclusive approach, it seeks to approach dance as a horizontal multiplicity of approaches and contexts, and attempts to translate that into a new educational model, that brings in a more varied palette of definitions of dance, seeks to activate and validate the individual students' diverse dance backgrounds and to consider a professional career as more multifaceted than the traditional ideal where the concert dance stage is the sole model towards which the education strives. In this, the program follows recent evolutions in the professional field while at the same time it also pioneers in rethinking how these developments

can and should affect the transmission of dance in a university context. This is a trial-and-error process without a clearly pre-defined masterplan, where ambitions bump into limits and imperfections that follow from the institutional context and histories they grow from and are placed in, financial and material constraints and also the paradoxes and inconsistencies that are inevitable when trying to re-think traditions from within.

The design of the program shows a strong student-centered and reflective pedagogy, where students are active participants and co-creators who are expected to have their own artistic backgrounds and interests propel the development of their education, in what is very much a collective setting. The teaching is deeply rooted in varied artistic practices that go beyond eurocentric traditions. The concept of the 'dancing citizen', which has become a summarising image of the programme's philosophy, connects the artistic to broader societal contexts, reflecting an engagement with social justice, positionality, and decolonial and Indigenous perspectives. This orientation signals a move beyond performer-centric training toward a broader societal and ethical positioning of dance practice.

The program's inclusive ethos doesn't only impact the educational content and the choice of teachers, but also the framework for the students, who are not treated as passive consumers but active producers of knowledge, knowledge that to a substantial extent is considered to already be present in their backgrounds and interests. Peer-to-peer learning processes take up an important part of the delivery of the programme, that strives to also include the teachers in horizontal learning processes. Being a small community, the programme tries to keep the communication lines short and to make sure it understands the needs and desires of the students.

The recommendations that are suggested by the assessment group depart from a full approval of and confidence in the broad goals the program has set for itself.

The main recommendations are the following:

- to define more clearly a balance between the breadth of practices it wants to touch and the depth needed to transmit these embodied knowledges;
- to bring an engagement with 'the pedagogical' earlier in the programme in order to anticipate better on different types of teaching and learning;
- to develop structures that broaden the leadership of the programme
- develop structures that allow for more interaction between the teachers and their different pedagogies, improve the support for teachers to enter into this context of multiplicities and engage them more closely and fully in the assessment of the students;
- further clarify the expanded career paths it educates students towards, and build more opportunities to interact with them in the programme;
- develop a clearer and broader articulation of the students' influence of the programme, via a clear feedback loop and broader possibilities of student engagement in the conception and realisation of the programme;
- demand more support from SKH to increase the financial viability of the program, to adapt the learning outcomes and assessment processes to the

new methods of the programme, to provide better contextual support (physical and mental health, scholarships) for the students.

Annexes

The assessment group has taken note of the following mandatory annexes to the self-assessment report:

Curriculum (first cycle and second cycle studies)

Overview of qualitative targets