

External review of study courses and programmes at University of Gothenburg

Panel statement for Master of Fine Arts Programme in Film
at HDK-Valand at the University of Gothenburg

revised final draft 06.05.2024 (first draft 22.03.2024)

Short background

The panel has been tasked with assessing MFA in Film at HDK-Valand at the University of Gothenburg based on the university's criteria in accordance with the policy for quality assurance and continuous quality improvement.

On 30.11.2023, a preparatory meeting was held where the panel agreed on work allocation for each member for the site visit and the overall quality assessment. Before the preparatory meeting, the faculty and the department submitted input documents to the assessment panel (appendix 2). The site visit was carried out on 8-9.2.2024 (program for site visit, see appendix 3). The panel has then, based on documentation and the site visit interviews, jointly prepared their statement.

The panel has consisted of:

- Jan Nåls, PhD, Senior lecturer, Arcada (chair)
- Nicia Ivonne Fernandez Grijalva, MA student, Stockholms Konstnärliga Högskola (student representative)
- Ylva Gustavsson, Professor, Stockholms Konstnärliga Högskola
- Nduka Mntambo, PhD, Program Head, MA in Film, The Netherlands Film Academy

The education's main strengths and weaknesses as well as the assessment group's reflections and recommendations

Introduction

First and foremost, the panel would like to acknowledge the commitment of present and former students, the staff members, and the management, all of whom we have interacted with during the assessment. Said commitment is evident in the accessible and thoughtful documents that relate to the program, as well as the diverse artistic research outputs produced by staff and students. More than anything, the dedication came to the fore in our on-site discussions with staff and students. The associated people care deeply about the program – their critical feedback and suggestions for development are tangible proofs of affection.

The MFA in Film is in many ways a unique program. Although arts and research have many historical touching points, the institutionalisation of artistic research is a novel development – the Vienna Declaration of Artistic research, for example, was published in 2020. Within the Nordics, there are few, if any, similar master programs in film with a commitment to artistic research. In this perspective, the MFA in Film is a pioneer program.

An added challenge is the dual nature of the approach of the program: to do, and to teach, artistic research, is to occupy both an insider and an outsider perspective. The MFA in Film at HDK-Valand is a space of creative tension – an ongoing dialogue between art and research, doing and thinking, practice and theory. The following report, and its findings and suggestions, arise from this dialogue. Much of the concerns and critique of the program boil down to questions of balance.

It is worth noting that a film education exists in relation to the expectations and conventions created by an omnipresent, and often conservative, film and media industry. It is therefore not surprising that there are multiple presumptions of what an MFA in film could (and should) entail, how it could be designed, and how it could be carried out. The many conflicting voices are a resource that was highly appreciated by the panel, and the many viewpoints are duly reflected in this report.

The panel would like to express its thanks to the University of Gothenburg for the attentive organisation that went into the review process both before and during the visit. The site visit gave relevant insights into the program, and the discussions with staff and students became an integral part of this report. This input will hopefully spark further reflection – and action – in the future.

Below we outline our responses to each of the suggested topic areas with recommendations bullet pointed at the end of each section. Each member of the panel had 2 topics assigned to them. Some of our recommendations are of a general nature, where we leave the practical implementation of potential measures to be solved by the faculty, other times we suggest concrete measures. A distinctive aspect of this report are the detailed recommendations of the

student representative of the panel, which we deem to be valuable input. Her recommendations are to be found in Appendix 1.

1. Achieved study results match intended learning outcomes and the qualitative targets of the Higher Education Ordinance.

The achieved study results of the program match the intended learning outcomes and the qualitative targets of the Higher Education Ordinance. The intended learning outcomes of the course syllabuses and the progression of courses over the four semesters also supports that these study results can be achieved.

The pedagogic benefit of having interwoven reflecting and practical courses during semesters is obvious and seen as beneficial by the students.

The schedule clearly states the date and time of examination and intended learning outcomes are listed in the course syllabus for each course, easily accessible for the student on the digital learning platform Canvas. Working with students in artistic practice like this program do, with a lot of seminars and feedback sessions scheduled during courses, is of great pedagogical value and students also talked of this as highly beneficial to their learning and development as artists and artistic researchers. Some of the students had questions of what and how intended learning outcomes were assessed, at what point and in which of the interwoven courses – the assessment criteria were perceived as vague. Some students felt that they were being assessed many times for the same outcome. Students also stressed the importance of having oral information about the learning outcomes at the start of the course.

Our one concern with assessment is thus communication. But, for lecturers and mentors to be able to communicate assessment criteria, they need to identify said criteria, and set the timeline of assessment. HDK-Valand nurtures a culture of constant dialogue on creative practice and artistic research, which is the lifeline of an artistic education. Within that dialogue also lies a constant evaluation and assessment of artistic work and process, but – and this is a crucial point – it may be difficult for students to discern what is assessed and at what time, because of the ongoing nature of dialogue and analysis. This is why we propose that courses include assessment criteria and a clear timeline when course outcomes are assessed based on these criteria. Criteria can also be determined in dialogue with visiting lecturers in connection to intensive courses. We are aware that creative practice and art works cannot be reduced to assessments based on a determined set of criteria. But clear assessment criteria can help students navigate their development as creative practitioners and develop their artistic identity. The ongoing dialogue / analysis and clear assessment criteria are not mutually exclusive. Rather, we believe they support the students in their practice.

Recommendations:

- Take care of the *when* and *what* of assessment. Find ways to communicate when the assessment of learning outcomes take place and identify and communicate the criteria for assessment both verbally and in text.

- Communicate clearly and repeatedly to students what the required study result of each interwoven course is, and how they are being assessed.
- Assemble teams of 2-4 lecturers per each course and ask them to determine outcomes and assessment criteria for each individual course. It is especially pertinent to determine the criteria for the second years final film and essay.
- If there are course outcomes that are not being assessed it is equally important to communicate this to students.

2. Teaching is focused on student/doctoral-centered learning.

The teaching, as evidenced by documents and interviews, allows the MA students to bring their own knowledge, past experiences, education, and ideas into the educational setting, and this highly impacts how they take on board new information and learn. It is clearly a student-centered approach. The relatively small number of students further allows for such a student-centered approach. Certain students, mostly MA1, expressed disappointment in the lack of ability to bring their own topics and merge them with the content of the intensives, while second year students were more content in the way their own research interests were at the center of teaching. These somewhat opposing views are not surprising, since much of the 2nd year is structured around the final project, which take the form a film project and a written thesis.

How the development of the final project and the ensuing examination is structured and managed was a substantial part of the on-site discussions.

The individuality of each student is considered and reflected in the development of the project dossier and in the overall development of their individual research approach. But the structure of the studies, especially in the second MA year, and how the structure supports the examination, are areas of improvement. Some students felt that the structure was not catering to the fact that they were aiming to make a completed film. The transition from year 1 to 2 is a case in point. The students are expected to deliver a developed project dossier quite early in semester 3, year 2, before they go into production. There is not necessarily sufficient time for development and pre-production, or then this development is to be made partly in summer, without access to teaching or supervision. Since resources are limited, it is advisable to put emphasis on pre-production. The project dossier is a good deliverable which challenges the students to answer many relevant questions, and it supports them in defining and answering their artistic research questions. But it does not always work as support for the production of the film. For example, some of the dossiers we encountered lacked a developed script, and only contained an abstract/outline combined with descriptions of methods and references etc. This is understandable, as many of the films we have seen can be categorized as exploratory documentaries/essay films, genres that are not easily scripted. But our view is that such film could also benefit from a more thought-out script-based approach, where students would develop 2-3 drafts of the script, perhaps with an assigned mentor. Such a structure should be established at the end of semester 2. This might give students added control and overview of the production. Naturally, scripts for experimental films, documentaries and essay films differ

from traditional fictional scripts – perhaps questions addressed in a future intensive course that could be given in semester 2?

As always in film production, many interviewees voiced the lack of resources and time in the production process as major problems. These challenges can be, at least partially, met by solid pre-production and structural support. Regarding production and the final outcomes, we got the general impression that many films were done with a small crew. Oftentimes the director was also in charge of sound and cinematography, as well as editing. This auteur-driven approach suits some of the projects very well but is limiting others. It is also a factor when students plan their projects, as they sometimes shun away from film ideas that require more extensive teamwork, or ideas that are challenging when it comes to, for example, sound design or cinematography. All filmmakers and -schools face similar challenges, but it is good to be aware of the special circumstances at HDK-Valand. The program is very ambitious and encourages experimentation, as it wants to push the student's creative practice and research to new unforeseen heights. But the limits mentioned above tend to make some of the films predictable and sometimes even conservative, less than the sum of their parts. For this reason, the program might consider structures that would strongly enable teamwork, structures that would allow the students to explore the full scope of cinematic expression, across different genres.

Another issue is the chronological order of the film production and the written thesis. Now, in most cases, the film is made first (completed around February), and then the students have 2-3 months to complete the written component (completed around May). Many felt that this order could be more flexible, and in some cases interwoven or even reversed, so that students would be allowed more time to work on the film. This is in fact already happening outside the given structure, as many MA2 students told us that their films were not ready when they were publicly screened in February, and that they planned to work on them during the last semester.

This speaks to an ongoing debate around product and process, of practice and theory. The program is built around research through creative practice – it invites a practice of thinking and doing in a constant dialogue. With the current structure the balance can be viewed as tilted towards "research/thinking", as the written reflective component is given more time, and it constitutes the final deliverable. We are aware that this is a simplified view on a complex dynamic, but still a topic worthy of reflection. In our recommendations, we propose a more flexible timeline regarding the film and essay, combined with a more rigorous approach to pre-production and production.

The studies are concluded with examination, and this is a moment (or several moments) that should be given extra attention. The films are usually made public in February, during the Göteborg Film Festival (GFF) through an event (usually on campus) which is not currently part of the festival. The timing is therefore not ideal, as the event is competing with the festival and its many events.

The staff expressed differing views on how to address the examination - some staff members felt that there is no immediate need to make the films public, or even demand that the students make finished films. Other staff members argued otherwise – that it is of outmost

importance of "what the world sees" of a film program, and that the "professional integrity of a practice is to resolve something" - in this case a film. It is worth noting that there were also many positive examples of examination processes and meetings with audiences. One year a MA graduation film, depicting Greek immigrants and their longing for their home country, was shown in café to an appreciative audience of Greek men living in Sweden, a good example of connecting with audiences in a creative manner.

Recommendations:

- Examination should include a finished film, and students should be given structural support and flexibility to produce it.
- Identify individual student needs regarding production of the final film and be sensitive to how these needs affect the schedule/structure of the final year.
- Consider being flexible with the order of deliverables in year 2, so that the film and essay might be completed in reverse order, or being created in tandem, depending on the nature of the project.
- Oversee and develop the transition period from MA1 to MA2. The goal is to give a clear direction to each student ahead of year two. Perhaps give them a focused task for the summer in a key area of development.
- Allow more time and mentoring for development and pre-production in the third semester at the start of year two.
- Consider giving structural support for pre-production in the form of script development, with sensibility towards the genre and general nature of the film project. Script writing across genres could be the subject of an intensive course in year one.
- Consider structural support for production, especially with regard to team building in key areas such as cinematography, sound and acting, which would allow for more diversity in style and genre in the final films.
- Consider allocating more resources to production support, especially with regard to logistic and legal issues. Be aware that MA students often film in a foreign environment, so a local producer is a great asset, and thus consider boosting this resource in the program.
- Take care of the examination moment/s, so that the work, and the students behind it, are seen and acknowledged. Market the event/s properly.
- Create a communal event around examination, which may or may not coincide with a public screening and invite faculty and students from other departments to participate. Make it a big deal!

3. The content and form of teaching rests on scientific and/or artistic bases and proven experience.

The content and format of the program, as outlined in the comprehensive syllabus, is well designed. It is evident in the clearly defined aim of developing and enhancing students' artistic research practice through cinematic practice. This practice-based research trajectory

positions student tuition within an expanded understanding of lens-based practice, also reflecting broader societal concerns. The program's content and structure unfold over four defined semesters. The first semester is aimed at assisting students in identifying and refining their research interests and plotting their enquiry trajectory. The second semester facilitates students' methodological exploration through critical discussions with peers and participation in seminars that place their practice within wider artistic research discourse. The third semester is production-focused, orienting the practice towards public presentation, culminating in the fourth semester with both a presentation and a written component. The Film Practice and Critical Practice Courses throughout the semesters offers a systematic (scientific) translation of the pedagogic vision of the program while supported by the interdisciplinary electives. The format of teaching is similarly rooted in strong scientific and/or artistic principles. Many of the intensives introduce current research, and many students mentioned how the teaching consistently challenge their thinking and practice. Areas that were mentioned were decolonial art practices and sensory film practices, just to name a few. The Practical and Reflection Courses are interwoven and conducted through assignments, discussions and workshops that are organised in Intensive courses. Furthermore, the intensives with opportunities to present visual work and receive peer feedback.

The review process, including discussions with MA1 and MA2 students, the Programme Director, two responsible teachers, PhD, and alumni, affirmed that the programme's content and teaching format are founded on excellent scientific and artistic principles.

The permanent teaching staff brings excellent proven experience spanning from organising funded international exchange programs such as the LP Exchange, research projects such as BRICS, KONSTFORSK 2022-2024 and Erasmus+ research Project. Many of the staff are active professional filmmakers whose work is shown and awarded in international film festival. The demonstratable research practice of the permanent staff is translated in the cycles of research topics developed over several iterations of the program. This is a positive aspect since the curriculum benefits from agile teachers who instantiates the generative triad of being pedagogues, researchers, and practitioners. Further to that, the program welcomes diverse practitioners / researchers who collaborate by offering expertise in cinematic studio practice, transdisciplinary practice, and theoretical intensives. The inclusion of 20% PhD candidate teachers is a strong element of the pedagogy.

4. Teachers have up-to-date and adequate competence as regards their subjects and teaching and learning in higher education, and the numbers of teachers are in proportion to the scope and content of study courses and programmes

Based on the teaching guideline document ("Rollbeskrivning kursansvarig HDK-Valand"), the responsible teachers possess up-to-date and adequate subject-specific, higher education pedagogical and subject didactic skills. Both have completed a substantial amount of the HDK didactic courses, and one has recently completed their third cycle qualification. As indicated in the previous section, the teaching staff have extensive experience in teaching, research, and practice.

The challenge arising from engagements with staff was the question of workload allocation, particularly the disproportionate number of 'administrative' tasks that fall to the teachers. These tasks include coordinating guest teachers (accommodation, travel) and booking learning venues. There was also a query about how the time for curriculum development is calculated in the workload allocation. The third concern we identified from the discussion with the responsible teachers is that there is a need to dedicate time to getting the technical colleagues responsible for production or studio-based instruction to align with the idea of student productions as products of artistic research, rather than as traditional film productions. This would help them support the students in their experimental work that is part of the artistic research process. Regarding the proportionality of staff numbers in relation to the scope and content of education, concerns were raised that one of the teachers responsible was hired at full capacity but later reduced their percentage, resulting in a skewed distribution of the workload.

Recommendations:

Although the aforementioned concerns require immediate remediation in the form of administrative support, clarity regarding the calculation of workload distribution, negotiations about the implications of reducing the capacity percentage of the position, and additional technical support for the education project from the colleagues responsible for studio-based instruction (cinematography, editing, etc.), this panel member strongly believes that these challenges can be overcome and do not pose a substantial risk to the integrity of the teaching staff's core competencies and capacities.

5. Study courses and programs are relevant to the needs of the students/doctoral students and society. Description and analysis of the course/program strengths and weaknesses in relation to the criterion, as well as any recommendations for suitable improvements.

Overall, the program is perceived as relevant to the student's needs. It provides exposure to both artistic research and film industry-oriented practices, and access to various resources suggesting a broad approach to education in the field. The intensive courses are viewed positively as they give valuable experiences and enhance critical thinking and personal and artistic growth. Students view that external influences from guest teachers, forums with other MA students and visits to international festivals and events to be highly beneficial.

There are concerns about the lack of support in finding production means and resources. An example was given by a former student who didn't use her budget because she didn't know how to access it. Non-local students have limited networking opportunities. The students who lack knowledge in production find it challenging when they are tasked, as part of their examination, to produce films that are to be shared or published outside the program. Disparities in resources and opportunities based on (local) privilege and gender are also observed by students. This issue may be more pertinent to international students.

MA 1 students voiced several wishes, which included clearer expectations and guidance in the program's structure, project deadlines, and assessment criteria. Some MA2 students asked for more practical applications to their craft. These are suggested also by students who have previously specialized in different areas such as direction, cinematography, and screenwriting. Craft orientated education could include production, sound production and other technical training, scriptwriting, project management and logistics, creative collaborative tools and techniques used by film directors, as well as collaborative process in filmmaking.

Recommendations (see Appendix 1 one for details)

- Reduce mental load for incoming MA1-students with communication and help MA2 students in their production by increased support.
- Increase the sense of support by automatizing reminders.
- Employ a full-time production coordinator / advisor that also acts as a support person in networking to the local community.

6. Students/doctoral students have influence in planning, implementing and monitoring study courses and programs.

Students agree there are opportunities to influence the planning, implementation, and monitoring of study programs. As an example, efforts have been made to advocate for safer spaces and policies to address power dynamics and inequalities.

Students did, however, express various, and sometimes contrasting, wishes to further influence course structures, assessment criteria, and support structures. Regarding support systems, students mentioned specifically the need to connect to the world outside the school – closer ties with other study programs, such as local actor educations and study programs abroad, as well as the local and international film industry. However, the Nordic dimension in the program is strong. Many mentioned the visit to CPH:DOX as a highlight of their education, both in terms of networking and input that helped them develop their practice and research. The Nordic collaboration Konstforsk was noted as another example of Nordic collaboration that pushes the students' creative practice as well as develops new pedagogy.

Recommendations: (see Appendix 1 one for details)

- Tutor students using an individual pedagogical approach during the first semester/s to manage expectations and to empower incoming students.
- Maintain and develop the Swedish and Nordic presence in the program and develop further collaborations that foster Nordic values and practices.
- Maintain and develop international collaborations, especially those that have interests in research through practice, such as the strong links to PARSE, and its journal and events.

7. The study and learning environment is accessible and purpose-oriented for all students/doctoral students.

The HDK-Valand campus is accessible, and the facilities are orientated towards the purpose of film education. The MA students have, for example, access to a small film theatre and an adjoining exhibition space. Furthermore, the students have access to what is referred to as the MA corridor, with editing spaces, a kitchen, and a large common room for students. The equipment facilities, located in another part of campus, received some criticism, both in terms of the quality of equipment and its accessibility. Many students said that they end up using their personal equipment, which creates an unequal situation in the group.

The common room in the MA corridor is not sufficiently cared for, and on the date of the panel's visit it was messy and untidy. The students' comments confirmed that the common room is not fully functional, and as such supported our singular observation. The studio and its storage rooms in the cellar were also in a state of disorder, with props and set design not properly cared for. This state of the facilities sends a general message of negligence which is not in line with the high ambitions of the program. The state of the studio might even pose potential security and health risks, as it is a space with heavy equipment and high voltage. The situation presents an opportunity for the program to re-imagine these spaces, and at the same time build a sense of community and ownership for the building among all who work and study in it.

The digital space that is most used is Canvas, which acts as a communication channel and an archive for ongoing and past work. From the student's perspective Canvas is fulfilling its function, whereas some staff members acknowledged that various digital platforms are tying up resources that could be used to develop pedagogy, creative practice, and research.

Recommendations:

- Create a culture of agency and responsibility. Draft an action plan in dialogue with students and staff on how the studio could be developed and used, and how the MA corridor could be made more inviting.
- Clean up the studio and the storage rooms with a common event in which everybody in the building is expected to participate. Offer food and drinks to everyone who takes part.
- Create an intensive course that explores the creative possibilities of a studio environment.
- Name a group of students (perhaps from multiple programs) and staff members from key departments to form a group that is responsible for the studio and give them sufficient resources. Design a clear manual and sets of rules for the studio. The same group could re-evaluate how the equipment room could be used more efficiently.
- Form a parallel group with MA1 and MA2- students that have responsibility of taking care of the MA corridor. Consult other relevant student groups (architecture, design, woodwork, sculpture etc.) in the planning. Incentivize the group with sufficient resources.

8. The study courses and programs are continuously monitored and developed

The program is being continuously monitored and developed through the system of course evaluations and program monitoring that is in place at HDK-Valand.

When talking to students and alumni it also was very clear that they were aware that they know that they could leave anonymous evaluations on-line and where they could find these links. They also felt that they could discuss and give feedback on courses that are ongoing. A formative evaluation of courses takes place orally during the semesters.

Routines for development of courses and programs are also in place at HKD-Valand and in use at this program.

9. Other views from the panel

A separate area of concern was, for lack of a better word, loneliness. Firstly, this refers to a sense of professional loneliness and isolation which students (and some staff as well) felt, in varying degree, in relation to the local and international film industry and to commercial realities and expectations of industry and academia. Loneliness also refers to a sense of individual alienation, not surprising in a digital age dominated by the small screen, in an international master program with students from all over the world, far removed from their homes and communities. How to address loneliness is one key to personal and academic well-being, and success.

The well-being of staff also links to questions of sustainability in a broad sense. It is vital that teachers are constantly updating their pedagogical skills and can discuss pedagogy to create a common vision. It is equally important that staff and students know that the program commits to social and ecological sustainability goals, which feeds into a sense of purpose.

The MFA program in film is a strong and vital program. An alumni put it like this: "Valand is kind of punk!" The program produces relevant, bold, and diverse ideas and research. It pushes creative practice into new areas, and the skilled students who graduate see the value in such pursuits. An aspect of the program that is especially strong is the development of communication skills. This became evident during the on-site visit, where the panel was struck by how well different and often contrasting arguments were put forward.

The contrasting views, a hallmark for a thriving arts education, stem partly from the two different traditions that are present in the program: that of traditional film production, and that of artistic research practices. This tension can be a source of joy, creativity, and exploration, if all parties commit to a culture of curiosity and open-mindedness.

Recommendations:

- Create workshops / intensives that critically investigate and enhance soft skills: for ex compassion, empathy, emotional intelligence, leadership, teamwork. These could be done in collaboration with other departments, which could strengthen a sense of community and combat isolation.

- Review pedagogical training so that it addresses Fine Art teaching and allocate time for staff to reflect on their pedagogy together.
- Give administrative support to ensure the sustainability aspects of the program.
- Establish a mentorship program, where each student is paired with a mentor from outside the program, preferably from the local (or national) film industry or from another relevant field. Such a mentor would not tie up resources of the program, but it would help to connect students and the whole program closer to the city of Gothenburg.

Detailed recommendations of the student representative (Appendix 1)

List of input documents for the panel (Appendix 2)

Program site visit, on 8-9.2.2024 (Appendix 3)

Appendix 1

Detailed recommendations of the student representative Nicia Ivonne Fernandez Grijalva

• Reduce mental load for incoming MA1-students with better communication on campus and help MA2 students in their production by increased support.

- a. Print a poster of the school map and hang it in the MA student's room.
- b. Print a poster of the school staff (technicians, producer etc.) with their picture, contact email/phone and location. Add a description of what they could help with in regards of the program. Hang it in the MA student's room.
- c. Print a poster of the main departments that students can reach in the MA for support and hang it in the MA student's room.
- d. Add a landing page with this information in the student's portal (optional).
- e. Add signs around school to help students find places faster (optional).
- f. Place manuals on "how-to" ask for budget, the use of studio, equipment, books, use printers, kitchen etc. plus production forms in the MA student portal. Make it simple.
- g. Add a printed poster with the QR of these manuals at the MA student's room.
- h. Print a poster about how to ask/manage the film studio and hang it outside the studio. *Add driver license suggestions to manage it.
- i. Print a poster on how to ask/manage costumes, props and hang it outside this department. *Add external rental suggestions.
- j. Print a poster on how to ask/manage film equipment and hang it outside this department. *Add external rental suggestions.
- k. Do the same with any other department involved, etc.

Note: It must be visual for the students to get familiar with it. Everyday.

• Increase the sense of support by automatizing reminders.

- a. Make a list of the things that constantly need to be repeated to students during the program and send a programmed reminder by email every other week.
- b. Make a list of the things that are constantly asked by students during the program and the period these questions arise. Program the answers in advance by email or build a Q&A that can be re-sent every other week.
- c. Schedule one-on-one meetings with all the students on a formal basis. It can be the same day every weekday or every 2 weeks. Give instead a "latest day" to cancel (a week, 48 hrs., etc), and give the option to write a petition to 'cancel all and decide later' to those who are more proactive.

• Employ a full-time production coordinator / advisor that also acts as a support person in networking.

- a. As an advisor, support in the structure of the project, the legal agreements, and the resources (half of the year).
- b. Can be the person behind the 'posters' in the MA student room, etc.
- c. Checks that resources are in well state and coordinates maintenance.
- d. Supports the student union or students when they have collaborative or networking ideas.
- e. Coordinates a "recruitment" fair within the university, where all the students from different areas (actors, musicians, editors, set designers etc.) listen to MA student pitches and list themselves to help them. It is straightforward and time saving, and it can be done by the end of the first year.

- f. Influences the possibility of lending equipment during the holidays.
- g. Is up to date with the local clubs, locations, and events related to the industry.
- h. Responsible for creating external meetings/events with local Institutions, agencies, festivals etc. to promote networking and local knowledge in the industry.
- i. Responsible for communicating external programs (Erasmus, etc) and opportunities (internships, entree-level jobs).

Most of these recommendations can be implemented immediately and are intrinsically related to the way things are communicated and how well the student is familiarized with the institution.











• Tutor students using an individual pedagogical approach during the first semester/s to manage expectations and to empower incoming students.

- a. The limited number of students (8) gives space for personalized tutoring. Meet the former lecturers to find insight into the student process. Follow the process of each student project and pass the feedback to the next teacher together with suggestions (if any) for improvement. You will know beforehand how you can help students, because sometimes we don't even know in what we need help.
- b. During the one-on-one meetings, specify what does the course brief means in terms of my own project. What does developing my artistic research mean for my project? What options do I have in terms of research? Only references or also experimentation? Etc. You want to translate the 'teacher' language into 'student' language.
- c. Some students might not be accustomed to the arts 'free style' structure yet. Help students who need a specific deadline or how much it is expected from them decide.
- d. For 2nd year: The same students have a thesis advisor, they need a film project production advisor. A recommendation is to hire one person full-time that can work during autumn in administrative errands and focus on student projects during spring (or vice versa).

Appendix 2

The panel had access to the following documents that are available for further viewing at the link:

 [MFA Programme in Film - External review HDK-Valand 2023-2024](#)

 Name	Document Sta...	Modified	Fastställd dat...	Arkiverad av	Diariennr	Arkivlänk
 0.1 Reading instructions	✕	September 27, 2023				
 0.2 Governing documents	✕	September 22, 2023				
 0.3 Program-specific documents	✕	September 27, 2023				
 0.4 Teaching related documents	✕	September 22, 2023				
 0.5 Student work	✕	September 27, 2023				
 0.6 Course reports	✕	October 30, 2023				
 0.7 Miscellaneous	✕	September 27, 2023				
 Site visit program MFA Film 160124.docx	✕ Arbetsmaterial	January 18				
 Site visit program.pdf	✕ Arbetsmaterial	October 30, 2023				

Appendix 3

SITE VISIT PROGRAM External review panel MFA FILM Hdk-Valand at GU 8 and 9 February 2024

Day 1

10.00-12.00

- The assessment group meets representatives of the department to gain access to premises etc.
- The assessment group has an internal preparatory meeting.

Room 2081

13.00-14.00

- Walkabout with current students (student reps from MA1 and MA2) of learning environment.
(Bio Valand, Screening Room, X-Library, seminar rooms, film corridor with edit spaces and common areas)

- MA1: Karim
- MA2: Leonard

14.15-15.15

- Assessment group has decided student meetings will run concurrently of two different years simultaneously with 4-5 students per year (collective discussion with students per year group)
- Conversation with student cohort, of those that are available (arrange for MA1 and MA2 in two different rooms: room 3011) – requires two venues (TBC: another room for second review group)

MA1 – 60 minutes (3-4 students for 2 reviewers)

MA2 – 60 minutes (3-4 students for 2 reviewers)

Room 2081 and room Bengt Lindgren

15.30-16.30

- Conversation with student alumni (hybrid meeting in room 2081, two students are in Gothenburg)
- Vangelis, Gabriel, Louise (in person)- 2 reviewers
- Jamie, Frida (online)- 2 reviewers

requires two venues room 2018 confirmed, second room TBC

Room 2081 and room Bengt Lindgren

16.30

- The assessment group (self-deliberation) summarize their impressions.

Room 2081

Day 2 : requires two venues

(for Mirka Duijn and Ram Ranjan Krishna will have separate discussions with the review committee in parallel and staff involved in teaching in the program)

09.00-10:00

- Assessment group to inform on structure of these conversations (individual or collective discussion with teachers) in Room 2081
- Conversation with course responsible (Mirka Duijn and Ram Ranjan Krishna) (30') in parallel sessions

Other teachers in Film who participate in the Masters program: (30')

- Anna Hovad Fisher – Edit Workshops

- Samuel Malm – postproduction
- Dan Sandkvist – camera and studio
- Fredrik Lange – production and finances
-

Room 2081 and meeting room in Datasalen 4035

10h00: 10h30 meeting – with program director

Conversation with program director (Jyoti Mistry) (30') in room 2081

10:30-11:00 (in room 2081, online) (relationship between research and education)

- Conversation with PhD and Postdoc candidates in Film

- Anna Dasovic (PhD)

- Ronny Hardliz (Postdoc)

11.00-14.00 (assessment group's preparation time – on their own)

Requires a venue/room to be booked room 2081

- The assessment group prepares feedback meeting with department and faculty management.

Summary of the visit and what has been experienced and use the 8 criteria, and few recommendations/observations that may be expressed in a preliminary way.

14.00-15.00 room 3110

- Feedback meeting between the assessment team (prefekt and vice prefekt, program director, unit manager) and the department and faculty management, where the assessment group orally presents preliminary conclusions.

15.00

- The assessment group works individually on their assessment statement.

- Final report delivered between 4-6 weeks (end of March 2024)