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The International Evaluation of the Rijksakademie commissioned by its Board of Supervisors to be held in 2010 was the first ever for this institution. As the Rijksakademie is a unique institution in the Netherlands and in Europe, there was no obvious example, point of comparison or protocol available. As the Rijksakademie supports advanced artists in their further development without offering a formal program, it doesn’t fit to the protocol for institutions for post-academic education; nor is it an institution that carries out scientific research, nor a museum, although it has some elements of these type of institutions as well. Therefore, the Committee had to find its own way, taking as sources of inspiration the protocol for Dutch State subsidized Museums, the protocols of the National Office for Arts Accreditation (NVAO) and the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP, established by the Royal Dutch Academy for Sciences (KNAW), the Association of Dutch Universities (VSNU) and the Dutch Organization for scientific research (NWO). An advisory committee with expertise in the various fields has guided the internal evaluation process.

It is obvious that the Rijksakademie found it a difficult task to comply to non-existing requirements, which explains why the Committee felt that, however abundant the documentation provided was, and however informative the self-evaluation, much more had be found out during the site visit. Through intensive questioning, the Committee got a much more vivid idea of the Rijksakademie’s real functioning, its values, standards and way of doing things. It must have been complex for the general management to find the right balance between meeting formal standards and expressing the spirit, enthusiasm, impact, and the extraordinary commitment of the institute. It was through critically interviewing various people and observing the building and its facilities during the site visit that the Committee became entirely convinced of the professional quality and immense commitment concentrated in this unique institute, more than it was to be read in any of the written documentation available.

No other institution in Europe offers facilities to such a high number of residents in diverse disciplines, leaving creative freedom for experimentation and offering its support, advice, collection, library and network for the further advancement of the artists. In the Netherlands
as well as abroad, it is by far the largest and best equipped institute in the visual arts world, the broadest in its scope, and open to all orientations. It is capable to attract excellent international artists as its advisors who give feedback to the residents with full respect to their own vision. As one external interviewee puts it: ‘this is the best way an artist can work.’ The Rijksakademie also offers a quality impulse for the artistic world in the Netherlands as a whole. This refers just as much to the opportunities created for Dutch residents as to the Dutch art scene in general.

In the Committee’s view, all attempts to measure the rate of success or impact of such an institute is doomed to fail as it simply misses the essential point: the community of artists from many countries, sharply selected in various disciplines, leads to new contacts, new inspiration, and new forms of creativity. All these effects are beneficial for the artistic sector at large in Amsterdam and in the Netherlands, probably as much as the foreign residents profit from the buoyant atmosphere in Amsterdam. Many of them indeed keep close contact or even stay.

The Committee has worked intensively in a marvelous mutual respect and harmony, and all members were equally impressed by their observations. We sincerely wish the successful continuation of this brilliant ‘unique selling point’ for the Netherlands, and we are convinced that the Rijksakademie will prove to be flexible enough to adapt some of its traditions to its changing environment.

Prof. Dr. Wim Blockmans,
Chairman
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INTRODUCTION

This report reflects the findings of the international visitation of the Rijksakademie van Beeldende Kunsten in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. The Rijksakademie Board of Supervisors invited an independent and expert committee to assess the functioning of the Rijksakademie as an autonomous institute in the past ten years. It asked the Visitation Committee to evaluate the Rijksakademie based on the following aspects:

A. Functioning of the organization and its policy
B. Quality and added value
C. Relevance and overall image

The Committee was asked to analyze the following:

1. Does the Rijksakademie Self-Evaluation give a true account of the reality?
2. How does the quality of the Rijksakademie compare with (inter)national peer institutes?

Based on its findings, the committee was requested to make recommendations for the institute’s further development.

Rijksakademie Board of Supervisors appointed a Visitation Committee consisting of the following experts:

- Prof. Dr. Wim Blockmans (chairman), Rector Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences, expert in the political, economic and cultural aspects of the Low Countries, also expert on visitation processes in higher education (Belgium)
- Ms. Ngoné Fall, independent curator, art publisher and consultant in cultural policies (Senegal)
- Mr. Dennis Adams, independent artist and Professor of Art, at the Cooper Union, New York City (USA)
- Mr. Rein Wolfs, artistic director of the Kunsthalle Fridericianum in Kassel (Germany)

Mr. Marc Pil Msc was added as secretary to the Committee, and is the writer of this report.
The Committee determines its own research method and has chosen the following instruments. First it studied the Rijksakademie self-evaluation report and its annexes (May 19th, 2010) extensively. The Committee members had an exploratory meeting before the visitation took place. The Committee also met with the Rijksakademie Board of Supervisors.

To assess whether the self-evaluation gives a true account of the reality, the Committee visited the Rijksakademie on June 15 and 16, 2010. During this visit the Committee interviewed people involved with the Rijksakademie, both internally as well as externally. The Committee studied the organization’s policy documents and publications of the Rijksakademie, and visited the project spaces, artist’s studios, technical workshops, the library, and the collection depot. The Committee also conducted interviews by telephone with external experts. After the visit the Committee presented its preliminary conclusions to the director, and the staff of the Rijksakademie. This report presents the final conclusions to the Rijksakademie Board of Supervisors.

The Committee applauds that this report will be presented to the Minister of Culture and is made public.
Chapter 0: General notes of the Committee

The objective of the Visitation Committee is to evaluate the Rijksakademie on how the organization functions, the organization’s policy, the quality and added value, its relevance and overall image. The Committee looks to see if the self-evaluation gives a realistic account on the institute’s functioning and compares the quality of the Rijksakademie with other (inter)national peer institutes. Based on its findings the Committee will make recommendations for the institute’s future development. The Committee is aware that the Ministry of Culture makes its own evaluation of the Rijksakademie, as well as of the fact that an evaluation is due regarding the overhead expenses of post-academic institutes in the Netherlands. This report is focused on the quality of the Rijksakademie as a whole, and the Committee intends this report to complement the financial findings of the other evaluations.

The Committee was intrigued by the quantity of information that the self-evaluation report lacked, and which was found in the interviews during the two days site-visit. The Committee understands that the Rijksakademie hired an external writer for the self-evaluation report, but isn’t completely satisfied. The Committee acknowledges that the process of self-evaluation is of great value. The Rijksakademie formulated questions to analyze itself more thoroughly than ever before. The Committee feels that the results of the self-evaluation don’t reflect the uniqueness of the institute, and that it lacks the passion and commitment that is so apparent in the Rijksakademie.

However the Committee will structure its findings according to the self-evaluation. Included in this document you will find the summary of the different chapters of the self-evaluation report, the information obtained from the dossiers and the interviews, followed by an evaluation. Based on the findings future recommendations will be made at the end of this report.
Chapter 1: Mission Statement and Goals

The post-academic institute (for visual arts) works strategically, systematically and innovatively towards accomplishing its mission and its (legal) duties. In every policy term the institute formulates appealing and relevant points of focus.

1.1. Mission Statement

In its self-evaluation report the Rijksakademie describes its mission statement as “supporting the development of individual artists and artistic practice, its main goal: excellence”. The Rijksakademie defines three core assets: it provides a tailor-made artist residency, it houses the Prix de Rome and it offers expertise through its library and its collections. The Rijksakademie recognizes that there are different views on contemporary art, artistic practice, development and excellence within the institute and externally, but the Rijksakademie is reluctant to adopt a fixed opinion on these matters.

The Rijksakademie intends to make excellence an operational term, with this it means setting high standards for its selection of residents, by its ambition to enable artists in their development and also by applying these standards to the selection of the nominees of the Prix the Rome. Furthermore excellence is a qualification that attracts national and international artists, and therewith significantly contributes to the Dutch artistic climate. The Rijksakademie states that it excels in documenting the achievements of its alumni by archiving publications, press clippings, articles, exhibitions of the work and awards. To further development of the residents the Rijksakademie focuses on the individual artistic work process and offers high level facilities to create optimal standards to achieve the highest level of quality and impact of the work. The term artist is being regarded as dynamic, and the Rijksakademie defines the artistic practice through different artist positions and the role of art and artists in society (from individual creator to role model).

Furthermore, the Rijksakademie aims to create connections between contemporary art, science and technology. The Rijksakademie also describes its role as an advocate for contemporary art, artists and artistic practice.
The Rijksakademie claims to maintain a unique position in the Netherlands and the rest of the world, by offering a unique chance for the residents to spend two years developing work, and by publicly presenting their results. The Rijksakademie cannot be compared to master programs in visual art at home or abroad. The Rijksakademie also differs from the other Dutch post-academic institutes (De Ateliers, Jan van Eyck Academie and the Europees Keramisch Werkcentrum) for having to fulfill three core tasks: the residency, the Prix de Rome and the Expertise Center. It cannot be compared with international institutes on account of size, its building, its technical facilities and specialists, advisors, and international network.

The institute bases its policy on its mission and core tasks. Central issues until 2012 are:

· Anticipating the changing ambitions and methods in the art field by expanding the number of available residencies;
· Expanding and diversifying the outreach of the Prix the Rome;
· Further open up the collections and broaden the role of its expertise center;
· Creating a transparent and healthy financial situation.

The Rijksakademie considers itself a mission-driven, determined and efficient organization. In its short mission statement the organization avoids conceptual discussion, but it also leaves several subjects implicit. This may lead to a less transparent organization than is desirable. The institute realizes the importance of its mission statement and that some of its aspects should be more explicit.

The Committee considers the mission statement too long and not specific enough. It defines what the objectives of the Rijksakademie are, but it cannot be understood by a lot of people in a short amount of time. The mission statement should be formulated as a concise monument. It doesn’t reflect the passion and love that is found at the Rijksakademie. We recommend to put the love for the institute in writing, and cut right to the chase.

The Committee wonders what actually is the core business of the Rijksakademie. The connections between the residencies, Prix de Rome and expertise center aren't exploited fully. It is clear that the Rijksakademie’s three core tasks enforce each other with facilities,
knowledge and expertise, however the Committee feels that the institute should further employ the possibilities of secondary tasks (Prix de Rome and expertise center). Also the Committee feels that although there is a long history between the Rijksakademie and the Prix de Rome, this doesn't mean they necessarily need to be linked. The Committee respects the struggle the organization is having with these matters, and wants to emphasize the importance to address them.

**The institute is responsive to relevant features of the external environment and involves these in policy-making and activities.**

**1.2. The Environment**

The Rijksakademie considers the relationship with its environment twofold. On one hand the institute is active in the art scene, and tries to influence the artistic climate. On the other hand it depends on a wide range of financial support to sustain the institute. Its environment is specified in a separate memo related to codes used in the Rijksakademie address database and categorized as follows: customers (the residents), (foreign) governments, public opinion, financial markets, labor market and art world (purchasing market).

The Rijksakademie finds itself responsive to its environment, and considers its contribution to be meaningful.

The Rijksakademie finds it important to improve the visibility of its alumni in Amsterdam, and the Netherlands, as they gain recognition abroad but less so nationally and locally. The institute considers hosting an ongoing exhibition space.

Several of the institute’s alumni note that Rijksakademie could open itself up more and create more interaction between the artists and the outside world. On the other hand alumni note that the unique opportunity to be sheltered from the outside has a positive influence on their work process. This ambivalence is also felt by one of the advisors.
The Committee considers the Rijksakademie as unique in Europe, and is not aware of another institute of this size, who offers a substantial working period, relevance and diversity.

The Committee feels the Rijksakademie could benefit from creating an interface with a larger public in Amsterdam and the Netherlands. This could be accomplished by exploring the options of collaboration with other Dutch or Amsterdam based institutes, like the Stedelijk Museum, University of Amsterdam or De Ateliers. It is evident to the Committee the Rijksakademie is unique in its environment looking at size, international network, and reputation. Both the city as well as the national arts world can benefit more from the Rijksakademie, for example by sharing international advisors and expertise.

Although the Committee respects the thought that Amsterdam could use a public exhibition place with room for experimentation, it is not convinced that the Rijksakademie would benefit from exploiting such a place.

The Board of Supervisors of the institute is promptly informed on relevant issues by the direction and uses this information to perform her tasks efficiently

1.3. Management and supervision

The Rijksakademie’s legal status is that of a not-for-profit organization (“Stichting Rijksakademie van Beeldende Kunsten”) with its core tasks recorded in its by-laws. The organization has two administrative bodies: the director/manager and the Board of Supervisors. The direction, consisting of two members, answers directly to the Board. The Board works with a financial audit committee. Members of the Board are appointed by the Minister of Education, Culture and Science and come from diverse backgrounds and represent various public positions. The Board meets with the direction three to four times a year, and the direction composes an agenda based on priorities as input prior to the meetings. Board and direction follow the national Code Cultural Governance.
Since its legal independence established in 1999 the Rijksakademie founded a separate trust fund (Stichting Trust Fund) to sustain the Rijksakademie and to maintain relations with national and foreign governmental foundations, (inter)national private foundations, corporate sponsors and private donors. The Trust Fund consists of a director (also director of the Rijksakademie), a Head and two Relation Officers. The fund is supervised by a separate Board of Supervisors.

The Rijksakademie states in its self-evaluation that both foundations fully accomplish their goals. The Committee endorses this statement.
Chapter 2: Development of artists and artistic practice

The Rijksakademie selects emerging national and foreign artists for a residency, and offers a stipend, a studio on the premises, technical facilities and expertise and it supplies the artists with documentation and its collections. The goal is to achieve excellence, and for the individual artists and to improve the position of artists in society in general.

The recruitment and selection of candidates for artists residencies, takes place carefully, transparently, independently and fairly.

2.1. Recruitment and Selection Resident Artists

The Rijksakademie aims to select promising artists with a strong potential to impact contemporary art. The Rijksakademie selects both candidates for a two-year residency as well as applicants for the Prix de Rome.

Recruitment takes place through the Internet and the network of former residents, advisors and (inter)national art institutes. The selection starts with a pre-pre-selection, mainly based on age (<26 and >35 years old), and on artists who graduated from art school less than two year before. These groups are not accepted unless there are reasons to forward them to the next round, the pre-selection. The pre-selection focuses on applications (25-35 years old, including those artists who came through the pre-pre-selection on criteria which still need to be made explicit), which consists of a quick scan. After this selection the amount of approximately 2,000 applicants (300 from the Netherlands, 1,700 from abroad) is narrowed down to approximately 300 Dutch and 350 foreign candidates. After assessment of work, a jury consisting of five to six members decides to invites a selection of 35 Dutch and 35 foreign candidates for an interview. These applicants get interviewed by two different committees, and each interview takes about 25 minutes. Both the rejected and accepted candidates receive written notification.
The Rijksakademie considers its selection process to be independent as there are no formal requirements, and no fees. Because the advisors of which the selection committee is composed of will work with the artists during their residency, curiosity is a factor. The Rijksakademie aims to select a diverse jury consisting of experts from diverse backgrounds. The growing number of applications puts considerable pressure on the organization. Therefore the Rijksakademie is looking to find efficient ways to deal with this amount of applications. The Rijksakademie considers the selection procedure to be open and precise, which results in a great diversity in terms of the backgrounds, the nature of the work, et cetera. Rejected applicants consider the selection procedure fair, this is concluded based on the fact they apply a second and third time. To summarize, the Rijksakademie considers the current selection procedure adequate, although it also happens that some promising applicants are not selected. To make the recruitment and selection procedure more efficient the Rijksakademie looks into ways to stabilize the number of applications (by stricter criteria, by implementing registration fees and by streamlining the information flow). It also wants to create time-saving adjustments for the selection procedure.

The selected candidates receive an annual stipend of 11,000 euro and a work budget of 1,900 euro. The residents pay an annual fee of 2,000 euro. The Dutch government, advised by the Council for Culture, only awards artists who live in the Netherlands with a stipend. The Rijksakademie and the Trust Fund support all residents in applying for fellowships, for example to the government of the country where a resident comes from. When a fellowship is not obtained a selected artist receives support from the lump sum.

The Rijksakademie pleads to the government to finance all residents, rather than just Dutch residents. Due to the financial crisis the percentage of fellowships awarded has dropped. The Rijksakademie considers the current system, with equal stipends and working budgets for all residents fair and efficient.

It is policy of the Rijksakademie to obtain an equal balance between residency places for artists from abroad and from the Netherlands (25 – 25). The institute feels that this balance is important, because it reflects the culture of the country where the institute is located. Apart from that, the institute is mainly funded by the Dutch State, and artists from the Netherlands should benefit from this.
However, the Committee understands that because of the greater pool of applicants from abroad, the foreign residents perform better than the Dutch. Therefore the selection of the foreign applicants can be more critical, which leads to greater quality. The Committee wonders if the balance between the residency places (25 Dutch, 25 abroad) is appropriate. The selection rate of approximately 1% for foreign applicants seems discouraging in the eyes of the Committee.

The Committee has been told that it is possible for (Dutch) applicants to get more internal recommendations. This seems to create the feeling of the procedure being a lottery with a small chance on success. The Committee thinks that this lobbying blurs the objective of a totally transparent and independent procedure. The criteria for the selection are said to be based mainly on the age limit 25-35; it should be clear for candidates, which other criteria may deflect from the norm.

The Committee applauds that the selection committee is able to detect at what stage of his or her career an artist is, and why a residency at the Rijksakademie comes at a critical point of this artist’s development.

**The institute offers an inspiring and productive environment for further development of the selected national and international (young) artists and their artistic practice.**

### 2.2. Research Residency

After the selection procedure is finalized in June, the residency starts in January with a presentation of the artists’ work, and a trip abroad with the entire first and second year residents, and a few advisors and staff. Although it is experienced a hectic start, these events connect the residents to their peers and their new work environment. For the first year’s residents the actual working process starts in March.

The artist are awarded a stipend, a working budget, accommodation, studio, technical workshops and expertise, service of facilitators, expert feedback and network, a position in the international artistic community and access to relevant documentation.
Residents have full-time access to their studio. There are also white cube spaces available for larger projects, collaborations or presentations. In 2010 the occupation capacity is 55 studios. The Rijksakademie finds it is essential for the artists to have access to an individual and exclusive studio, and considers the studio as the private domain of an artist. Residents frequently visit the technical workshops for research and experiments. Having a private studio provides a base and enriching context from which the artist can position him or herself in the art scene.

The Rijksakademie considers the specific architectural design and size of its building, the various project spaces and the duration of the residency of additional value for the development of its residents. The Rijksakademie notes that its residents interact with the world around them and are not secluded from it. Modernization of the building and relocation of some of the studios is considered urgent and is included in the policy 2009 – 2013. The focus on individual and private studios will be maintained.

The technical workshops offer the facilities and expertise to explore construction- and production-related questions and experiments. There are ten technical specialists and four types of workshops on the premises: image and sound, printmaking, chemistry and construction. Residents are encouraged to explore the different disciplines and are challenged to leave their familiar medium.

In their application the artists describe projects to realize, and include how they would like to employ the workshops. After one year they evaluate the first part of their residency, and write plans for the second year, which is important for assigning the studios. The Rijksakademie is constantly looking to keep its facilities up-to-date and notes that therefore investments can thus also be artist-driven. In its self-evaluation the Rijksakademie states that the great variety of workshops, expertise and multidisciplinary cooperation available on the premises distinguishes the institute from other artist residency programs in the world. Outsourcing the facilities is not considered an option. The workshops need to invest in specific upgrades and knowledge i.e. of their computer software (e.g. Apple).
CHAPTER 2: DEVELOPMENT OF ARTISTS AND ARTISTIC PRACTICE

The Rijksakademie facilitators support the residents in more than their artistic practice and are responsible for the logistics that involve the residency as a whole. Facilitators form the connection between the institute’s management and the residents. The facilitators support the residents with problems that have to do with project organization, or issues of matching. For most artists the facilitator is their confidant at the Rijksakademie. On average there is one full-time facilitator per twenty-five artists.

The advisors are distinguished art professionals who can be invited by a resident to make a studio visit. These visits are used to discuss the quality of the work, the artistic position and the impact of the work. Thirty advisors are contracted by the institute annually, and are present and available for a set amount of days (6 to 30). The advisors consist of professional visual artists (75%), theorists and scientists. The group composition is based on several criteria: highest professional level national/international, various artist positions, media and vision, and the ability to communicate and give feedback. The Rijksakademie experiences that presence of the advisors is of incredible value for the development of the work of residents. Advisors perceive working for the Rijksakademie as a privilege. Background information of the advisors is available for residents through the facilitators, the library and from second year residents. Residents are free to connect to advisors, but as with all the Rijksakademie facilities, it is not compulsory and residents can utilize the facilities on their terms. There are two formal moments per year when advisors and facilitators meet, and decide how to facilitate each individual artist best. These findings are written down in reports for internal use only. The fall out was said to be negligible, but no precise data were available on this point.

The Rijksakademie considers itself to be a productive community of professional artists. Its intellectual openness manifests itself in different ways, via its library, advisors, presentations, field trips, guests, lectures and international network. It is found that residents sometimes struggle with propriety of their work: Is this the artist’s project or is this a Rijksakademie project? Residents understand that the Rijksakademie is concerned about quality standards, being an official institute.
The institute is looking into ways to create more interaction with the external community and to disclose some of the facilities to the public. The residents develop a social environment and the project areas, the building and the Cantina (restaurant, meeting place, which is currently under construction) play an important role in this process.

The residency at the Rijksakademie leads to an ongoing affiliation with national and international (former) residents and advisors. An example of such a connection is the RAIN-network, a world-wide platform for artist initiatives in Africa, Asia and Latin-America.

In short, the Rijksakademie considers itself a dynamic community that leads to life-long connections and access to otherwise closed doors. This is less so for Dutch residents, who do not always interact with or maintain contacts with foreign peers.

The Committee is impressed by the way the Rijksakademie facilitates its community, and respects the way it positions itself around the continuous dilemmas involving community and individuality, and of the way the community changes each year. In our interviews, the residents and alumni confirm this view. They feel that they have learned from each other, and shared experiences and opinions. The Committee is impressed by the quality of the advisors. The advisors stimulate the residents think about their work, and make them aware of processes they don’t recognize themselves. The dialogue with a professional peer creates confidence, which is especially important for artists from abroad. Sometimes collaborations expand until after the residency.

The Committee feels that the artists’ presentations and the excursion (in 2010 to Egypt) to kick off the academic year are an exciting and relevant way for the residents to meet and work together. It recommends creating more opportunities for residents to present their work to each other.

The facilities in the building (private studios, workshops) are impressive and relevant for the development of the artists. The technical staff is highly committed to find creative solutions for the artists’ projects. The same applies for the group of facilitators and advisors.
There is one side note we would like to make. We conclude that there is a gift culture at the Rijksakademie, and a very low fall out rate between the first and second year. We ask ourselves how critical the Rijksakademie is on itself, so its generosity won't be misused and gets fair returns. More concretely, specific requirements may be formulated to which residents are expected to comply. In our opinion this question should be more explicitly addressed by the Rijksakademie.

The institute organizes the 'state award' for Visual Artists and Architects who have resided in the Netherlands for a minimum period of two years and who are less than 35 years of age. The Prix the Rome locates current and innovative talent and contributes to expounding promising contemporary visual art and architecture for a wide audience.

2.3. Prix de Rome

The Prix de Rome was introduced in 1808 in the Netherlands by Louis Napoleon. The objectives are “locating of talent” and “to spot trends in the Netherlands, in an international context”. The prize is considered to be important for the role of visual arts and architecture, and considering the amount of applications, this consideration is being shared by the artists.

The Rijksakademie hosts the award in collaboration with a wide range of organizations and sponsors. The jury consists of international and national professional artists, architects and theorists. Four candidates (out of approximately 200 applications for visual arts and 100 for architecture) are selected for a residency of three months in the Rijksakademie to create new work. This is not compulsory. From the work they produce during this time, the prize ranking is determined 1, 2 or 3. It is under consideration to increase the period between nomination and the awarding of the prize. The prize consists of the residency and a stipend, exhibition, media coverage and prize money (45.000 for the winner, 20.000 for the runner-up and 10.000 for third and fourth place). In the previous years the PR and media coverage leading up to the award ceremony improved.
The Rijksakademie considers selection for the shortlist of the Prix de Rome a good prophecy of future success. However the Council for Cultural Affairs wonders whether the award is becoming “worn out”, since it has been proven difficult to find a venue for the exhibition. In its self-evaluation the institute addresses the question whether (former) residents are being favored for the prize. The Rijksakademie does not disclose the names of the applicants to the jury, which is independent of the Rijksakademie.

The Committee thinks that making the actual work in the studios of the Rijksakademie could enrich the community and the nominees. It advises to make this work period compulsory for all nominees, although most of the nominees already are willing to work on the premises.

The Committee applauds that the Rijksakademie tries to prevent the prize from appearing to be an internal occasion, by using an anonymous selection procedure. Apparently there has been sensitivity in the press about the amount of winners who are former residents from the Rijksakademie. The director should not chair this jury, nor have a vote.

The Committee feels that the Prix de Rome is covered extensively by the media, which has pushed its reputation. The momentum could be used to enhance the role of art in general. Overall the Committee is not convinced that the Prix de Rome should be so closely linked to the Rijksakademie, or that it should be utilized to support the residencies.

The works of former resident artists (alumni) and nominees for the Prix de Rome play a part in the current national professional discourse on the visual arts (and sciences).

2.4. Working of the Residency & Prix de Rome

During the so called RijksakademieOpen the residents open their studios and present work of the past year. This annual event averagely attracts 5.000-7.000 visitors from the art world as well as the common spectator. Daily papers write about it prominently, so the RijksakademieOpen is perceived as meaningful.
The Rijksakademie tries not to put pressure on the residents for the RijksakademieOpen. The residents perceive the open studios as relatively safe. It does help the residents to make decisions, to budget and to work with deadlines. The RijksakademieOpen is perceived by the organization as somewhat of a contradiction with the usual atmosphere of retreat, like a monastery.

The Rijksakademie considers a residency successful when the artist has achieved more than one way of generating income, which means that they are part of society, i.e. by being represented by a gallery and a teaching position – this provides them with a foundation from which they can advance. Alumni have the feeling when they leave the Rijksakademie they have to do something great, building further on the experience and network. Residents consider staying connected to the Netherlands and the Rijksakademie by having a studio in Amsterdam. Some of them maintain an international network with former residents, which lowers the boundaries for traveling. The Rijksakademie facilitates this network with an association of alumni and through a mailing list.

Both the curricula vitae of residents and of nominees for the Prix de Rome are documented. The Rijksakademie concludes that the majority of alumni contribute to the development of, and the discourse within the visual arts. It bases this conclusion on the fact that the work of alumni is exhibited, purchased, on the frequent participation in international events, and that there are frequent publications concerning their work.

The Rijksakademie concludes that the work created by alumni assumes a position in the national and international art world, and that work of the artists, i.e. presented during the RijksakademieOpen influences the artistic climate. The Rijksakademie considers itself to contribute to the level of art in the Netherlands, as well as the artistic climate, though its network, through fundraising and its way of working.

The representatives of the art world that the Committee has spoken with confirm that the Rijksakademie is the best in Holland, however it is impossible to objectively measure success. One of the criteria mentioned is that all artists from the Rijksakademie are chosen for renowned exhibitions and shows, and many of the Dutch artists are well known in the
The institute is an internationally positioned post-academic institute of visual arts and, from that perspective, contributes to the development and innovation of the national and international Visual Arts.

2.5 Collections / Expertise center

The Rijksakademie makes expertise both accessible and available. The expertise center is intended for the residents but is also accessible for third parties. In 2009 there were 4,647 visitors. The recently created Information Plan, established by external support and funding, has to lead to greater openness and a wider audience.

The library aims to be the theoretical facility for artists, with approximately 36,000 books. The collection from before 1940 is stored in an acclimatized depot. In 2009 there were 4,062 loans and 645 borrowers. A growing number of outsiders become a member of the library. There is a purchasing budget of approximately 15,500 euro per year for the library.
Since 1980 the Rijksakademie collects materials of artists and keeps the curricula vitae up-to-date of those who are resident, alumni and shortlisted for the Prix de Rome. The documentation currently consists of 800 files. With this documentation the Rijksakademie aims to follow the careers as a way of quality care, and also makes the information publicly accessible for third parties. Through the website the Rijksakademie publishes information on exhibitions by residents, alumni and advisors. The Rijksakademie keeps track of them partly by internet searches, partly by direct contact. Because there is so much information available on the internet, the Rijksakademie admits it has to find new ways of gathering information, because it costs too much time and effort. It is working on a new information plan, and ways to keep up-to-date by having artists upload their own information.

The collection of the Rijksakademie consists of a book collection (library) and 7,969 pictures, drawings and art objects since the 18th century. The collections grow because since the 90’s residents donate one work at the end of their stay. There are also approximately 500 plaster sculptures, and archives with documents from and about resident artists. Approximately 10% of the residents use the historic collection during their residency. Loan requests of other institutes are handled very generously, but without factual checking of climate or physical conditions.

The Rijksakademie considers the meaning of its collections the combined value of the whole (“ensemble”), and wants to make its collections more manageable by assembling a core collection, better announcing of the collections on the internet, and by collaborating with related collections and institutes. The Rijksakademie can preserve, but there are additional funds needed for restoration of the collection. The Rijksakademie is in discussion with the Heritage Inspection to find a form of inspection befitting these specific, non-museum like, collections. According to the self-evaluation the collections have a good name among artists, art academies and academics. The workload (daily opening hours and activities like digitalization and registration) is assessed to be larger than the staff (4.0 fte) is able to handle. The Rijksakademie itself does not perform scientific research, but opens up the collection for researchers from universities.
The Committee thinks that maintaining the artist documentation may be problematic with emerging new technologies. To do the same job here as is done elsewhere isn't efficient. The role of the Rijksakademie could be more of an advisory one, and to consult artists about how to present themselves. In regards to the organization, a substantial part of the employees is involved in the expertise center, and the Committee hasn't been convinced about the added value for the Rijksakademie. In a technical sense it envisions more the role of a hub, to link whatever there is, and not to duplicate the data.

As mentioned before the Committee is also not convinced by the current evidence for the added value of the Rijksakademie for the former residents, for example by using Artfacts.com. This site represents a crude use of statistics based on incomplete internet research, and completely ignores valuable small-scaled and local projects rooted in the interests of community. When statistics are used, they should be used properly. The Committee admits it is difficult, if not impossible, to measure new platforms or their impact on society. It concludes that the self-evaluation is focused too much on the marketplace as an index of evaluation and that a more diverse idea of artistic practice should be put forward. This consideration should also be reflected in the mission statement, which should be more front-loaded, and balanced. Staff and advisors can see change in content and personality during the residency. Highlight the impact on all individual artists. There are good stories, share those, and let the statistics be. It should be possible to create documentation with images to share what the residents made here, and where their work was presented (résumés), aiming to build an archive that reflects the working period. This might be in collaboration with the artist, by talking with them about the content of their work, what their plans are next year, and how this can be made visible. This enables the possibility to look back at what happened (text, images, working process), and to document the process in depth. The current list of exhibition venues doesn't reflect this.

As to the library and collections, the Committee thinks that when the institute aims to open up more to the public it should communicate the possibilities more actively, for example by sharing the database of the collections. The Committee is of the opinion that a new website for the Rijksakademie as a whole should be considered.
Chapter 3: Organization and finances

The institute is efficiently organized with an eye on realizing her mission, duties & objectives. Her employees and advisors are qualitatively and quantitatively capable of making an optimal contribution to the realization of the mission, duties and objectives.

3.1. Organization and Personnel

The Rijksakademie, under orders from and with financing from the Dutch national government, executes three statutorily determined core tasks. The institute reports annually on the whole of its performance.

In its self-evaluation the Rijksakademie considers itself to be a task-based organization (founded on the core tasks under orders of the government) and not a market-based organization (because of the lack of commercial services provided and prizing based on market demand).

The core duties (housing the residencies and Prix de Rome) are characterized as capacity organization, being fulfilled flexibly based on interaction between the demand of the artists and the possibilities of matching this demand (artist-driven). The Trust Fund can mainly be characterized as the market-oriented capacity organization of the Rijksakademie.

The staff structurally consists of a total of 33.2 fte, divided over 43 employees. Direction consists of 2 members (2 fte), support (secretariat, IT, cleaning, finances) consists of 10.3 fte, research residency (studios, facilitators, executive and administrative support) consists of 14.8 fte, including the technical facilities consists of 6.8 fte. There are no fte reserved for the Prix de Rome, complemented with standby employees at peak times. The expertise center has a total of 6.1 fte, with 2.2. fte intended for PR, marketing and reception. The Trustfonds consists of 1 fte for the head and 0.9 fte for the two relations officers.
The total amount of employees has diminished from 40.38 fte (2000) to 33.2 (2009). In 2004 the Rijksakademie anticipated large cost-cutting. Most of the contracts are long term. This means it is complicated to adjust employee expenses to fluctuations. The organization minimized the number of fte's and feels it cannot cut more without running into serious expenses or effecting the professional quality the Rijksakademie stands for. Still, the Council for Culture has made remarks in its advice in 2008 about the high personnel expenditures.

The organization is structured in line and staff responsibilities. The management team meets up every few weeks, and is the main advisor for the director. In preparation of moving from a two-headed management to a single directorship, Els van Odijk invested in making the Management Team (MT) stronger, and in teamwork. The responsibilities of the members have become heavier, as they now are not only responsible for their own department but also committed to the Rijksakademie as a whole. Recently the Trust Fund was added to the MT, and sometimes the Prix de Rome coordinator is present. The MT feels it's well informed on finances and policy.

The organization philosophy is characterized by a striving for an optimal execution of general logistic tasks, being a hospitable organization and being consistently and permanently conscious of quality. Because a large part of the activities requires specialist expertise, the employees and departments have a high degree of personal responsibility in locating and solving problems. The Rijksakademie has an active employee council, which meets every two months with the director and every month by itself. There are complaints about the lack of information provided to the employees.

The Rijksakademie is continually looking for balance between the work it can factually handle and the extra work coming its way. In 2008 the Rijksakademie feels it has reached the borders of the work it is capable of performing.

On May 1st, 2010 general director Janwillem Schrofer retired. This retirement implies a necessity for the Rijksakademie to reflect on the organization and management. For now a choice for one statutory director has been made, Els van Odijk.
The Rijksakademie is of the opinion she is effectively tailored to perform her tasks. The ambition to achieve more residency places requires more labor and income.

The Committee understands that the single directorship is the preferred vision for the future. Looking at the size of the organization, and the functioning of the Management Team this seems to be an appropriate choice. Also, Els looks confident in her new role. However, the Committee recommends to reflect upon the mission statement and objectives of the Rijksakademie as a whole, and then look at the integral picture of the organization and its management. It also suggests for the new director to have one or two (informal) favorite advisors at hand she can trust and receive feedback from.

As to internal communication the Committee advises to make minutes of meetings, and distribute these to the staff. Listing decision points and making meeting minutes help the organization to stay on track and to execute responsibilities adequately. When decision points and meeting minutes aren't read by or reacted on by the staff, the department heads have to take action. Freedom as philosophy towards artists is good, but running the institute accordingly will make it fragile.

The institute is a subsidized institute and a culturally enterprising organization

3.2. Planning & Control

The Rijksakademie is subsidized by the Dutch national government. In 2008 it received approximately 1.8 million Euro as support for the building, and 3.35 million for the exploitation and artists’ stipends from the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. The institute’s earned income in 2008 was 1.36 million, which consisted of contributions, sponsoring generated by the Trust Fund (which included a grant from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and incidental income. There isn't a formal norm by the Ministry, but the organization formulated the duty of raising 20% of earned income. In general there was some stagnation in financial support, and the assets of the Trust Fund have decreased due to the financial crisis.
Every four years the institute writes a Policy Outline, and annually accounts for the realization of its objectives. According to the self-evaluation these accounts are up-to-date and should give a clear insight into the realization of the budget on any given day.

As of 2005 the Rijksakademie received 600,000 Euro less in governmental support than in previous years. Therefore the Rijksakademie reduced the number of fte as well as the capacity norm for residency places.

On June 1st, 2010 the Rijksakademie collaborated with Sotheby's Amsterdam and organized an auction to create a solid base for the Rijksakademie Artists Endowment Fund. In the future this fund will contribute to material expenses of residents and participants of the Prix de Rome.

The Committee is of the opinion that there should be a clear distinction between the Rijksakademie’s core business and which activities are made possible by additional funding. Apparently the government funding is not enough to cover the level of support provided. The Committee appreciates the efforts made by the Trust Fund to provide additional funding for the residencies by raising money from various public and private sources in The Netherlands. Support from the public and private sector in the resident’s home countries is equally felt to be a highly relevant acknowledgement, an additional value to both the residency at the Rijksakademie, and for its selection process. This might lead to the conclusion that the organization will evolve into another type of institution, from state to private, with more risk, return on endowments, and dependency on market fluctuations. We foresee a risk that the Dutch national government will start to develop policy speculating on the economic value of the art, although the Ministry has said the auction will not have a negative effect. The earned money of the auction at this moment is not part of the norm of 20%. In general, the Committee warns the Rijksakademie for a possible gliding scale and recommends not to select residents on basis of market value. The Rijksakademie's strive for excellence is a goal based on quality, not on quantity.
The accommodation of the institute optimally enables the realization of her mission, tasks and objectives.

### 3.3. Accommodation

The renovated cavalry barracks where the Rijksakademie is housed has always been experienced as suitable for its purposes. Now there are plans for a large maintenance, durability, and safety overhaul. The Rijksakademie seizes this process for the benefit of increased public disclosure.

The institute works with and effective P&R and offers easily accessible information

### 3.4. Public Relations

The Rijksakademie focuses on interesting emerging artists in a residency, or a position as advisor, transferring its reputation to benefit art and the artistic practice and for acquiring financial means. It does so by having released a documentary, through websites of the Rijksakademie and the Prix de Rome, RijksakademieOpen, media coverage of the Prix de Rome, relation management with the Dutch national government, foreign governments, funds, companies and individuals. Also alumni are – as ambassadors– an aspect of the PR-policy. The Rijksakademie occasionally asks short written statements of alumni and advisors for PR purposes.

The Rijksakademie states that it has a name and reputation in the national and international art world, although the credits for the success of artists are sooner connected to galleries, museums, and festivals. Documenting the impact of the Rijksakademie on the career of the artists is seen as very important. Also communicating the facilities, supervision, international network and the independent sign-up and judging process the Rijksakademie provides are considered essential.
The Committee is of the opinion there should be a stronger vision for the future, and a more focused way of communicating. Value will diminish quickly if the institute doesn’t know what to do, and if it isn’t able to explain what it does. The communication at this moment is very broad and doesn’t reach the people it should reach. The Committee understands it's difficult to explain this magnificent institute, but it's necessary to let the outside world know it is there.
Conclusions

In its self-evaluation the Rijksakademie comments on its ambitions for the future. This gives a view on the policy agenda of the institute. The main conclusions are the following.

- It is worth the effort to make its mission statement concise and explicit;
- An adequate, independent, and efficient selection procedure is a necessary condition for maintaining quality;
- There is a capacity of fifty five residency places in 2010, the increase from fifty to fifty five was made possible in part by the support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs;
- The technical workshops and expertise provide an essential contribution to the development of artists, and it's necessary to further develop the areas of information technology, digital direction and image development;
- Facilitators form a crucial link in the process of the development of art work and the realization and efficiency of the production process;
- The visits of advisors are very meaningful for the development of the work of residents;
- An international environment contributes to the quality of the artists;
- The Prix de Rome needs to attract a wider audience and to broaden the social basis;
- The Expertise Center is under construction with three main objectives: the artists' documentation, the library, and the collections;
- Spreading of financial dependency is needed, and new channels are being opened;
- The building is being repositioned by a large renovation.

During the site visit, the Committee has found much additional information about the Rijksakademie. For example: the organization chart on pp. 72 and 90 of the self-evaluation doesn’t mention the Management Team, which in interviews was explained to consist of seven members who meet with a 6-weeks frequency and that its members can contribute to the agenda. Further, it was only during the interviews, that members of the Committee got a clear idea of the description of ‘advisors’, ‘facilitators’, and of the distinction between ‘residencies’ and ‘fellowships’. The Committee learned on the spot, through its interviews,
about the academic program of seminars, lectures, presentations which is essential in the overall atmosphere of mutual inspiration. Moreover, the site visit entirely convinced the Committee of the immense quality and commitment concentrated in this unique institute, more than it was to be read in any of the written documentation made available.

In general we can subscribe to the conclusions of the Rijksakademie in its self-evaluation.

On the question whether the self-evaluation gives a true account of the reality of the institute, the Committee has to qualify its answer. The self-evaluation is too formal and modest. It is not in sync with the Rijksakademie’s style and content. It lacks the passion and commitment experienced on every level within the organization.

Summarizing:

**A. Functioning of the organization/policy**

- Internationally speaking the Committee considers the Rijksakademie unique in Europe, and can't think of another institute of this size, substantial working period, relevance and diversity. In general, the Committee is of the opinion that the institute is efficiently organized with an eye on realizing its mission, duties & objectives. Its employees and advisors are qualitatively and quantitatively capable of making an optimal contribution to the realization of the mission, duties and objectives. Also the choice of a single directorship with a stronger MT seems adequate. The Committee is convinced that the Rijksakademie is an internationally well-positioned post-academic institute of visual arts and, from that perspective, it contributes to the development and innovation of the national and international visual arts world.

- The Committee is of the opinion that the mission statement is not concise, and wonders what the actual core business of the Rijksakademie is. From our point of view the core business should be the facilitation of the residencies and the extra assets (the Prix de Rome and Expertise Center) should contribute to the core business.
Although it is clear the three tasks benefit of each other, the Committee thinks that the secondary tasks should be reconsidered in terms of their added value to the residencies. This would aid the Rijksakademie in working more adequately towards accomplishing its objectives. After this undertaking, we encourage the Rijksakademie to rewrite its mission statement as a monument, and to make it clear for everybody.

- The Committee believes that the Rijksakademie Board of Supervisors is well informed on relevant issues by the direction and uses this information to perform its tasks efficiently.

- The Committee advises to reflect upon the mission statement and objectives of the Rijksakademie as a whole, and have a refreshed look at the organization and its management. Further, the Committee strongly advises to operate the Rijkakademie more like a business, make minutes of meetings, communicate decisions with the staff, and steer stronger on responsibilities.

- The fact that the institute is keeping track of its success by following its alumni makes sense. However, the way that this is currently done doesn't seem efficient. We feel that the Rijksakademie could be more of a coach to its residents and alumni, and a hub to the outside world. For opening up more to the outside world (also via the library and collections) a more active communication approach should be considered.

- The institute is a subsidized institute and a cultural enterprise. The Committee recommends making a clear cut in what is the core business and which activities are made possible by additional funding.

- The Committee trusts that after the large scale renovation the accommodation of the institute will optimally enable the realization of its mission, tasks and objectives.

- The Committee isn't convinced that the Rijksakademie has an effective PR strategy. It feels that the institute would benefit from a more focused and standardized way of external communication and publication, to let the outside world know its there, and what it stands for.
B. Quality and added value

- The Committee thinks that the institute can improve its interaction with its environment and to involve relevant matters more in policy-making and activities. We believe that the institute can benefit from a stronger interface with a larger public in Amsterdam and the Netherlands. We also feel that more contact and collaboration with other Dutch and Amsterdam based institutes could contribute to this. By doing so the city and the art world will benefit more from the presence of the Rijksakademie.

- The Committee is convinced that the recruitment and selection of candidates for artist residencies takes place carefully, transparently, independently and fairly. It does wonder if the balance between the residency places (25/25) is appropriate, and whether the potential lobby of Dutch applicants is a threat to the transparency. In its practice the selection works rather well, the Committee applauds that the selection committee is able to detect at what stage of his or her career an artist is, and why a residency at the Rijksakademie comes at a critical point of this artist’s development. However, the success rate of foreign candidates in the application process is extremely low, which may create risks and surely high costs in the first stage of the selection process. As mentioned on p. 36 of the self-evaluation, ‘stricter application criteria and the establishment of an application network’ are highly desirable. A clear format of an application, made available on the website, may reduce the applications to more manageable numbers.

- The Committee thinks that the institute indeed offers an inspiring and productive environment for further development of the selected national and international (young) artists and their artistic practice. We are impressed by the different ways the Rijksakademie facilitates the (changing) community, and by the quality of the studios and the technical workshops, the skills and commitment of the staff, facilitators and (international) advisors. The possible risk of the generosity of the Rijksakademie to its residents is that of misuse, and the Committee wonders if the Rijksakademie gets enough in return.
- The Rijksakademie is recommended to keep a more formal track record of the residents’ progress, their performance and participation in the institute’s community.

- The Committee acknowledges the importance of the 'state award' for Visual Artists and Architects (Prix de Rome). The Committee recommends including a residency for a minimum period of three months as a compulsory part of the award. Although the media attention can be used to promote the arts in general, we are not convinced that this prize should be too closely linked to the Rijksakademie. We think that the reputation of the prize will be enhanced when the director of the Rijksakademie is not a member of the jury.

- The Committee has gathered sufficient evidence to confirm that the works of former resident artists (alumni) and nominees for the Prix de Rome play a part in the current national professional discourse on the visual arts (and sciences). The way of measuring this impact is another matter. We are not convinced that the statistics prove the added value of the Rijksakademie for the former residents. We have to conclude that the self-evaluation at this point is too focused on the marketplace. There are good stories, share those, and let the statistics for what they are. The Committee recommends to create a betterarchive with images, and present the “before and after”.

- Further, we give into consideration to organize the RijksakademieOpen (open studios) only for the second year residents.

**C. Relevancy and overall image**

The Committee is of the opinion that the Rijksakademie is a unique and relevant institute in the Dutch and European context. Compared with other post-academic institutes it is better equipped, broader in scope, larger, with more international outreach, and higher esteemed than any other institute it is aware of. With excellent international advisors and residents the Rijksakademie has created the best way to facilitate the work and development of artists. The Committee respects the way artistic liberty is offered. The presence of two dozen hand-picked artists from the whole world is, in the words of an external interviewee, ‘extremely
CONCLUSIONS

important for the Dutch art world as it opens up the atmosphere in a small country; in the
slipstream of which Dutch artists become involved in an internationalized network, and the
Dutch art market becomes more competitive’. The institute has great impact on the quality of
the art world and artists in the Netherlands. Flexibility was discovered on all levels of the
organization, with a large commitment and professional standards of direction, management
and staff.
Recommendations

The Committee recommends the Dutch Ministry of OCW:

- Recognize that stipends for critically selected foreign residents at the Rijksakademie are essential in creating an ideal climate for artistic production on the highest international level. For that reason, the Rijksakademie should be allowed to allocate part of its grant to stipends for foreign residents. Doing this would be in line with the policy of attracting foreign PhD-researchers receiving a stipend in universities and research institutes, as well as with that applied since 1971 for foreign fellows in the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences (NIAS).

- Encourage closer and more structural collaboration between the Rijksakademie and the three other institutes of post-graduate artistic study, the universities, art schools and museums.

The Committee has the following recommendations for the Rijksakademie.

1. Clarify the Mission Statement
The Rijksakademie would benefit from a singular and concise mission statement, which is reader friendly and can be used on all levels of publicity. The Committee thinks that the mission statement should mention the role of artistic experimentation within the context of a residency program. The Committee misses ideas on distribution and reception in the current statement. Also, there should be mention of the possibilities for expanding the boundaries of artistic production beyond the limits of studio based practice.

2. Make your own strengths clear
The institute has a great reputation to live up to, an unsurpassed pool of technical and external advisors, an important international network of relations and former residents, valuable human capital with extreme commitment on all levels, and internationally
RECOMMENDATIONS

recognition of quality. The Rijksakademie owes it to itself to emphasize these strengths more. Stay unique and communicate its uniqueness. Use its name to mobilize sponsorship for secondary tasks such as the Prix de Rome, the collection, the library and specific projects.

3. Communicate more effectively
The Committee thinks the institute should express its philosophy and uniqueness more to its surroundings. The brand name of the Rijksakademie can be a unique selling point for the sponsorship activities. It is recommended to reflect on the question to recruit a communication officer who can think about identity, and a communication strategy fitting to the Rijksakademie. The Committee noted that there are plans to renovate the website, which is absolutely necessary in its opinion.

4. Reflect on a strategy for the future
It is advised to use the grant from the Dutch national government and allocated support from the Trust Fund for the core activities, and use additional sponsorship for the extras as the Prix de Rome, the collections, and projects. The Committee thinks that the Rijksakademie can benefit from seeking collaboration with the art world in Amsterdam, and the Netherlands, without giving up the uniqueness of the institute. In this search the Rijksakademie can reflect on sharing competences with others, and possibly consider outsourcing certain aspects of the organization.

5. Open up to the environment
The Committee recommends opening up more to its environment. The building is literally and virtually closed to the outside. We would like the motto “Take down the gate”. Share the facilities and competences with others. Link up with other institutions in Amsterdam, and be more connected to the art world and city.

6. Improve Internal Management
The Committee appreciates the positive integration of the management team. It is felt that this boosts the moral and sense of involvement. However, it feels that some degree of structure in the internal management is required.
RECOMMENDATIONS

- It is recommended that the director would be consulted by external experts in different artistic disciplines;

- More standardization and professionalization of procedures of committees, and information of the staff is recommended;

- Make the financial streams entirely transparent.

7. Standardize the selection and evaluation procedures

- Advertise stricter application criteria on the website, make absolutely clear which requirements will rest on the residents and which opportunities will be offered;

- Use an electronic format for the applications;

- Communicate better about the advisors’ availability, and about the seminars, lectures and forums organized;

- Formalize the evaluation of the residents’ progress and their further planning at the end of the first year of residence.
Appendix 1: Program site visit

Monday, June 14 2010

Tuesday, June 15 2010
- 09.00 – 10.00 Welcome to the committee by Els van Odijk, with video about Rijksakademie
- 10.00 – 11.00 Interview: MANAGEMENT: Els van Odijk
- 11.00 – 12.00 Interview: MANAGEMENT TEAM 1: Martijntje Hallmann (Studios), Roy Taylor (Workshops), Tinie Kerseboom (Expertise Centre), Martijntje v. Schooten (Prix de Rome), Susan Gloudemans (Trustfund)
- 12.15 -12.00 Showing around Rijksakademie: Project spaces and some studios by Martijntje Hallmann (Studios)
- 13.00 – 14.00 Lunch
- 14.00 – 15.00 RESIDENTS: Guy Wouete, Kianoosh Motalebbi, Matthew Lutz-Kinoy, Sara Verbeek
- 15.00 – 16.00 ALUMNI: Paulien Oltheten, Marcel Pinas, Lucia Nimcova, Marijn van Kreij
- 16.00 – 17.00 Showing around Workshops, meeting Raymond van Ee (concerning item Art and Science), by Roy Taylor
- 17.00 – 18.00 Interviews by telephone: Anna Tilroe, Seth Siegelaub
Wednesday, June 16 2010

- 09.00 – 10.00 Interview MANAGEMENT TEAM 2: Audrey Moestadja (Finance), Michel de Rooij (Facility Management)
- 10.00 – 11.00 Interview (FORMER) ADVISORS 1: Alain Cueff, Aernout Mik, Ansuya Blom
- 11.00 – 12.00 Interview (FORMER) ADVISORS 2: Avis Newman, Philippe Pirotte
- 12.00 – 13.00 Walking around Expertise Centre (Artists' documentation, Library, Collection depot, - new collection): By Tinie Kerseboom (Expertise Centre)
- 13.00 – 14.00 Interview Janwillem Schrofer
- 14.00 – 15.00 Interviews by telephone: Lex ter Braak, Mr. Pitz
- 15.00 – 16.00 Interview PRIX DE ROME: John Lonsdale, Barbara Visser, David Bade
- 16.00 – 16.30 Interview Paul Boeding, Algemene Rekenkamer
- 16.30 – 17.30 Committee
- 17.30 – 18.30 Conversation with director Els van Odijk
- 18.30 – 19.30 Presenting preliminary findings to staff and Board