

zeppelin universität

zwischen
Wirtschaft Kultur Politik



Exzellenz in der Lehre

**Fellowship für
Innovationen in der Hochschullehre**

Abschlussbericht

Places of Excellence

**A critical analyzes on how reputation in master programs
in the field of Arts Management and Cultural Policy evolve**

Prof. Dr. Martin Tröndle, Würth Chair of Cultural Production
Zeppelin Universität Friedrichshafen

Places of Excellence

Prof. Dr. Martin Tröndle, Würth Chair of Cultural Production
Dr. des. Johanna Schindler, Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin am
Würth Chair of Cultural Production

Dieses Vorhaben wird aus Mitteln der Baden-Württemberg Stiftung im Rahmen des Programms Fellowships für Innovationen in der Hochschullehre gefördert.

Die Baden-Württemberg Stiftung hat zusammen mit der Joachim Herz Stiftung und dem Stifterverband für die Deutsche Wissenschaft das gemeinsame Programm „Fellowships für Innovationen in der Hochschullehre“ im Rahmen der Initiative „Exzellenz in der Lehre“ initiiert.

Ziel dieses Programms ist es, Anreize für die Entwicklung und Erprobung neuartiger Lehr- und Prüfungsformate oder die Neugestaltung von Modulen und Studienabschnitten zu schaffen. Durch regelmäßige Veranstaltungen sollen der gegenseitige Austausch der Fellows und die Verbreitung der entwickelten Projekte gewährleistet werden. Der Stifterverband für die Deutsche Wissenschaft (Stifterverband ist mit der Programmträgerschaft von der BW Stiftung beauftragt.)



Stifterverband
für die Deutsche Wissenschaft

Abstract

Ziel des Projektes *Places of Excellence* ist es, Impulse zur Lehrinnovation zu geben. Dabei standen weniger bestimmte Lehrformate im Zentrum des Interesses, als vielmehr die Frage nach der Schaffung einer exzellenten Lehrkultur. Es ging also weniger darum, was, sondern vor allem wie und in welchen Umgebungen gelehrt und gelernt wird, um „Exzellenz“ zu erreichen. Dazu wurden im Rahmen eines mehrmonatigen internationalen Vergleichs die Lernsituation führender Master-Studiengänge im Bereich Cultural Management und Cultural Policy analysiert. Zum Einsatz kam die teilnehmende Beobachtung in Unterrichtssituation, die feldforschende Analyse der Lehrumgebung, sowie über 60 Leitfadeninterviews mit Lehrenden und Studierenden. Ergänzt wurde das methodische Vorgehen durch eine quantitative Erhebung.

Die Ergebnisse der untersuchten Masterprogramme in Nordamerika und GB waren in zweifacher Hinsicht überraschend, zum einen wurden die vorab aufgestellten Hypothesen größtenteils nicht bestätigt, zum anderen wurde in nahezu allen untersuchten Programmen durchgehend ähnliche „Exzellenz“ Faktoren gefunden.¹

¹ Die im Text verwendeten Genusmarkierungen erstrecken sich ausdrücklich auf beide Geschlechter. Auf eine spezifische Markierung wird in der Regel aus sprachökonomischen Gründen verzichtet.

1. Fragestellung und Motivation

Insbesondere die jüngere Wissenschaftssoziologie hat den Blick für den Zusammenhang zwischen institutionsspezifischen sozialen Praktiken und Wissensgenese geschärft. So wurde von Bruno Latour nicht nur darauf aufmerksam gemacht, dass Artefakte und materielle Objekte als ‚Aktanten‘ eine aktive Rolle bei der Hervorbringung von Wissen spielen, es wurde auch ein gewandeltes Verständnis von Wissensproduktion und Sozialität entwickelt (Knorr-Cetina u.a. 1988; Latour 2001a, 2001b; Rheinberger 2010). Forschung wird demnach nicht nur als von soziokulturellen Faktoren beeinträchtigtes Tun, sondern selbst als soziokulturelle Praxis beschrieben. Dabei sind Räume, Objekte, Dinge, soziale Umfeldler, Machtfragen und Aufmerksamkeitsökonomien der Wissensgenese nicht äußerlich, sondern jeder Wissensform und jeder Forschungsaktivität immer schon eingeschrieben (Latour 2003). Nun steht zu vermuten, dass diese Erkenntnisse der Wissenschaftssoziologie nicht nur auf die Frage von Forschungskulturen, sondern auch auf die Frage von Lehrkulturen applizierbar ist. Eine empirische Feldstudie, die jedoch insbesondere das Zusammenspiel der ‚Aktanten‘ der Lehr-Lernsituation im Latour’schen Sinne untersucht, ist in der Lehrforschung bisher kaum erfolgt. Auch in der Lehr-Lernforschung wurde die Lehrsituation nicht mehr allein aus der Sicht des Lehrenden, sondern auch aus der Sicht des Lernenden thematisiert (Straka 2006: 15). Es ging nicht nur um kognitive, sondern auch um motivationale, emotionale sowie um soziale Aspekte der Lernsituation.² Auch bei dem vorliegenden Ansatz wurde den Kontexten, also den Lehr- und Lernumwelten (und ihrer Inszenierung), besonderer Wert beigemessen.

Ziel des Projektes Places of Excellence war daher, die Auswirkung dieses „Netzwerks der Aktanten“ (Latour verwendet für die bewusste Zusammenstellung von Einflussfaktoren ebenso den Begriff des *Compositionism*) im Hinblick auf Masterprogramme begleitend zu untersuchen, um so Faktoren und Rahmenbedingungen freizulegen die zur „Exzellenzbildung“ beitragen.

2. Methodik und Vorgehen

Eine solche Analyse konnte nicht alleine mit einer Literatur- oder einer Internetrecherche durchgeführt werden. Vielmehr forderte sie ein feldforschendes Vorgehen, also die Begegnung und Analyse vor Ort, wie sie von Bruno Latour (Latour/Woolgar 1979) begründet wurde und die seit den 1980er Jahren exemplarisch in die Wissenschaftssoziologie Einzug erhielt (Tröndle et al. 2011; Tröndle/Warmers 2012).

² vgl. [www.bwp.uni-oldenburg.de/7512.html] 10.8.2012

Methodisch wurde das „Netzwerk der Aktanten“ mit den Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung untersucht. Dazu wurden Leitfadeninterviews (Atteslander 2000; Flick 2002; Mayring 2002), Literaturlauswertungen/Materialanalysen und teilnehmende Beobachtungen als Instrumente der Organisationsforschung (Kühl/Strodtholz/Taffertshofer 2009) verwendet. Des Weiteren wurden Feldnotizen (Emerson et al. 2007) angefertigt. In der direkten Konfrontation vor Ort und in der Erfahrung von Lehrsituationen sollten mit Hilfe des methodischen Instrumentariums die jeweiligen „Netzwerke der Aktanten“, die die Lehr-Lernsituation prägen, freigelegt werden. In diesem Projekt sollte somit nicht lediglich ein Vergleich der Curricula stattfinden, also dessen, was gelernt werden soll. Vielmehr sollte verglichen werden, wie und unter welchen Umständen gelehrt und gelernt wird.

Dabei versteht sich von selbst, dass nationale Eigenheiten des Curriculums wie beispielsweise kulturelle Besonderheiten berücksichtigt wurden. Dennoch kann – und dies mag in besonderem Maße für universitäre Einrichtungen gelten, die das gleiche Feld bearbeiten und Studierende für die Arbeit in denselben Organisationsarten (Theater, Museen etc.) vorbereiten, deren Lehrende derselben wissenschaftlichen Gemeinschaft angehören, in denen oft dieselben Theorien favorisiert und in denselben Journals publiziert werden – davon ausgegangen werden, dass in einer vergleichenden Analyse exzellenter Umfelder durchaus Transformationspotentiale für Studiengänge im Bereich Kulturmanagement / Kulturpolitik in Deutschland herausgearbeitet werden können (vgl. Meyers 1992).

Ebenso schien es selbstverständlich, dass eine Auseinandersetzung mit der Lehre in einem Fachgebiet Fachkompetenz verlangt. Denn es gilt zu verstehen, welche Schwierigkeiten und Herausforderungen vor Ort jeweils bestehen und welche Lösungen dazu wie entwickelt werden. Auch das ist nicht aus Dokumenten herauszulesen, sondern kann erst im Gespräch und der Beobachtung in Erfahrung gebracht werden. Dabei sind insbesondere die organisationskulturell bedingten, subjektiven Perspektivierungen und Brechungen interessant (Tröndle 2006), die die Qualität der Lösungsansätze bestimmen, Entscheidungsverhalten evozieren und damit maßgeblich zur Exzellenzbildung beitragen. Bei der teilnehmenden Beobachtung konnte es daher nicht darum gehen, didaktische oder curriculare Allgemeinplätze zu beschreiben, sondern vielmehr Lernumwelten und den spezifischen Umgang mit Problemstellungen zu charakterisieren.

Wie Herbert Kalthoff (2003) in seinem Beitrag zu den Instrumenten ethnografisch-soziologischer Forschung herausstellt, bestimmt nicht nur das Verhältnis von Beobachter und Beobachteten, sondern auch die Beobachtungsleistung und deren Analyse, die Sprachfähigkeit und auch der Modus der Verschriftlichung das In-Erscheinung-Bringen der beobachteten Situation. Denn es handelt sich hier nicht um eine Abbildung, sondern um eine Übersetzung dessen, was der Forscher vor Ort erfährt und um das in Textform-Bringen des Erfahrenen. Dieses Dilemma einer Beobachterabhängigkeit ist nicht dadurch zu lösen, mög-

lichst ‚neutral‘ zu beobachten – auch dann nicht, wenn diese Beobachtung quasi ‚hypothesenfrei‘ erfolgt (nicht nur die Systemtheorie postuliert ‚es gibt keine Beobachtung ohne Beobachter‘). Auch eine strikt hypothesengeleitete Beobachtung, die im vergleichenden Ansatz gerade durch ihre ‚Neutralität‘ versucht, ‚Objektivität‘ zu konstruieren, kann dieses Dilemma nicht umgehen: Schon die Konstruktion der Hypothesen verhindert eine offene Beobachtungsleistung. Pragmatisch kam daher ein Methodenpluralismus zum Zuge, der von der Völgelperspektive zum Tiefeninterview unterschiedliche Involvierungsgrade zuließ, um dadurch vielfältige Beschreibungsebenen zu erzeugen.

Exzellenzbegriff und Beobachtungskriterien

Paul Taylor und Richard Braddock kritisieren die „engen“ Evaluationsfaktoren der Hochschulratings und werfen die Frage auf, was Exzellenz für Universitäten bedeuten möge

„(...) whatever criteria might interest potential students, from the vibrancy of university social life and the quality of campus eateries to the university’s standing as a centre of teaching and research. We are concerned with systems that rank universities specifically according to their excellence as universities“ (Taylor/Braddock 2007: 246).

Auch bei dem vorliegenden Ansatz war die Frage, welche Faktoren untersucht werden sollen und auf welche ggf. besonderes Gewicht gelegt werden soll. Im Wirkungsfeld von Kultur – Strategie – Struktur, wie es in der Organisationsentwicklung bei der Analyse von Organisationen zur Anwendung kommt (Tröndle 2006; Badelt 1999; Fatzer 1999), sollen hier-von ausgehend erste Anhaltspunkte gegeben werden, auf welche Faktoren bei der vergleichenden Analyse fokussiert werden kann.

- | Inhalt, Strukturiertheit, Abfolge des Curriculum | Lehrformate | Gruppengröße | eingesetzte Lehrformen: Seminare, Vorlesungen, Projektphasen, Exkursionen, Übungen etc. | didaktische Aufbereitung | Lehrpersönlichkeiten | Betreuungsintensität | Arbeitsbedingungen | Prüfungsleistungen | Stoff- oder Kompetenzorientierung | Verhältnis von Disziplinarität und Interdisziplinarität | Verschränkung von Theorie und Praxis | Praxisphasen
- | Auswahlverfahren und Aufnahme-rituale | Studiengebühren | Anteil der Studierenden anderer Nationalitäten | institutionalisierte Treffen der Studierenden (mit und ohne den Dozierenden) | außercurriculare Lehrformen | die Rolle der Alumni | Gestaltung der Studieneingangsphase
- | Wer lehrt und wie viele SWS? | Wie viel Wert wird auf hervorragende Lehre gelegt? | Wie werden Lehr-Lernformate weiterentwickelt? | Wird Lehre universitär diskutiert? | Evaluations-, Beschwerde- und Vorschlagswesen | Werden Drittmittel nicht nur für Forschungsprojekte, sondern ebenso für die Lehre und die Förderung der Einrichtung

eingeworben? | Selbstbild und Wertehaltung der Lehrenden | Wie fließen Forschungsergebnisse in die Lehre ein? | Bestehen Lehrforschungsformate?

- | Entstehungsgeschichte der Universität und des Departments (Gründermythen, Motivationen etc.) | Struktur des Departments, Einbettung in die Universität, steile oder flache Hierarchie etc. | Entscheidungsprozesse: wie kommt die Entscheidungsfindung zustande und wo liegt die Entscheidungsgewalt? | Managementqualitäten der Institution | Ist die Universität resp. das Department in der Lage, strategisch zu agieren? Trägt dies zu einer markanten Profilierung bei? (Gibt es Jahresthemen etc.) | Existieren Kooperationen zwischen den Lehrenden? Dichte und Intensität der Kooperation in Forschung und Lehre im Department | Organisationskultur des Department („Spirit of Department“) | Inwiefern können die Departments auf die Öffentlichkeits-, Marketing- und Fundraisingabteilungen der Universität zurückgreifen? | Weiterbildung der Dozierenden und Angestellten | Inwiefern ist organisationales Lernen verankert?
- | Wie und wodurch haben sich die Lehrenden qualifiziert (Beruflicher Werdegang)? | Wie ist die Stellung der Lehrenden innerhalb der Disziplin? | Über welche Netzwerke verfügen die Lehrenden? | Sind die Lehrenden Trendsetter in ihrem Bereich? Nehmen sie auf die Entwicklung der Fachdebatte oder gar darüber hinaus Einfluss? | Bestehen dominante Theorien oder Schulen- oder Lehrmeinungen? | Sind Netzwerke zu künftigen Arbeitgebern vorhanden? Werden sie in Lehrprojekte eingebunden? | Sind Netzwerke zu Politik und Medien vorhanden?
- | Wie kann die Atmosphäre der Gebäude und Räumlichkeiten beschrieben werden? | Welche Umgangsformen bestehen? | Gibt es bestimmte Rituale? | Gibt es Insignien oder andere Auffälligkeiten? | Welche Rolle spielen die Selbstdarstellung und der Habitus von Studierenden und Lehrenden? | Was lässt sich über die soziale Herkunft der Studierenden sagen? | Welche Berufsbilder und welches Rollenverständnis haben die Studierenden? | Welche Berufserfahrung haben die Studierenden und welche studentischen Nebentätigkeiten verfolgen sie?

Im Laufe der Untersuchung (Pretest und erste Interviews) haben sich für die befragten Gruppen (Lehrende und Studierende) folgende Fragestellungen herauskristallisiert (siehe Anhang 1) Fragebogen für Studierende und 2) Fragebogen für Lehrende).

Fallauswahl

In Vorbereitung dieses Projektes befragte der Antragsteller neun international tätige Professoren und Experten (aus Deutschland, Österreich, Schweiz, Rumänien und den USA) nach ihren Einschätzungen über international herausragende Studiengänge und nach ihren Gründen für diese Bewertung.³ Dieses Vorgehen einer Expertenbefragung scheint legitim, handelt es sich doch auch beim Begriff der Exzellenz eher um eine soziale Konstruktion der peers im Feld, als um ein objektivierbares Kriterium.⁴ Je nach disziplinärer Orientierung der Befragten, wurden unterschiedliche Einrichtungen genannt.

Nach einer eingehenden Internetrecherche zu den Programmangeboten, der Studiengänge und ihrem internationalen Renommee, sowie dem Feldzugang wurden folgende Institutionen für die Untersuchung ausgewählt:

- | HEC Montréal: Master of Management in International Arts Management
- | School of Art Institute Chicago, Master in Arts Administration and Policy
- | MIT Cambridge, Program in Art, Culture and Technology⁵
- | Ohio State University: Master Program in Arts Policy and Administration
- | New York University, Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development: Master in Visual Arts Administration & Master in Performing Arts Administration
- | Goldsmiths College: Institute for Creative and Cultural Entrepreneurship
- | University of Warwick: Centre for Cultural Policy Studies, MA in International Cultural Policy and Management

Im Folgenden wurde dann Kontakt mit den jeweiligen Instituts- oder Programmleitern aufgenommen, um den Feldzugang zu ermöglichen. Zeitgleich erfolgt die Analyse der Selbstdarstellungsmaterialien, der proklamierten Ziele und der Lehrpläne, Statistiken über Studienzahlen und ggf. Alumniinformationen. Auch die Voruntersuchung zur Qualifikation der Lehrenden zum Zeitpunkt ihrer Erstberufung ließ sich weitgehend durch eine Internetrecherche abfragen (Dokumentenanalyse).

³ Die Universitäten, in denen die Professoren angesiedelt waren, sind in Arizona, Basel, Chicago, Cluj-Napoca, Friedrichshafen, Lüneburg, New York, Weimar, Wien

⁴ Exzellenz schlägt sich insbesondere in Reputation der Einrichtungen bei den peers der Disziplin nieder. Dieser Logik folgen zumindest auch die großen Hochschulranking wie Times Higher Education (www.timeshighereducation.co.uk) oder das CHE Hochschulranking (www.che-ranking.de). Bei der Auswahl der Untersuchungsorte wurde in kleinem Rahmen ähnlich verfahren.

⁵ Zwar wurde hier der Besuch und die teilnehmende Beobachtung erlaubt jedoch wurde es vor Ort dann nicht zugelassen Interviews mit Studierenden und Lehrenden zu führen.

Feldphase

In den Monaten August bis Dezember 2013 wurden dann die Orte aufgesucht, um die Feldforschung als auch die Interviews durchzuführen. Idee dabei war, im Rahmen einer vergleichenden Untersuchung deren Lern-Lehr-Situationen zu analysieren, ihre Genese zu verstehen und gegebenenfalls Gründe zu finden, warum diese Studiengänge als exzellent wahrgenommen wurden. Dazu hat sich folgendes Vorgehen als hilfreich herausgestellt:

- | Leitfadengestützte Interview mit dem jeweiligen Leiter des Institutes resp. Department
- | Leitfadengestützte Interviews mit Lehrenden
- | Leitfadengestützte Interviews mit Studierenden aus verschiedenen Semestern
- | Besuch und teilnehmende Beobachtung mehrerer Lehrveranstaltungen z.B. Vorlesungen, Seminare, Übungen, Workshops etc.
- | Besuch und teilnehmende Beobachtung und Analyse der nicht-curricularen Formate z.B. Gastvorträge, Alumniveranstaltungen etc.
- | Feldforschendes Erkunden der Lehrumgebung (Unterrichtsräume, Büros, Bibliothek etc.) und der Situierung des Institutes / Departments innerhalb der Universität, festgehalten in Feldnotizen und einer fotografische Dokumentation.

3. Auswertung

Noch während der Feldforschungsphase wurden Feldnotizen angefertigt und teils die Interviews transkribiert. Die über 1200 Transkriptseiten der über knapp 70 zwischen 60 bis 90-minütigen Interviews, wurden codiert und anschließend mit den Feldnotizen und Fotos sowie der Dokumentenanalyse, in je einer Dichten Beschreibung eines Ortes komprimiert (Geertz 2001). Die Codierung fand entlang der zu Beginn formulierten die Untersuchung leitenden Fragen statt, sowie der sich vor Ort gezeigten neuen möglichen Faktoren, die zur Exzellenzbildung beitragen. Jede dieser sechs Beschreibungen der besuchten Orte/Masterprogramme umfasst circa 30 Seiten. Auszugsweise wird zur Illustration ein Teil eines Beispiels angeführt:

University of Warwick: Centre for Cultural Policy Studies, Master of Arts in International Cultural Policy and Management



Fig. X: Warwick Castle

One would likely assume that the name the University of Warwick stems from the fact that it is the university located in Warwick, England. Not quite. The University of Warwick is in fact not located in Warwick, but on the outskirts of Coventry, an hour's train ride away from its namesake city.

Some say that the reason why the name the University of Warwick was chosen for a university in Coventry is that Warwick, with its impressive castle and many picturesque buildings from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, already had an international reputation due to its cultural heritage. Coventry, on the other hand, was heavily bombed during WWII (due to several aircraft and car engine manufacturers being headquarter there, including Coventry Morris Engines and Armstrong Siddeley Jaguar), and it shared the fate of many German cities, in that it was completely rebuilt in the 1950s and '60s.

Thus, the story goes the historical importance of Warwick was used to give a rather young university, established in 1965, greater significance. If this is truly the case, the outcome of this ploy would count as a major PR win, for the university has achieved an impressive international reputation over the past few decades—regardless of whether because of help from the name Warwick or because of its highly ranked departments and researchers. A further reason for its success could be the relatively young university's ability to respond to

societal demands in a changing postwar Britain, as one of the interviewed professors expressed:

I think the single most important thing is the Warwick brand. We managed it through innovation. We didn't have the historical traditions of other universities. So it became a university that was open to change, which was socially diverse. The British university system, until very recently, was based on the English social class system and dominated by the middle and upper middle classes. Students from other backgrounds—minorities and working-class students—found universities very intimidating, very difficult. Ironically, Warwick was both left leaning [and] very socially inclusive, but also entrepreneurial and very innovative. (P4: 208ff.)

When talking about the University of Warwick, one has to mention that Coventry has another, more established postsecondary institution: Coventry University, which was founded in 1843 as the Coventry College of Design. Although Coventry University has the upper hand as far as history and student population (30,000), University of Warwick comes out on top in international reputation and across various university rankings, thanks to its world-leading research.⁶ Warwick Uni self-confidently boasts this leading research strategy on its website:

Warwick is justifiably proud of the reputation it has earned for the quality of its research and has ambitious goals for continuing growth. Although Warwick is already clearly one of the UK's leading research-led universities, the strategy has the goal of enhancing its research profile to yet higher levels of international excellence. It aims, no less, at us becoming a top fifty world-ranked university.⁷

The thirty-two departments and various research centers of the University of Warwick are organized in four faculties: Arts, Medicine, Science, and Social Sciences. Today, the university population numbers around 23,000 full-time students and 1,600 academic and research staff.⁸

When one arrives on campus, the functional architecture of the approximately eighty buildings is immediately striking. Figure X conveys the impression left by Library Road, where the Department of Chemistry, the School of Engineering, the library, and the complexes for the sciences and humanities' can be found.

⁶ <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/research/rae2008>, <http://www.theguardian.com/education/table/2012/may/21/university-league-table-2013> (accessed April 22, 2014)

⁷ <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/research/strategy/> (accessed April 22, 2014)

⁸ <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/about/profile/people> (accessed April 22, 2014)



Fig. X: Library Road on the campus of the University of Warwick.

Warwick University House sits at the center of campus. It comprises the university administration and student services as well as a restaurant and coffee bar. With its brick exterior and an architecture adapted from residential houses, the building resembles the housing developments for workers in the surrounding neighborhood.



Fig. X: Warwick University House

Inside the building, the atrium is dominated by a tall white wall, shaped like an oversized tombstone or memorial. One could say that the wall even asks for an artistic intervention; instead, it displays white emptiness. In general, the environment is mostly art free. Only the first floor displays a few artworks in its hallways.



Fig. X: Coffee bar in the Atrium of Warwick University House

Despite the central wall's dominance, the atrium is light and luminous, as its glass-paneled roof opens up to the sky. Still, after wandering through the building, the impression of Anglo-Saxon efficiency becomes even more entrenched. The cafeteria and the office spaces strongly call for such an interpretation (see figs. XX and XX).



Fig. X: View into the cafeteria at lunchtime



Fig. X: Office space for the staff on the first floor of Warwick University House.

Millburn House, which is only a five-minute walk from Warwick University House, houses some of the art-related programs, including the School of Theatre, Performance and Cultural Policy Studies, the History of Art Department, and the Warwick Writing Program, in addition to the Centre for Cultural Policy Studies.



Fig. X: Millburn House in the Science Park

The building itself is located on the edge of campus; its architecture is rather demure. The combination of the out-of-the-way location and the sober architecture does not attract too much attention toward Millburn House. Inside the building, the Centre for Cultural Policy Studies seems somehow even more hidden away, as a short extract of the field notes shows:

During my first visit to Millburn House, I had difficulties finding my way. Firstly, the door was locked and I had to wait for someone to let me in. Secondly, I had to pass several doors and hallways and turn many times, until I finally arrived at the Centre for Cultural Policy Studies. In the end, a student helped me find my way. [One often needs a security card to get access to the buildings of the university. But unlike in the School of the Art Institute of Chicago and New York University, the staff facilitates the access. Here the entrance door was locked but no security staff around to open it.]



Fig. X: The entrance area of the School of Theatre, Performance and Cultural Policy Studies

Interestingly, this metaphorical resonance of this mixture of efficiency and hiding that is made concrete in the center's architectural environment was addressed by P2:

I mean all of the strategy for the center was initially to be invisible. Do the work and be very effective and don't let them ask too many questions. If you put your head above the parapet you will get shot at. Keep out of the way. (P2: 354ff.)

The removed location and modest presence of Millburn House, as well as the labyrinthine path finding required to navigate the building, might have supported that strategy.

Centre for Cultural Policy Studies

A survey of the content of the centre's offered MA programs could lead one to assume that the Centre for Cultural Policy Studies (CCPS) is located at the Faculty of Social Sciences. But it is actually part of the Faculty of Arts. It's possible effect of this is that the center developed more independently than it would have if it had been attached to a seemingly more closely related discipline, such as sociology or political sciences. In addition to a few research centers, the Faculty of Arts includes six departments: Classics and Ancient History; English and

Comparative Literary Studies; Film and Television Studies; History of Art; the School of Theatre, Performance, and Cultural Studies; and History.

A short extract from the CCPS website gives a good indication of what the center's overall philosophy is:

Established in 1995, the Centre provides a focus for teaching and research in cultural management, cultural policy, media and communications, social enterprise and the creative and media industries. Our distinctive approach is to engage with the practical realities of working in the cultural and media industries while having critical oversight of the ideological, strategic and conceptual questions, which lie behind professional practice. This approach is shaped by an ongoing commitment to preparing postgraduate students for careers in the culture, media and communication industries.⁹

It is probably worth emphasizing that the CCPS neither qualifies students for a specific career path nor is it especially hands-on in its teaching methods. Rather, it prepares them by inhabiting and promoting a reflective approach. But let us take a look at the development of the center. It was only in the early 1990s, when a master's degree in International Cultural Policy was initiated at the University of Warwick. P3 had been developing this program since the late 1980s at Leicester Polytechnic, which was the first school in the UK to offer a degree in the field of cultural policy. S/he then put it to practice at Warwick University in 1993 and directed it until 2008 (P1: 205ff.). With the establishment of the Center for Cultural Policy Studies in 1999, the expertise in this field, and the reputation of Warwick University by extension, was strengthened:

There weren't that many programs and it was very unusual to talk about this thing called "cultural policy." It felt impossibly exotic to be talking about France, Germany, Sweden, and the Netherlands—these countries, which, for somebody working in the arts in the UK, you thought had proper cultural policies and which funded theaters, operas, and music. It was all very exciting and I decided to do that. (P2: 34ff.)

This quote not only illustrates the center's entrepreneurial spirit and the original faculty's excitement at creating something new, but it also shows that the mindset has spread to the younger generation of professors. P2, for example, is a former PhD student who was...

⁹ http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/arts/theatre_s/cp/about/ (accessed April 22, 2014)

Drivers of excellence

Dieses teils explorative, teils hypothesengeleitete Vorgehen ergab, dass sich in den Dichten Beschreibungen der sechs Fälle (cases) an den verschiedenen untersuchten Orte, wiederkehrend ähnliche Faktoren zeigten. Das qualitative Vorgehen wurde durch ein quantitatives Vorgehen ergänzt, zur Gegenprüfung und Ergänzung der Ergebnisse, in das die Antworten der geschlossenen Fragen aller Befragten eingeflossen sind.

Zuletzt wurde dann die quantitativen und qualitativen Ergebnisse über alle sechs Fälle hinweg ausgewertet und abermals verdichtet, um die „drivers of excellence“ zu extrahieren. Dies sind Werthaltungen, institutionelle Konstellationen und Verhaltensmuster, die in ihrer Interaktion aus unserer Sicht die hohe Reputation dieser Masterprogramme erzeugen. Dabei zeigte sich auch, dass „exzellente“ Studiengänge nicht unbedingt mit einer „exzellente“ Lehre einhergehen müssen; also die internationale Reputation eines Masterprogrammes nicht unbedingt außerordentliche „Lehrqualität“ nach sich ziehen muss.

Zur Illustration sollen auch hier einige der Exzellenzfaktoren „drivers of excellence“ vorgestellt werden:

Case descriptions revisited: Overall drivers

The aim of the project *Places of Excellence* was to investigate the formation of “excellence” in higher education programs in the fields of cultural policy, cultural production, and arts management. To this end, we examined six programs considered to be “excellent”—one in Canada, four in the US, and two in the UK—and described the results of our surveys, interviews, and observations in detail on the previous pages. In the course of this analysis, we were not interested in or trying to establish best-practice examples and benchmarks. Rather, we were looking for distinct characteristics of the examined programs that could explain their reputations. In this section, we will now turn our efforts to considering the data all together. However, before pointing out the patterns we have found, we will provide short summaries of the research results.

Summing up: The six cases

HEC Montréal: Master of Management in International Arts Management

In the Marketing Department of HEC Montréal, twenty-four professors concentrate on specifically on marketing, some of them also specialize on marketing in the arts. Additionally, the

Carmelle and Rémi Marcoux Chair in Arts Management edits the *International Journal of Arts Management (IJAM)*. This is one of the most relevant scientific journals in the field, in which most of the HEC Montréal faculty members regularly publish research articles. Due to his/her publications, the department Chair can be considered as the “founding figure” of arts marketing. It is noteworthy that the same professor, who still acts as the leading “entrepreneur” of the program today, has been directing this department for the past twenty-five years.

According to the student interviews and course observations, teaching was focused on the transfer of skills in order to successfully publish in peer-reviewed journals, such as *IJAM*. Each class was based on the analysis and/or editing of a case study, which dealt with real field scenarios. In terms of networking, the staff was engaged in associations such as AIMAC (International Association of Arts and Cultural Management), AAAE (Association of Arts Administration Educators) and ICCPR (International Conference on Cultural Policy Research), providing various possibilities for HEC Montréal faculty to influence the development of the field on an international level. Alongside this academic strand of the program, practical placements in the field were facilitated by an advisory board composed of the directors of major international art institutions, who took care of the students’ placements, where they worked as consultants or in the institutions’ management.

The latest achievement of the Chair was creating the International Master of Management in International Arts Management. This program is carried out in collaboration with Southern Methodist University Dallas and SDA Bocconi. Each of the partnering institutions contributes to the program with its particular field of expertise, which is why the trimester carried out at HEC Montréal focuses strongly on arts marketing, both in its teaching and research.

One could say that marketing is not merely a research topic in the context of this master’s degree; it can be considered the ideology of the department. As it is located in a business school, the examined department has adapted its programming offers and mentality to this environment. A detailed case description was performed in chapter XY.

...

University of Warwick: Master of Arts in International Cultural Policy and Management

At the University of Warwick we visited the Centre for Cultural Policy Research (CCPR). Out of the four master’s degrees the center offers, we examined the MA in International Cultural Policy and Management in more detail. Among the six “places of excellence” examined

during the research project, this was the only one located in a city with a population of less than half a million. It was also the only program entirely focused on research: For example, the *International Journal of Cultural Policy* and the conference linked to it, the International Conference on Cultural Policy Research (ICCP), were founded at the center.

Classes at the CCPR took place just one or two days a week, allowing the students to use the rest of their time to read and discuss texts. However, the small class sizes of (we observed 12 to 20 per class) students allowed for in-depth discussion of the required readings. The center successfully integrated the students' diverse backgrounds into the teaching environment, both in regard to their nationalities and their professional experience. This was congruent with the center's mission to develop the "thinking manager."

The programs were built around the professors' individual research interests and adapted to the students' needs at the same time. It is noteworthy that even though the faculty actively influences the academic field on an international level and the CCPR is well positioned in national rankings, it still needs to fight for recognition inside the university itself. Formerly, it was the center's strategy to remain invisible in order to be able to test its programs. Today, this is still reflected in the center's location at the outskirts of the campus and at the back of a building, somehow hiding a bit away.

We also found that the students appreciated the friendly atmosphere and personal environment these spaces provided.

These short summaries show that despite the examined programs' similar orientation in the fields of cultural policy, arts administration, and cultural production, each has developed very distinctive features and individual approaches to these subject areas. Therefore, considering them to be best-practice examples or benchmarks does not make much sense. The six cases are both too different and too specific to be compared. Nevertheless, the questions of why these programs were considered to be "excellent" and how they have attained such high reputations remains open. Are there distinct factors that might explain these programs' "excellence"?

We believe, the data we have collected offers the ability to identify such characteristics. These characteristics can be considered as "drivers" leading to the formation and communication of a notion of excellence specific to each program. We outline these drivers in detail below.

Similarities and patterns: Overall drivers for "excellent" programs

Fresh beginnings

All of the examined programs were developed from scratch. In each university, a window of opportunity opened—the time was right for someone to create a new position and to start a new program. As the lead professor from SAIC put it: “there was no faculty in place, no real curriculum and no presence in the school, no vision, no nothing. . . . It was a good moment for me to do something different and that’s why I came.” (SAIC, P3: 66ff.) This is similar to the story at the University of Warwick: “I felt I had gone as far as I could [at my previous institution]. So I came to this university, which had a reputation for being open to new ideas” (WW, P3: 219f.). Each of the examined programs sprung up in places and at times when there was the possibility to do something different than the already existing programs within an institution or at competing universities:

And then [P3] came up with this idea for a master’s in cultural policy. It was through [his/her] talking to people in continental Europe, in particular the Scandinavians. It was when all of their interest in cultural policy was starting to kick in (WW, P1: 205ff.)

Five years ago, . . . I said that there were no real master’s programs that would focus only on the international market. . . . I thought that beside courses on international management, to really have an international program, it would be nice if we could have the students travel to different countries to study. (HEC, P1: 129ff.)

These excerpts show that the time was right not only in regard to the institutional environment, but also with respect to current discourses in the field, around which new programs were woven. At Goldsmiths, a new program has been initiated nearly every year since the creation of the ICCE, allowing the institute to develop a master’s around the qualifications of one particular professor, who would then be responsible for that program (see p. XX – GS).

Existence of a leading figure

The descriptions of the programs’ development revealed that each program—and sometimes even the entire department under which the programs fall—were founded by one of the current professors, who, in most cases, continues to act as the head figure still today. The nature of the current Directors’ roles differed from program to program, functioning variously as leader and even creator of the field (HEC, Warwick); as a parental figure watching and caring for his/her staff and students (GS, HEC); or as a duo who split responsibility for two aspects

of the students' future, the academic and the practical (OSU). In all cases, comments like “this is his/her baby” (see p. XX and XX) and “s/he has been here forever” (see p. XX – GS) reinforce that the leading figures have ongoing influence on and investment in their respective programs.¹⁰ At Warwick, the directorship has already been handed down twice. Still, each of these new Directors took care to “keep the flame” and “legacy” that the founding figure had established (see p. XX – WW). Thus, even in cases where the founding figure of the program is no longer in the Director's seat, it is clear these authorities who gave distinction to the programs still shape them today.

Disposition / Ideology / School of thinking

The founding professors were able to choose and collect individuals around them to support their initiatives, thereby creating a faculty that thinks alike. All of the programs presented a specific idea of what the program should be about and of how its students and faculty should see the world, that is, their professional fields:

We want them to know what the artist is feeling. We want them to know what it is to be an artist, because from my experience in the field I know that artistic companies are very reluctant to hire somebody who is not from the field. They are not looking for a manager, but for a manager that has experience in the arts field. (HEC, P1: 223ff.)

A fundamental aspect of the program . . . is a constant intersection between the concepts of cultural management and managing culture with the art makers themselves. . . . because there are just artists around here all the time. So the students in our program are not learning in a vacuum. They are in the firepit with the creative process, the complexity of managing that and negotiating those conversations and relationships all the time. (SAIC, P2: 133ff.)

The way that all our MA teaching has evolved has really been based around one person. A course Director who is passionate about that subject and leads it. Our view is that if you don't have that, then it is not really going to work, it is not going to be distinctive and powerful. (WW, P2: 228ff.)

The above-mentioned “world view” does not necessarily imply a content-related concept, like the ones of HEC (arts marketing) and SAIC (critical thinking and community development).

¹⁰ The founding fathers/mothers have been directing their programs for up to thirty years and are approaching retirement. One consequence of this long-term involvement is that each program will have to deal with the question of succession in the upcoming 5-10 years.

It could also encompass a shared point of view regarding structural aspects or approaches to teaching and research, as shown in the last quote from Warwick Uni.

We also found evidence of this set of shared values across the teaching body in the quantitative analyses. In all programs, the atmosphere among the professors was rated as cooperative (2.00), collegial (2.13), motivating (2.17) and only minimally competitive (3.21) within their program/center. They shared common concerns (1.92), were on the same wavelength as their colleagues (2.08), and all showed great will to change something at the department e.g. in regard to improving classes or departmental structures (2.17) (see p. XY)¹¹.

When we asked the professors about the qualifications and capacities they considered important for their fellow professors, they agreed highly on three out of fifteen possible answers: “professional qualification” (17), “enthusiasm for the subject they are teaching” (16), and “pedagogic competence” (15) (n = 24). This result bolsters the idea that team building as well as faculty cohesion via shared values and beliefs are further drivers for the development of excellence.

The following two findings also contribute to the validity of this aspect of excellence, which we have termed “coherent egoism.”

Strong departmental culture

We observed a strong departmental orientation toward and passion for the content of the programs they offer. This holds true for all examined cases. Each faculty member is dedicated to his/her work for the respective department, including teaching and nurturing the students’ and individual research. Below are a sample of the statements we collected that explain how dedication manifests itself in the examined programs:

People know why they are doing this program, they are eager to learn. . . . Everybody teaching in this program prefers this program, because the students are lively, they are creative, and they make connections. They are *passionate* about the product, about their arts, and about the field. It gives a spirit in the class, an atmosphere that you don’t find in any other program. And I’ve taught in every program here. (HEC, P1: 207ff.)

The other guiding ethic of the program is that we are all very idealistic. We feel the potential of the arts is always yet to be discovered. So we are not interested in people who are going to figure out how to make a concert come off absolutely smoothly. We are interested in people who are going to

¹¹ 1 = applies fully, 5 = does not apply at all

think about how the concert hall could look five years from now. What could the environment be? And how is the music changing? And how is the audience changing? (SAIC, P3: 198ff.)

We have identified this [departmental spirit] through our faculty meetings, and it is now in the hallway on the wall so that nobody will forget it. It is called: “Understand the past, shape the future.” It is that you can’t do anything without knowing where you are, the history of the field, the history of the arts and culture. We are very focused on social justice in this department; that is like a cornerstone. (OSU, P1: 200ff.)

We are constantly tinkering and upgrading the curriculum. I think that is the crux of what we have. Our product, so to speak. . . . We are constantly adjusting to what is going on in the field. (NYU, P6: 527ff.)

There is a societal responsibility. It starts really simply with “How can I help people to maximize their potential and to reach their ambition?” (GS, P5: 308ff.)

It’s not necessarily having the hands-on technical competences . . . , but it’s being able to think about what it involves to be doing an audience development strategy. It’s understanding the underlying principles. (WW, P1: 853ff.)

On the one hand, these statements aptly sum up what is at stake and at the core of each program, and what it is the interviewed professors care about. On the other hand, they exemplify once more the entrepreneurial attitude of the staff members as well as the programs’ specificity. Our interpretation is that the passion that the professors display for their programs’ topics and their (societal) relevance, as well as the passion with which they teach the programs, is what results in these institutions being experienced as ‘authentic’ places. They stand for specific topics and mindsets. This authenticity and specificity, in turn, is what attracts the students who find these academic niches and attitudes appealing.

High level of specificity

The distinct ideas and dispositions of the programs also lead to highly specific curricula. It becomes obvious through our detailed case descriptions that although all of the programs educate students for similar markets (that is, employment in the field of arts and culture), they each focus on one specific topic, which provided the basic framework for the curriculum development. These “flashpoint” subjects at each institution are: arts marketing at HEC Montréal-

al; community development at SAIC; arts and cultural policy at both OSU and Warwick Uni; performing and visual arts management at NYU; and cultural entrepreneurship at Goldsmiths. Using these topics at their starting points, the programs were able to fill a niche and to distinguish themselves from the various other programs offered in the fields of cultural production, cultural policy, and arts management. Equally as important, the departments were able to develop a high level expertise around these topics. It is noteworthy that this content specificity—the program’s niche—was communicated by each program as one of its unique selling proposition (USPs).

These departments also attain exclusivity in another manner: all of the examined departments mainly offered master’s degrees and the possibility of continuing on in the department with a PhD program. Except for OSU, none of the examined departments offered programs in these subject areas at the BA level. The reasons for this were both economic and academic. While the lead professor from the University of Warwick stated that a master’s degree seemed to be the most appropriate academic level to her/him when starting the program, professors from SAIC, NYU, and Goldsmiths explained that running a BA program would require PhD students who could function as teaching assistants, which has financial implications (see pp. XY – NYU). In contrast to this, the only resources required to run MA degrees were tuition fees. Thus, this academic level was more economically beneficial to the university, and also to the department, if its students attend a maximum of courses within the department, meaning that all tuition fees feed directly back into the program (see pp. XY – GS).

...

4. Zusammenfassung und Abweichungen gegenüber der Konzeption im Antrag

Im ursprünglichen Antrag wurde formuliert, dass die gefundenen Ergebnisse, in ein neues Programm an der Zeppelin Universität umgesetzt werden sollten. Dieses Masterprogramm wurde basierend auf den internationalen Analysen renommierter Master-Studiengang detailliert ausgearbeitet und dem Präsidium der Universität im Frühling 2015 vorgestellt (Arbeitstitel: *Center for Cultural Policy and Cultural Production*). Das Präsidium evaluierte das Konzept, bei dem ein forschungsbasiertes und problemorientiertes sowie gelebtes interkulturelles Lernen im Zentrum steht, positiv, verabschiedete es und Fundraisingaktivitäten wurden vorge-

nommen. Der Fellow, sollte das neue Programm verantworten, entwickeln und an der Universität als innovatives und internationales Lehrforum etablieren.

Mit dem überraschenden Rücktritt und vollständigen Austausch des Präsidiums und der Geschäftsführung der Zeppelin Universität im Herbst 2015 und dem darauffolgenden Interimsjahr lag das Projekt auf Eis. Die dann neu angetretene Universitätsleitung verfolgte eine andere Strategie, so dass das entwickelte Center darin keinen Platz mehr fand. Von der Idee des Centers, seines innovativen Lehrkonzeptes und der daraus entstehenden internationalen Anziehungskraft ist der Fellow weiterhin überzeugt.

Aufgrund der nicht erfolgten praktischen Umsetzung werden die Ergebnisse nun publiziert:

- | Tröndle, Martin / Schindler, Johanna (in preparation, 2017): *Places of Excellence: a critical analyzes on how reputation in master programs in the field of Arts Management and Cultural Policy evolve* (approx. 280p)

Und auf nationalen und internationalen Tagungen vorgestellt, u.a.:

- | International Association of Arts and Cultural Management – Juni 2017 BEIJING, CHINA
- | Jahrestagung Kulturmanagement des Fachverbandes Kulturmanagement e.V., Januar 2018, Hamburg
- | European Sociological Association, Arts Management Reseach Stream, September 2018

Nonetheless...

Persönlich hat mich die Auseinandersetzung was „Exzellenz in der Lehre“ bedeuten könnte als auch wie innovative Lehrkonzepte umgesetzt werden weiter umgetrieben. So konnte ich in den letzten zwei Jahren zwei weitere Projekte im Bereich des forschungsorientierten Lernen lancieren, von denen ebenfalls eines bereits dokumentiert ist:

- | Tröndle, Martin (Hg.)(2017): *Die Kulturkonzeption: Stadtentwicklung und Kulturpolitik am Beispiel der Stadt Ravensburg*. Wiesbaden: VS-Springer.

Zur Illustration auch hier Auszug aus dem Vorwort:

Forschungsgeleitetes Lernen

Gehen wir davon aus, dass Wissen nicht alleine von einem Speicher abrufbare Informationen sind, sondern eher komplexe Prüfoperationen, die uns ermöglichen, bisher Unbekanntes zu analysieren, es einzuordnen und gegebenenfalls Sinn oder Handlungsoptionen daraus zu gewinnen. In diesem Fall stellt sich die Frage, was Lernen ist und wie Lernprozesse – also Wissensgenerierung – stattfinden. Das Lehrformat des forschungsgeleiteten Lernens versucht, dem Rechnung zu tragen und die Wis-

sensgenerierung qualitativ zu verändern. Wer forscht, hat den Wunsch, etwas in Erfahrung zu bringen. Wissenschaftliche Forschung zeichnet sich dadurch aus, dass dies mit wissenschaftlichen Methoden und Theorien vonstattengeht. Dabei geht es vor allem auch darum, zu verstehen, unter welchen Bedingungen, mit welchen Prämissen und Methoden welche Art von Wissen erzeugt wurde, um sich der Relativität und damit der situativen Nützlichkeit dieses Wissens bewusst zu werden. Beim Lehrformat des forschungsgeleiteten Lernens werden Studierende daher unter der Moderation eines oder mehrerer Lehrenden zum Forschen angeleitet; sie werden in die Techniken, aber auch die Verantwortung zukünftiger Wissensproduzenten eingeführt.

In Anlehnung an das Humboldt'sche Bildungsideal der Einheit von Forschung und Lehre führt die forschende Lehre zu Humboldt 2.0 – der Selbstermächtigung der Studierenden durch das Format der forschenden Lehre. Die Studierenden erhalten fachspezifische Kompetenzen zu einem bestimmten Problemfeld, indem sie sich mit diesem Feld selbst, aber auch zugehörigen Methoden und Theorien auseinandersetzen, um selbst Informationen zu diesem Thema zu verfertigen. In solch einem Lehr-Lern-Umfeld begegnen sich Lehrende und Studierende auf Augenhöhe: Sie versuchen gemeinsam zu verstehen, wie die Problemlage konstituiert werden kann, welche Theorien zu einem besseren Verständnis des Problems genutzt werden können und welche Methoden geeignet sein könnten, um die Fragestellungen zu bearbeiten. ...

Auch bei den Fellow-Treffen des Programms „Innovationen in der Hochschullehre“ und den Lehr-/Lernkonferenzen habe ich den Austausch mit den anderen Fellows als sehr anregend und bereichernd wahrgenommen. Für die Studierenden und mich war somit das Fellowship eine wirksame und über die Projektförderung hinaus nachhaltige Investition zur Förderung innovativer Lehrkonzepte. Ich bin zuversichtlich, dass sich durch die Publikationen und Vorträge weitere Kollegen für das Thema interessieren und sensibilisieren lassen.

Das bedeutet, obgleich das entwickelte Master-Programm nicht umgesetzt werden konnte, hat mir die Auseinandersetzung mit der Thematik vielfältige Anregungen gegeben und motiviert, mich mit der Thematik lehrend und publizierend weiter auseinanderzusetzen.

Literatur

- Badelt, Christoph (Hg.) (1999): Handbuch der Nonprofit Organisation. Strukturen und Management. 2. überarb. und erw. Aufl., Stuttgart: Schäffer-Poeschel Verlag.
- Emerson, Robert M., Fretz, Rachel I., Shaw, Linda L. (2007): Writing ethnographic fieldnotes. Chicago [u.a.] : Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Fatzer, Gerhard (Hg.) (1999): Organisationsentwicklung für die Zukunft. Ein Handbuch. Köln: EHP.
- Flick, Uwe (2002): Qualitative Sozialforschung. Eine Einführung. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Verlag.
- Geertz, Clifford (2001): The Interpretations of Cultures: selected essays. New York: BasicBooks.
- Kalthoff, Herbert (2003): Beobachtende Differenz. Instrumente der ethnografisch-soziologischen Forschung. In: Zeitschrift für Soziologie, 32 (1), 70-90.
- Knorr-Cetina, Karin (unter Mitarbeit von K. Amann, S. Hirschauer, K.-H. Schmidt) (1988): Das naturwissenschaftliche Labor als Ort der ‚Verdichtung‘ von Gesellschaft. In: Zeitschrift für Soziologie, 17 (2), 85-101.
- Kühl, Stefan / Strodtholz, Petra / Taffertshofer, Andreas (Hg.) (2009): Handbuch Methoden der Organisationsforschung. Wiesbaden: VS.
- Latour, Bruno (2001a): Eine Soziologie ohne Objekt? Anmerkungen zur Interobjektivität. In: Berliner Journal für Soziologie, 237-252.
- Latour, Bruno (2001b): Gabriel Tarde und das Ende des Sozialen. In: Soziale Welt, 52, 361-376.
- Latour, Bruno (2003): Die Versprechen des Konstruktivismus. In: Jörg Huber (Hg.), Interventionen 12: Person/Schauplatz, Zürich: Edition Voldemeer, 183-208.
- Latour, Bruno & Woolgar, Steve (1979): Laboratory Life. The Social Construction of Scientific Facts. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mayring, Philipp (2002): Einführung in die qualitative Sozialforschung. 5. Aufl., Weinheim: Beltz.
- Meyers, John (1992): Organizational environments: Ritual and Rationality. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Rheinberger, Hans-Jörg (2010): Papierpraktiken im Labor, Interview. In: Krauthausen, Karen / Nasim, Omar W. (Hg.), Notieren, Skizzieren. Schreiben und Zeichnen als Verfahren des Entwurfs. Band 3 der Reihe „Wissen im Entwurf“, hg. v. Hoffmann, Christoph / Wittmann, Barbara, Zürich: Diaphanes, 139-158.
- Straka, A. Gerald (Hg.) (2006): Lernen organisiert und Selbstgesteuert: Forschung – Lehre – Praxis. 4. Aufl., Münster: Waxmann.
- Taylor, Paul / Braddock, Richard (2007): International University Ranking Systems and the Idea of University Excellence. In: Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 29 (3), 245-260.
- Tröndle, Martin (2006): Entscheiden im Kulturbetrieb: Integriertes Kunst- und Kulturmanagement. Bern: h.e.p.
- Tröndle, Martin et al. (2011): The Entanglement of Arts and Sciences: On the Transaction Costs of Transdisciplinary Research Settings. In: Journal for Artistic Research, 1, [<http://www.jar-online.net/>]
- Tröndle, Martin / Warmers, Julia (Hg.)(2012): Kunstforschung als ästhetische Wissenschaft. Zur transdisziplinären Hybridisierung von Wissenschaft und Kunst. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Anhang 1) Fragebogen für Studierende

Stifterverband
für die Deutsche Wissenschaft



Dear Students,

Thank you very much for supporting the research project “Places of Excellence”. “Places of Excellence” is a field research project comparing internationally leading master programs in the fields of Cultural Management, Cultural Policy und Cultural Production. The research looks towards stimulating teaching and learning situations. The focus is put less on specific pedagogic formats or on what is actually taught; rather, we are interested in “cultures of excellence” and in how teaching takes place. The *Association for German Science* funds “Places of Excellence” with a mandate to improve teaching and learning situations in universities.

The following questionnaire will take approx. 60 minutes. All information will be handled anonymously and I sincerely thank you in advance for your cooperation.

To begin with, I would like to ask you to answer the following questions regarding the choice of the program in which you are studying:

1 Are you studying at the MA- or PhD-level?

q Master q PhD

2 Which semester of study are you in? _____

3 What did you do before starting your current studies?

4a Why did you choose this program?

4b What did you expect from the program?

5 In what way did you experience the selection procedures? How did you feel about those processes of admission?

6 How did you experience your first weeks? Please give a short description on your “period of arrival”.

7 What aspect makes the program unique, what makes it stand for / out? What makes it special compared to other programs? (What is it’s USP?)

8a Is there a specific spirit, disposition, or something like a “departmental ideology”? (a general goal)

8b Are there specific Key-words being used, or a “terminology that gest thrown-out”?

8c How would you complete the sentence when talking about the program (defining me and my class in a professional way)

“We are (“cultural workers”)....

S9 When choosing this program, how important were the following aspects:	Very important	Important	More or less important	Unimportant	Absolutely unimportant
The general reputation of the university/ school					
Friends / acquaintances already studying here					
The program's / department's orientation/profile					
Family reasons					
One / several professors and their teaching and research foci					
The city and its cultural activities					
The ranking of the university/school and the program					
The program's environment and what it offers / everything beside the core curriculum e.g library, cafeteria, events...					
The alumni network					
Future professional options					
The scholarship / funding options					
Tuition fees (Did this alter your decision then coming here?)					
The possibility to work in parallel to studying					

Are you studying at your preferred university? q Yes q No

10 What profession would you like to attain upon having finished your studies?

11 What are the three most important (academic) things you have learned here? (And who taught you them?)...

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

12 ... and what else would you like to learn?

13 What are the three most interesting authors, books, or theories you have gotten to know here?

14 What aspects of the studies do you specifically appreciate...

15 ... and what would you like to change?

In the following, I would like to ask you some questions regarding the professors:

S16 Which qualifications and capacities are important for a professor of this program?

Please choose a maximum of 5 among the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Professional academic/ artistic qualification
<input type="checkbox"/>	Pedagogic competence
<input type="checkbox"/>	Frequent publishing / professional activities
<input type="checkbox"/>	Practical experience
<input type="checkbox"/>	Humor / Spirit
<input type="checkbox"/>	Appreciative treatment of the students
<input type="checkbox"/>	Enthusiasm for the subject they are teaching
<input type="checkbox"/>	Availability and approachability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Empathy
<input type="checkbox"/>	The ability to grasp / recognize the students' professional difficulties / uniqueness
<input type="checkbox"/>	Practical orientation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Interdisciplinary orientation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Committed personality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Interested personality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Motivating personality

17 What do the professors of this program stand for? Do they represent a specific scientific, theoretical, methodological or ethical position?

S18 With these pairs of characteristics we would like to assess the effect of the teaching units on you. Please classify yourself between the two alternatives.

How do you experience the teaching units with your professors?

	1	2	3	4	5	
Interesting						Boring
Overtaxing						Sub-challenging
Inspiring						Suppressing/inhibiting
Consistent						Chaotic

I would now like to look at the relationship between you and your fellow students and at the time you are spending at university by asking the following questions:

S 19 How would you describe the atmosphere amongst the students? Please rate the following items according to your experience.	Applies fully	Applies	Applies up to a point	Does not apply	Does not apply at all
Collegial					
Competitive					
Cooperative					
Harmonious					
Inspiring					
Individualistic / "everyone for him/herself"					
Motivating					

20 In general, I experience the time I spend at university as ...	To	Very	A little	Not	Too little
... intense.					
... focussed.					
... activating and stimulating.					
... happy.					
... challenging.					
... burdening.					

21 Please place a check mark for the corresponding answer to the following questions:	Very often	Often	Some-times	Rarely	Never
Are you on the same "wavelength" as your fellow students?					
Do you share common concerns / interests?					
Do you work together with them?					
Do you meet other students of the program in your spare time as well?					
Are you motivated to change something at your program?					
Do you have an impact on the development of the program?					
Is the quality of teaching discussed amongst fellow students?					
Is the quality of teaching discussed with the professors?					
Does this lead to concrete changes?					

22 In what manner do you / does the university try to improve the quality of teaching in the program? What instruments and forums are used to this end? (evaluations, etc.)? In what way are students integrated in the development of the curriculum?

Now, I would like to ask you to answer three questions regarding the organization of your leisure time:

23 How often do you go to cultural events per month on average (exhibitions, concerts, etc.)?

q 0-1 q 2-4 q 5-10 q 11 times and more often

24a And how often would you like to go to cultural events per month on average?

q 0-1 q 2-4 q 5-10 q 11 times and more often

24b If applicable: What are the reasons for this discrepancy?

Thank you!

Anhang 2) Fragebogen für Lehrende

Stifterverband

für die Deutsche Wissenschaft



Dear Professors,

Thank you all very much for supporting the research project "Places of Excellence".

"Places of Excellence" is a field research project comparing internationally leading master programs in the fields of Cultural Management, Cultural Policy und Cultural Production. The research looks towards stimulating teaching and learning situations. The focus is put less on specific pedagogic formats or on what is actually taught; rather, we are interested in "cultures of excellence" and in how teaching takes place. The *Association for German Science* funds "Places of Excellence" with a mandate to improve teaching and learning situations in universities.

The following questionnaire will take approx. 60 minutes. Please feel free to provide brief answers, since I am quite aware of your busy schedules as professors. All information will be handled anonymously and I sincerely thank you in advance for your cooperation.

To begin, I would like to ask you some questions regarding your role in the program / department:

1 Do you teach students at BA-, MA- or PhD-level?

Bachelor Master PhD

2 Which classes do you teach?

3 Approx. how many teaching hours is this per week (without preparation and/or out of class work)?

4 Are the(se) classes repeated?

per semester annually biannually never

5 How often do you have the possibility to take a sabbatical?

6 Looking back at the past 5 years, how much working time do you spend on these activities on average (in percent, 100 percent in total):

Teaching	Curriculum development	Research / Art Production	Student supervision	Administration	Acquisition of external funds	Other:

7 Before beginning your university career, did you work at an organisation other than a university (where and for how long)?

7a Are you or have you been editor of a journal or on the editorial board of a journal, or a or have you been board member of an academic or artistic society, or institution?

In the following, I would like to ask you some questions about the initiation of the program and its actors:

8 How and with what goals was the program created? (Who were the founders of the program, and what did/do they stand for?)

9 What aspect makes the program unique, what makes it stand for / out? What makes it special compared to other programs? (What is it's USP?)

10 Is there a specific spirit, a specific culture, or disposition, or something like a "departmental ideology"? Are there specific Key-words (terminology that get thrown out)?

11 How and why did those specific differences emerge over the years?

12 In your opinion, what is the biggest challenge facing the current and future development of the program?

12a How would you define success in the program and how would it be probably be measured?

I would now like to ask you some questions regarding the teaching in the program:

13 In your opinion, what are the major difficulties when it comes to teaching and how do you cope with them?

14 In what way do you try to improve the teaching quality in the program? What instruments and forums are used to this end (evaluation, etc.)? In what way are students integrated in the development of the curriculum?

15 What are the three most important authors, books, or theories the students should know / learn about, and why?

16 What practical competences should they have learned upon terminating their degree?

17 For what professions are the students being prepared with the knowledge and competency gained through your program?

18 How does the selection of students work, and what aspects do you consider important in this process?

19 What should the students learn / experience in the first weeks? Are there special events or seminars?

Now, I would like to look at the organization of the program and its position within the university/school by asking the following questions:

20 In what way are the studies (the program / department) integrated in the university?

21 Is the program supported by other departments of the university (for example, research funding department, public relations, marketing, fundraising)?

22 How are new professors appointed? Who decides about positions and faculty?

23 When taking decisions about the strategic orientation / development of the program, what criteria need to be met?

24 Who needs to be integrated in such a decision making process and who makes the final decision?

25 What are major hurdles for the program's innovation?

26 How is the program's budget composed? (Student fees, etc.)

Finally, I would like to ask you some questions regarding the professoriate in your program:

27 What qualifications and capacities are important for a professor in this program?

Please choose a maximum of 5 among the following items:

	Professional qualification
	Pedagogic Competence
	Frequent publishing / professional activities
	Practical experience
	Humor / Spirit
	Appreciative treatment of the students

	Enthusiasm for the subject they are teaching
	Availability and approachability
	Empathy
	The ability to grasp / recognize the students' professional difficulties / uniqueness
	Practical orientation
	Interdisciplinary orientation
	Committed personality
	Interested personality
	Motivating personality

28 How would you describe the atmosphere among the professors in the program (competitive, cooperative etc.)? Please rate the following items according to your experience.

	Applies fully	Applies	Applies up to a point	Does not apply	Does not apply at all
Collegial					
Competitive					
Cooperative					
Harmonious					
Inspiring					
Individualistic					
Motivating					

29 Please place a check mark for the corresponding answer to the following questions:	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Are you on the same "wavelength" as your fellow colleagues?					
Do you share common concerns?					
Do you work together with them?					
Do you meet other colleagues of the program in your spare time as well?					
Are you motivated to change something at your program?					
Did you already do this?					
Do you have a significant impact on the development of the program?					
Are teaching and teaching quality discussed amongst colleagues?					
Are teaching and teaching quality discussed with the students?					
Does this lead to concrete changes?					

Thank you!