Report

Accreditation of the Music Programmes delivered by the

Escola Superior de Música de Lisboa (ESML)

(Lisbon, Portugal)

Site-visit: 11-13th December 2017

ESCOLA SUPERIOR
DE MÚSICA DE LISBOA

Content

Introduction

In June 2017, the Instituto Politécnico de Lisboa (IPL) took the decision, agreed with the Portuguese accreditation agency (A3ES), to commission MusiQuE – Music Quality Enhancement to organise a procedure for the accreditation of three programmes offered by its school of music, the Escola Superior de Música de Lisboa (ESML): the Bachelor in Music (BMus), the Bachelor in Music Technologies (BMT) and the Master in Music (MMus). As required by the A3ES ESML had recently fulfilled its requirements for self-evaluation (self-assessment reports are in Annex IV).

MusiQuE coordinated the organisation of the accreditation procedure and carried out the review of the programmes.

The procedure for the accreditation of the programmes followed a three-stage process:

- ESML prepared a *Self-evaluation Report (SER)* and supporting documents, based on the *MusiQuE Standards for Programme Review*;
- an international Review Team composed by MusiQuE studied the *SER* and conducted a site-visit to ESML on 11th-13th December 2017. The site-visit comprised meetings with representatives of the ESML and IPL management team, teaching and support staff, students, alumni, employers and external stakeholders, and visits to classes and performances. The Review Team used the *MusiQuE Standards for Programme Review* as the basis of its investigations;
- the Review Team produced the accreditation report that follows, structured along the *Standards* mentioned above.

The Review Team consisted of:

- Peter Tornquist, Rector of Norwegian Academy of Music, Norway (Review Team Chair)
- Celia Duffy, former director of Research and Knowledge Exchange, Royal Conservatoire of Scotland, United Kingdom (Review Team Secretary)
- Daan van Aalst, independent Recording Producer / Sound Engineer, teacher at the Art of Sound department of the Royal Conservatoire in The Hague (Review Team Member)
- Isabel González Delgado, Student at Conservatorio Superior de Murcia, Spain and founding member of the National Federation of Music Students (FNESMUSICA) (Review Team Member)
- Orla McDonagh, Head of Conservatory, DIT Conservatory of Music and Drama, Dublin, Ireland (Review Team Member)

Observer:
- Rosa Bento, A3ES project manager for the performing arts area

The Review Team would like to express its sincere gratitude to the Director of ESML, Miguel Henriques and his team for the excellent organisation of the site-visit and for welcoming the Review Team as peers in such a hospitable way. The Review Team hopes that the present report will be helpful to ESML.

Note: The report that follows covers the review of the three programmes. Many observations, findings, and recommendations in the report apply to all three programmes. Where they specifically refer to a single programme this is clearly marked in the main text of the report. In the final summary, compliance with the MusiQuE Standards and recommendations are shown for each programme separately.

Key data on ESML

Name of the institution	**Escola Superior de Música de Lisboa (ESML)**
Legal status	Public institution
Date of creation	1983
Website **Programmes offered**	https://www.esml.ipl.pt Bachelor in Music Bachelor in Music Technologies Bachelor of Music in the Community Master in Music Master in Music Teaching PhD in Musical Arts (in collaboration with the Universidade Nova de Lisboa) PhD in Performing Arts, Moving Image and Movement (in collaboration with the Universidade de Lisboa)
Number of students	Numbers for academic year 2017-2018 for programmes under consideration for accreditation here (SER, p.4): Bachelor in Music: 346 Bachelor in Music Technologies: 70 Master in Music: 39

List of programmes to be accredited

Bachelor in Music (BMus)

Bachelor in Music Technologies (BMT)

Master in Music (MMus)

1. Programmes' goals and context

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

The institutional mission and vision of ESML is expressed in its statutes (Annex 1).

> 'ESML's mission is to promote a quality teaching / learning environment that, with a lifelong learning perspective, encourages students' personal, artistic, scientific, technical and cultural development, with a view to professional, entrepreneurial, national performance and internationally competitive and socially relevant, in the areas of the arts and music industries.'

ESML places itself as an institution of reference in higher education, both in Portugal and abroad (SER, p.5). The self-evaluation report (SER) also states that ESML's educational offer should be regarded as 'of the utmost importance for the future of the country' both culturally and socially (SER, p.5) and Annex 1 states that freedom, equality, diversity and inclusion is among its 'principles of conduct with universal application' (Annex 1, p.1).

ESML offers three 1st cycle music programmes of which the Bachelor in Music (BMus) and Bachelor in Music Technologies (BMT) are under consideration here; two Masters programmes of which the Master in Music (MMus) is under consideration here; and two 3rd cycle programme in association with the Universidade de Lisboa (SER, p.4).

In Meeting 1 (Senior management) the main goal of all programmes was characterised as giving students the opportunity to experiment with a professional level of performance or sound engineering. ESML wants to give the students a feel for what is a professional level, so that they are properly prepared to progress to other institutions or succeed in professional work. It is felt that the high standards in ESML are not widely known about abroad.

The relationship of ESML with its parent institution, the Instituto Politéchnico de Lisboa (IPL) was described as arms-length (Meeting 1). ESML is independent in terms of pedagogical and scientific strategy, but new programme proposals need to be ratified by IPL. ESML shares some administrative and back-office functions with IPL.

The lack of specific governmental and legal regulation for arts institutions (for example, in terms of teaching staff qualifications) is problematic for institutional development and financial management (Meeting 1). This was also felt to be part of a general lack of wider political understanding and support for higher arts education.

BMus

The BMus programme has 3 different 'profiles' or pathways as described in the SER (p.8):

1. Composition, Conducting and Music Education (offering different branches such as Composition, Choral Conducting and Music Education and Wind Orchestra Conducting)
2. Performance (offering different branches such as Voice, Guitar and Harp, Strings, Winds and Percussion,

Early Music, Organ and Piano)

3. Jazz

The goal of the BMus is briefly stated in the SER (p.8): 'to succeed in training professional musicians'.

BMT

The SER (p.22) clearly sets out the distinctive programme goals of the BMT. The programme aims to fill a gap in high-level professional training in sound and audio by combining musical, scientific and technical components. The programme aims to produce professional sound technicians and audio specialists, able to adapt their skills in a wide range of areas of activity, 'from musical and recording production, recording studios, sound reinforcement of shows, radio and television stations, concert halls, room acoustics, audiometry and audiology […]' (SER, p.22).

The SER notes (p.22) that the number of graduates is not high; the programme team has been reactive to this in making changes to the content of the syllabus which may take some time to feed through.

MMus

The SER (p.27) lists the 8 specialisations of the programme:

1. Voice
2. Composition
3. Choral Conducting
4. Orchestra conducting
5. Performance (across all instrumental disciplines)
6. Jazz
7. Early Music
8. Chamber Music

The SER (p.27) briefly states that the aim of the MMus programme is to 'succeed in training professional musicians in a changing environment'. In the following section under 2.1 (SER, p.17) characteristic attributes of the 2nd cycle (e.g. in development of critical thinking, analysis of theoretical topics) are noted and further developed in the Programme Handbook (Annex XIX). Research is highlighted as a vital element of MMus programmes with the philosophy that research and artistic creation are deeply linked (SER, p.5). The Review Team heard about research initiatives at ESML in Meeting 8 and in the SER (p.6); these include ESML's branch of the Research Centre CESEM (in collaboration with the Universidade Nova de Lisboa), and at the ESML research centre, IDEA (Research, Development and Experimentation in Musical Arts). Academic research outputs are lodged with the IPL Repository. ESML provides, through its own Documentation Centre, much of the research/artistic work produced by teachers and students, contributing to its study and dissemination (SER, p.6).

In the opinion of the Review Team, the programme goals have a clear focus on excellence, aligned to ESML's mission as the premier national institution and a reference institution in the national context. However, each of the two Bachelors' programme goals should be more explicitly stated. If programme goals are explicitly stated it helps in many other respects, producing a positive 'domino' effect, in which both students and teachers are fully aware of what is required of them and what they are aiming for.

The Review Team finds that the Bachelors programme documentation is 'missing a layer'. The SER descriptions are very general and brief; on the other hand the material provided in the Curricular Plans as Annexes is detailed and technically orientated (e.g. regulations for admissions and examinations). A Programme Handbook would provide a clear link to the institutional mission, specific programmes goals and learning outcomes. The Review Team was unable to locate BMus and BMT Programme Handbooks (e.g. the missing layer in documentation) that should be easily available.

An overall focus on excellence broadly connects the Programme Goals to the ESML institutional mission but a more explicit connection is lacking. It also gained the impression of a detachment from IPL, for example, interdisciplinary projects are not promoted and there is no mention of IPL's institutional mission. The significant exception to this is the ESML research area which has also received funding from IPL (Meeting 8, Research staff). The SWOT Analysis (Annex IV a 9), however, cites more vigorous partnership development (national, international, with the artistic professions and with other artistic schools of the IPL) as opportunities.

The Review Team noted the frustrations with inappropriate regulatory treatment expressed at Meeting 1 and responds with a suggestion that ESML should consider placing itself in the centre of these debates and working as an active advocate for the arts and higher arts education.

BMus

The main programme goal expressed in the SER (p.8), is relevant and reflects the ESML mission, but it is far too brief. The SER states that more complete information is on the ESML website but this is not obvious to the Review Team and the majority is not available in English which limits the ability of ESML to recruit students from outside Portuguese speaking countries. There is still a need for the intermediate-stage documentation of a Programme Handbook.

BMT

The programme goals are reasonably well expressed in the SER (p.22), they are relevant and reflect the ESML mission. However, there is still a need for the intermediate-stage documentation of a Programme Handbook. The SER (p.22), notes, but does not expand upon the reasons for the low number of graduations from this programme; the Review Team would have liked further detail on this.

MMus

Although the one-sentence definition of programme goals in the SER (p.27) is far too brief, the Programme Handbook remedies this with an appropriate level of useful information (although it would be helpful to international students if this were available in English). The Review Team particularly commends the research area with its energetic, collaborative and outward-facing attitude and finds this and the MMus programme goals to be substantially reflective of the institutional mission.

Compliance with Standard 1

On the basis of the information in the *SER*, further documentation including annexes and the meetings during the site-visit, the Review Team finds ESML programmes compliant as follows with Standard 1:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor in Music	Partially compliant
Bachelor in Music Tech.	Partially compliant
Master in Music	Substantially compliant

2. Educational processes

2.1 The curriculum and its methods of delivery

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

Detailed tabulated descriptions of the syllabi of the programmes are available (Annexes III (a-c) Curricular Plans) including ECTS credits, student workload, contact hours etc. In the case of the BMus Annex IV a 1 also describes detailed programme content down to the level of individual Curricular Units (or modules) including Curricular Unit learning outcomes, teaching approaches, bibliography etc. The SER (p.9 and p.23) notes that learning outcomes are in line with Polifonia and AEC documents. Department coordinators indicated that although every department may not follow Polifonia Dublin Descriptors to the letter, nevertheless the thinking and the process is there in every description of each subject based on the results the school wants to achieve and the emphasis is more on capacities than lists of things to be learned (Meeting 4). The use of learning outcomes by teachers and students also varies from department to department (Meeting 4). The Review Team heard about the aspirations in curricular design, particularly to make the curriculum sufficiently specific, but also sufficiently general to be able to be appropriately adaptable and flexible (Meeting 4).

The MMus Handbook (Annex XIX, available in Portuguese) gives both higher level information such as programme learning outcomes along with technical details for the MMus programme.

All programmes employ a range of teaching and learning strategies, including studio and classroom teaching, performances, seminars, and individual assignments. The Review Team notes that there is a great deal of collaborative activity; Composition Festival Week (Annex XIV) or the large number of chamber music projects on the ESML website stand as examples. Academic staff performance is monitored annually (Annex IV c). Annex IV c notes that a strength of this process is the documentation of 'good quality activities, developed by teachers inside and outside the school and for a better knowledge of artistic / scientific, academic and organizational work that is developed by the teaching staff' - e.g. as a vehicle to share good teaching practice.

The SER (p.5) notes that in addition to the usual social network platforms, both B-on and Moodle are used by teachers and students, although the Review Team did not see evidence of this. As regards innovation in teaching methods, Senior management indicated that the students arrive from a conservative style of teaching and are not very open to change: they are not generally reflective and are not aware of integration between learning and teaching (with the exception of the 2nd cycle where the approach is different) (Meeting 1). Although the SER (p.9 and p.23 for BMus and BMT programmes) notes an emphasis on reflective and self-reflective discussions between teachers and students, there is no particular mechanism in the Pedagogical Council to stimulate student thinking and learning and teaching approaches (Meeting 1). Innovation was said to be up to the different personality, style and approaches of teachers.

In Meeting 1 the Review Team heard that the level of maturity and social and political awareness of Bachelors students is varied and diversified. Senior management indicated the existence of challenges in Portugal post the revolution in wider personal and civic education, relatively low audience numbers and a lack of understanding from political leaders of the concept of an all-round artistic education[1] (Meeting 1). IPL is developing a module of 'complementary skills' to address this deficiency; a module on ethics has been proposed by ESML but would need specialist teaching.

The student group was generally very positive about the programmes, including the range of activities available to them and the wealth of performance opportunities and students openly expressed pride in the institution (Meeting 2). When critical, they were critical about minor details rather than major issues. Students also commented that the programmes were flexible and allowed students to pursue their own areas of interest (Meeting 2).

All students are required to engage in research activities in all programmes (in different degrees of intensity according to the cycle) (SER p.5) and there is a particularly vibrant Masters research environment, via IDEA and CESEM (SER p.6 and Meeting 8). The SER (p.7) is critical of the 'tragically outdated vision' which prevents ESML from offering its own doctoral programmes and an outdated traditional view of a conservatoire as a training, rather than educational or research-orientated, institution.

BMus

The SER (p.9) notes the broad approach of the BMus programme, where in addition to specialised instrumental, vocal or compositional training, attention is given to scientific training both at musicological and artistic level. It also asserts (p.9) that students are not truly aware of the importance of a musicological or research perspective and that ESML wishes to recruit more staff in this area. Students met by the Review Team commented that there were not many tools in the curriculum for them to exercise critical thinking, but those on the Jazz pathway indicated that critical thinking informed their studies (Meeting 2). Department coordinators highlighted that learning outcomes are found to be useful to both teachers and students, are specifically discussed in classes and are widely, if flexibly, used (Meeting 4).

As regards teaching methods, Annex IV a1 (BMus Curricular Units) repeats the same text for each Curricular Unit: 'The teaching methodology is based on systematic and organized presentation of information by the teacher, complemented with its study and discussion, and with guidance and supervision of the knowledge and skills acquisition process, as specified in the C.U. objectives.'

There is a marked emphasis in the SER (e.g. p.9), reinforced by discussions with staff and students (Meetings 1 and 2), on freedom and flexibility in the curriculum. The SER (p.9) describes the 'total' freedom of teachers to pursue pedagogical strategies, taking account of students' own individuality, artistic individuality and creative

---

[1] Evidence for these statements was not available to the Review Team.

freedom. The SER (p.9) also emphasises the importance of the availability of academic and professional guidance for students.

Students indicated that they are provided with several performance opportunities in which to show their artistic progress throughout the year (Meeting 2) and there is clear evidence of vibrant concert activity which is available to the public including via the ESML website (SER p.6).

Although BMus students generally expressed only minor concerns about the programme, Jazz students reported more issues concerning materials, equipment, practice facilities, change of semester plan, and relevance of history modules (Meeting 2).

BMT

A range of skills (musical, scientific and technical) is demanded from students on this programme (SER, p.21). There is provision to reinforce any technical deficiencies (SER p.23) and both practical and theoretical research is included. Much of the students' work is practical; students learn on-the-job in a professional context in public events and recordings of ESML artistic output. The SER (p.23) emphasises the values of high professional standards, backed up by close guidance from teaching staff and a reflective approach.

Student autonomy and flexibility in the curriculum was evident from the students (Meeting 2). BMT students spoke positively about the wide range of opportunities and recording experience offered to them at ESML. The Review Team heard from students about electives, individual projects and creation of individual learning profiles.

MMus

The SER (pp.27-28) notes that the 'Master in Music program implies not only instrumental study and performance, but also analysis of theoretical topics, founded in bibliography and reference repertoire'. The SER emphasises (p.27) the 2nd cycle attributes of critical thinking mainly in relation to the more theoretical curricular units: 'In theoretical Curricular Units, students are encouraged to read, reflect, problematize, write and develop critical thinking around theoretical aspects of their scientific and artistic projects'. Research is also emphasised. The SER (p.28) describes the MMus as dealing with specialized scientific knowledge and its active discussion, stimulating students to undertake interdisciplinary and autonomous research.

The Review Team heard from Masters students in Meeting 2 that they were afforded a great degree of choice and flexibility in their programme.

There is a vibrant research arm at ESML (Meeting 8 (Research staff) and SER, p.6) which has particular impact on the MMus programme. The SER (p.6) and the MMus Handbook (Annex XIX) notes that the final outcome of the MMus is an Artistic Project, usually evaluated by a recital, accompanied by a dissertation. In Meeting 8 the Review Team heard about various research initiatives, including collaborations with external partners.

The Review Team finds that, overall for all three programmes, Standard 2.1 is met and that the content and structure of the curriculum and its methods of delivery are appropriate to achieve the goals of the programmes.

However, the available documentation was not helpful to the Review Team in coming to this view. The SERs (p.9, 23 and 27 for the BMus, BMT and MMus programmes respectively) are partial and brief. By contrast the Curricular Plans (Annexes III (a-c) Curricular Plans) give full technical details on each component part of the curriculum. The BMus Annex IV a 1 gives full technical and content details of each Curricular Unit. The Review Team was unable to locate an appropriate level of detail about Bachelors programme learning outcomes or explicit reference to Polifonia Dublin Descriptors (although the SER (p.9) asserts that they are in line with these and staff in Meeting 4 explained that this thinking is the foundation for the curricula). The Review Team acknowledges differences in interpretation between technical terms in Portuguese and English; here the Curricular Plans list every Curricular Unit in a programme in full technical detail. A higher level description of the philosophy, content and approach of a programme that takes some account of all its aspects and components and that includes programme learning outcomes, would be useful.

In its meetings with staff, the Review Team noted a strong - but informal - debate about artistic and pedagogical standards. It appears that freedom and creative flexibility in the curriculum is very important in ESML (SER, p.9) and that ESML teachers are given a 'total' freedom over pedagogical strategies. This sits somewhat at odds with the extremely detailed curriculum plans. The Review Team noted other discrepancies between documentation and opinions expressed in meetings; it took this to be a sign of the spirit of healthy debate so much in evidence during the visit, but suggests that it would be helpful to discuss and then clearly articulate institutional thinking in writing, and that this should be a concern of the Pedagogical Council. For example, the reflective attitude of students was presented very differently in the SER and in Meeting 1, as mentioned above. It would also help to share good teaching practice, again under the auspices of the Pedagogic Council, in addition to the informal debate between teachers.

Recognising the varying levels of maturity and societal and political awareness of its students, the Review Team encourages ESML to consider how to promote greater societal engagement among its student body. The curriculum design does not always seem to reflect what ESML wishes for its students and their wider cultural understanding – again, the Review Team suggests that this might be addressed by the Pedagogical Council.

BMus

The Review Team concludes that the BMus curriculum reflects the overall programme goal of striving for excellence and a high level of professional preparation. However, Learning Outcomes for the BMus programme overall are not clearly stated. The Review Team also found the repetition of generalized text about teaching methods in Annex IV a1 unhelpful.

The SER (p.9) notes the importance of a wide range of study, including research. The Review Team did not see clear evidence of this and it suggests that research could be better established and integrated.

Although the SER states (p.9) that 'naturally' students continue to Masters programmes, the Review Team would have liked more detail on progression opportunities. The number of places on the MMus is quite restricted and the Review Team heard that many students from the BMus continue to the Masters in Music Education. The Review Team would have liked to know, for example, how the BMus prepares for the Master in Music Education, for example, in provision of non-performance units.

BMT

In the BMT programme only the international aspect is not completely reflected in the SER, but otherwise this appears to the Review Team to be a solid technical curriculum that fills a gap in sound and engineering in Portugal and appropriately achieves the goals of the programme. The detail of the Curricular Plan reflects the technical slant of the programme, but programme learning outcomes could be clearer.

The Review Team noted an implicit research attitude in this programme and good provision of personal learning opportunities, even though it heard (Meeting 2, students) that sometimes learning is often in classroom groups and those groups are considered too large.

The BMus and BMT are academically and administratively separated; there would be advantages to some shared classes provision for BMT and BMus students, not least to encourage a spirit of true collaboration and equity rather than the current 'service' relationship in which the BMT department seems to be the only option when it comes to facilitating performances that include the use of audio technique. This is both a strong and a weak point. The strong point is that students are involved in many projects. The question is whether all these performances have equal educational importance as it seems that there is no choice for the BMT students.

MMus

The Review Team found learning outcomes for the MMus are clear and reflective of Polifonia Dublin Descriptors, and compliant with the artistic mission of the programme which includes critical reflection and autonomous research. The Review Team was very impressed by the research arm of ESML and considered this a real asset to the institution and to Masters students.

Compliance with Standard 2.1

On the basis of the information in the *SER*, further documentation including annexes and the meetings during the site-visit, the Review Team finds the ESML programmes compliant as follows with Standard 2.1:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor in Music	Substantially compliant
Bachelor in Music Tech.	Substantially compliant
Master in Music	Fully compliant

2.2 International perspectives

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

The institution is 'following a strategy that favours an internationalization of its learning offer' (SER, p.4) and 30 partnerships and international exchanges from 14 European countries are cited (Annex V). The SER also mentions ESML's membership of the AEC and its active participation in European projects related to curricular development and evaluation although these are not specifically cited. ESML employs high-quality international teaching staff (SER, p.5), and the biographies of teaching staff in Annex XX show that many current staff studied abroad.

Internationalisation is very important for IPL which, with 14,000 students, is one of the biggest of its kind of institution in the country (Meeting 3 with Senior administrative officers). IPL is working hard to improve Erasmus numbers, especially for outgoing students. It also has several international programmes running, it responds to different calls for EU projects, and has a strategy to recruit international students from outside Europe, including by participating in International Fairs. International students from outside the EU currently apply directly to ESML but in future the IPL International office will centralise all the international applications. Annex VI gives figures for incoming and outgoing Erasmus exchanges in 2015 at 13 (incoming and outgoing. ESML has not yet engaged with the pilot project initiated by AEC to set up a common European online application system for the Erasmus programme (EASY).

Lack of financial resources is the biggest obstacle to both inward and outward mobility for staff (SER, p.13) although there are limited funds available from IPL to support staff travel expenses. A teacher from the USA is

due to teach for a semester next year, externally funded by a Fulbright grant. ESML does not fund masterclasses from its central resources, rather these are handled via Erasmus exchanges (Meeting 1 with Senior management). For other international masterclasses students pay a fee to participate, the student society collects these fees and funds the visiting artists' expenses.

BMus

The SER (p.8 and p.10) states that Erasmus is the only vehicle for internationalization, due to lack of financial resources preventing scholarships and opportunities to promote its programmes abroad. Annexes V and VI detail a number of international networks and agreements. As regards student mobility, outward exchanges most often happen in the BMus in the 3rd/4th semester (Meeting 3 with Senior administrative officers).

BMT

Annex IVc (BMT Self-Assessment Full Report) notes that there are few international students and exchanges on this programme but due to its collaborative nature BMT students are integrated into BMus and MMus international projects and ESML's external partnerships.

MMus

Almost half of ESML's international students (12 of 34) are enrolled on the MMus (Meeting 4, Department coordinators). Although the SER states (p.28) that curricula allow for both incoming and outgoing mobility, MMus student exchanges are more difficult to arrange due to the thesis requirement (Meeting 3).

In the opinion of the Review Team there is a clear international perspective in the BMus and MMus faculty and that influences the dynamic of the programmes. ESML hosts some international students but could attract more, including more Erasmus students, which are low for a school of its size; a systematic approach to student recruitment is hampered by a lack of financial resource. The Review Team considered that international opportunities for students are less than what might be expected in a similar elite national institution.

The Review Team was not made aware of an internationalisation strategy at ESML. Such a strategy would include target countries (e.g. BRIC countries including the obvious synergy with Brazil and other Latin American countries) and a language policy.

BMus

The Review Team is confident that, despite the restrictions of finance, students are exposed to a reasonable range of international opportunities.

BMT

The SER (p.23) is very similar to the BMus section, but the Review Team found considerable differences between these two programmes. For example, there is no evidence of a connection to the AES (Audio

---

Engineering Society) that would be very helpful in bringing an international perspective. The Review Team found that BMT teachers have a national, rather than international outlook and that BMT students seem to be disadvantaged (in comparison to the BMus) by a lack of financial support for international opportunities.

MMus

The SER (p.28) has only one sentence on mobility opportunities for MMus, and the Review Team would have liked more information here. However, it is confident that MMus students benefit from substantially the same opportunities as BMus students, even though it was reported in Meeting 3 that the thesis requirement in the MMus makes timing of outward mobility difficult. This could be addressed in an internationalisation strategy.

Compliance with Standard 2.2

On the basis of the information in the *SER*, further documentation including annexes and the meetings during the site-visit, the Review Team finds the ESML programmes compliant as follows with Standard 2.2:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor in Music	Substantially compliant
Bachelor in Music Tech.	Not compliant
Master in Music	Substantially compliant

Conditions for compliance have been formulated on page 48.

2.3 Assessment

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

The ESML grading system expresses results on a scale of 0-20. All programmes use a variety of assessment methods including continuous assessment, students' performances and participation in class, tests, presentations, papers and examinations.

Students reported that they know what to do for examinations but their perspective on marking criteria is not clear (Meeting 2). Their impression is that, for performers, assessment criteria can change depending on the instrument.

The representatives of the profession met by the Review Team are not invited to take part in assessment panels (Meeting 6 with Employers and external stakeholders).

BMus

Assessment methods are described generally in the SER (p.10) and in other BMus documentation. For example, Annex IV a4 BMus Methodologies, Assessment and Results states: 'The means to ensure the correspondence of the evaluation methods with the learning objectives of the UC are materialized by the very nature of the adopted assessment elements such as the students' performance and participation in class as well as in tests, presentations, papers and exams.'

The SER (p.10) notes that all practical examinations have three jury members and asserts that students are clear on assessment criteria. The SER (p.10) also explores some philosophical questions about assessing artistic outputs and debates surrounding those.

BMT

Examples of where general statements about assessment are adjusted to particular units are given in Annex IV c Self-Assessment Full Report: 'The coherence between the teaching methodologies with the learning objectives is assessed and demonstrated by the very nature of the performance and progress of students in classes, presentations, papers and exams, and by *the better performance in other curricular units where mathematics is fundamental.'*

The SER (p.23) refers to the above and adds that constructive feedback is given to students after various moments of assessment and that continuous feedback is given in laboratory-based work.

MMus

The SER (p.28) refers to the assessment criteria for the MMus Artistic Project Report and Dissertation in the Masters Handbook (Annex XIX). Annex IV d MMus Self-Assessment Full Report outlines appropriate methods for the 2nd cycle: 'The teaching methodology is based on the systematic exposition of the information by the teacher, the demonstration of its application by both the professor and the student, critical and reflexive analysis of the papers presented and the promotion of specific skills of students, establishing strategies to achieve short medium and long term progress. The continuous assessment will be based on the observation of the quality of participation in the activities developed during the teaching of CU and presentations of the developed works.'

The Review Team observed a lively and healthy spirit of debate in all of its meetings with ESML staff (e.g. Meeting 5, Artistic and academic staff). Nevertheless, students and staff need to be clear about assessment criteria and these need to be discussed and debated openly, and in a framework without 'dogmatic and rigid mentalities' (SER p.10). The Review Team found statements on assessment too general and both marking and examination assessment criteria unclear. Marks appear to be often bunched at the higher end of the scale (17-19) and the Review Team would have welcomed explanation of this.

The Review Team was unclear about the role (if any) of external examiners. It recommends that members of the professions are invited to take part in assessment panels.

The Review Team was also unclear about how recommendations from the QA report feed back into the ESML committee/programme evaluation process.

As regards assessment methods, Annex IV a1 (BMus Curricular Units) repeats the same text for each Curricular Unit: 'The evaluation process is based on observation of the quality of participation in the activities developed during the course, including presentations and discussion of themes, other tests or exams. Individual. Continuous evaluation.' This text needs to be more granular and matched to the requirements of particular units.

MMus

In the opinion of the Review Team the MMus Handbook defines appropriate assessment methods and their relationship to learning outcomes.

Compliance with Standard 2.3

On the basis of the information in the *SER*, further documentation including annexes and the meetings during the site-visit, the Review Team finds the ESML programmes compliant as follows with Standard 2.3:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor in Music	Partially compliant
Bachelor in Music Tech.	Partially compliant
Master in Music	Substantially compliant

3. Student profiles

3.1 Admission/Entrance qualifications

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

BMus

Applicants are required to take both theoretical and practical tests (SER, p.11). Detailed requirements including arrangements for portfolios where appropriate (e.g. composition) are supplied and criteria for evaluation and selection for admission are available in Portuguese and English at https://www.esml.ipl.pt/index.php/candidaturas/licenciatura-em-musica. Annex IV a4 gives brief legal entry requirements in English. The SER (p.8) states that the BMus is over-subscribed and that the entrance tests demand high standards.

BMT

Candidates are assessed through both theoretical and practical tests and on their potential to develop the skills needed for the programme including an understanding of mathematics involved in audio as well as musical competence (SER, p.11). Criteria for evaluation and selection for admission are available in Portuguese only at https://www.esml.ipl.pt/index.php/candidaturas/licenciatura-em-tecnologias-da-musica. Annex IV c gives brief legal entry requirements in English.

MMus

Students are required to take both theoretical and practical tests and an interview (SER, p.28). Detailed requirements including arrangements for portfolios where appropriate (e.g. composition) are supplied and written texts may be in either English or Portuguese. Criteria for evaluation and selection for admission are available in Portuguese and English at https://www.esml.ipl.pt/index.php/candidaturas/mestrado-em-musica.

The Review Team welcomed the provision of comprehensive information in both English and Portuguese for the BMus and MMus programmes. For the BMT programme the information is only available in Portuguese as this programme aims at local recruitment, however this information is also comprehensive.

The Review Team commends ESML on requirements and assessment criteria for student admission which are clear, detailed and appropriate throughout.

Compliance with Standard 3.1

On the basis of the information in the *SER*, further documentation including annexes and the meetings during the site-visit, the Review Team finds the ESML programmes compliant as follows with Standard 3.1:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor in Music	Fully compliant
Bachelor in Music Tech.	Substantially compliant
Master in Music	Fully compliant

3.2 Student progression, achievement and employability

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

Student progression is monitored through the QA system statistics, collected annually (Meeting 4). However, informal mechanisms and the efforts of teachers to follow up with students after graduation have been more effective (Meeting 5, Artistic and academic staff) as it was only this year that the surveys have become mandatory.

ESML does not have a formal careers advice service but most students find work, if not a full-time position, after graduating, and are employable (Meeting 3 with Senior administrative officers). Employers in Meeting 6 confirmed that students from ESML are employed by orchestras and military or police bands and that when they graduate they are musically and professionally well prepared – as well as prepared as a human being (e.g. knowing how to work with others).

BMus
The SER (p.11) cites positive graduate destinations and employment statistics from its QA system. It also notes (p.8) that ESML students are regularly employed in major international orchestras.

BMT
The SER (p.24) refers to Annex IX d, but the data there are hard to interpret. As above, the SER (p. 22) notes, but does not expand upon, the reasons for a low number of graduations from this programme; the Review Team would have liked further detail on this. Annex III b (the Curricular Plan) lists 9 specified fields of study, which translate into professional destinations (Meeting 3): work as a sound technician, sound engineer or some kind of studio work is the most likely; music production, although not the main goal, has been taken up by some graduates and acoustics is another possibility (one graduate from last year's cohort was working in this field). Some students go on to a Masters in room acoustics.

MMus

Annex IVd provides details of student progression and employability. The SER (p.18) refers the reader to the equivalent section in the BMus SER.

The Review Team has been able to verify that programmes have proper mechanisms in place to monitor the progression of students throughout their studies and after their graduation via the QA system statistics. The Review Team would have liked more detail in this area (e.g. what are the questions asked and what channels are used?).

However, it is unclear to the Review Team how ESML uses these data. The working quality culture at ESML seems to the Review Team to be strong, but informal, and founded on personal connections. With the exception of the BMus Jazz team (Meeting 5) there is little evidence of formal reflection about student progression; both how the student progresses through different levels of a programme as well as the transition from Bachelors to Masters.

There is evidence of employment of students on an individual basis (Meeting 6, Employers and stakeholders), but the Review Team questioned whether it was systematically followed up by the institution rather than on the personal basis.

Although an appropriate level of detail is given in Annex IV d (Self Assessment Full Report), the Review Team noted that the Masters SER simply referred the reader to the equivalent section in the BMus SER. A recognition of and commentary on the specific issues in these areas for the 2nd cycle and a more nuanced account of student progression, achievement and employability in the SER itself would be welcome.

Compliance with Standard 3.2

On the basis of the information in the *SER*, further documentation including annexes and the meetings during the site-visit, the Review Team finds the ESML programmes compliant as follows with Standard 3.2:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor in Music	Fully compliant
Bachelor in Music Tech.	Substantially compliant
Master in Music	Substantially compliant

4. Teaching staff

4.1 Staff qualifications and professional activity

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

BMus and MMus

The academic qualifications of the programmes' teachers have increased every year, currently standing at 23% Doctors (SER, p.5) and 22% Specialist title holders - the SER (p.12) separates specialists recognised by the CTC and specialists with title (see Annex VII Teaching staff for explanation). These academic qualifications are in addition to their professional e.g. artistic competence, as the 'most respected specialists in their field' (SER, p.12).

Many ESML instrumental teachers work in one of Lisbon's four professional orchestras, giving students direct contact to professional life (Meeting 1), confirmed in Meeting 2 (Students) as a strong reason for choosing ESML as those working in one of the Lisbon orchestras are viewed as being at the top of their profession. Artistic and academic staff indicated that ESML is flexible with teaching schedules to allow teachers to carry out artistic activity and understands the need to accommodate their schedules (Meeting 5).

The SER makes no mention of specific opportunities for continuing professional development of the teaching staff (the SWOT Analysis (Annex IV a 9) acknowledges this as an opportunity) but teachers' ability to adapt their teaching methods and adopt new ones is noted (SER p.13). There is support available from IPL for travel (Meeting 5). Teachers' creative and pedagogical freedom is emphasised (SER, p.9) as well as frequent discussion and debate among teaching staff (SER, p.12 and Meeting 5). In Meeting 5 it was emphasised that teachers do not expect professional development from the school - rather the most important source of professional development comes from working with colleagues and the professional connections that colleagues (rather than the School or IPL) can provide.

The SER (p.12) notes that most teachers pursue intense artistic activity. There is a general - and recent - aspiration for them to share any research activity through usual academic channels of articles or conference papers. This is acknowledged as a difficulty for part-time staff in particular.

Although part-time teachers do not generally become involved in organisational tasks due to their professional commitments, full-time members of staff are required to undertake these tasks (SER, p.12).

BMT

The SER (p.24) refers the reader to the information given for the BMus and to Annex IV c (BMT Self-assessment Full Report) that gives full details of academic staff (both full- and part-time) and their Doctoral or other Specialist qualifications.

The Review Team was impressed by the professional standards of the teaching staff and noted throughout a respectful and informed debate among staff. This positive impression was gained both through meetings (particularly Meetings 4 and 5) and in seeing staff in action on the stage and in the studio. In the BMT there is good interaction between the professions and teaching that is highly appropriate for the vocational slant of that programme.

In the opinion of the Review Team, there is a strategic need for investment in professional development to ensure, for example, that a teacher now in her/his 40s who has 25-30 years more professional work ahead, develops their practice both pedagogically and professionally. This could be organised locally at ESML, as mentored or peer-supervised development projects, institutionally together with relevant departments of IPL, or in collaboration with external partners.

Compliance with Standard 4.1

On the basis of the information in the *SER*, further documentation including annexes and the meetings during the site-visit, the Review Team finds the ESML programmes compliant as follows with Standard 4.1:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor in Music	Fully compliant
Bachelor in Music Tech.	Fully compliant
Master in Music	Fully compliant

4.2 Size and composition of the teaching staff body

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

The SER (p.8) notes a highly selective hiring policy at ESML and comments that due to budget control ESML is 'not allowed to expand teachers' numbers to correspond to [student] demand' (SER, p.8). Notwithstanding the budgetary constraints, ESML has been able to maintain an adequate teaching workforce (SER, p.13); it would like to recruit more staff in specialist areas - although these are not specified.

The SER (p.12) gives data for the number of teachers and FTEs, comparing session 2009/10 and 2016/17. This shows that there has been a rise in the number of teachers from 96 to 103 and a similar uplift in FTEs from 72.9 to 85.65 over that time.

Senior management indicated that governmental regulations on hiring academic staff mean that there can be a lack of flexibility, e.g. ESML needs to be more agile and, for example, hire a teacher for one year, but legislation does not allow this (Meeting 1).

In the opinion of the Review Team, the ratio of c.100 teachers to 700 students is appropriate and there are a relatively high number of full-time staff compared to similar European institutions. This proportion of full-time to part-time staff may be due to the nature of recruitment regulations and the lack of flexibility referred to in Meeting 1.

Although the SER states (p.7) that staffing levels need to be reinforced with new specialists, the Review Team did not hear of any particular problems in this regard from the BMus and MMus programmes. For the BMT programme, however, the Review Team noted a high proportion of part-time staff and would suggest this is closely monitored.

Compliance with Standard 4.2

On the basis of the information in the *SER*, further documentation including annexes and the meetings during the site-visit, the Review Team finds the ESML programmes compliant as follows with Standard 4.2:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor in Music	Fully compliant
Bachelor in Music Tech.	Fully compliant
Master in Music	Fully compliant

5. Facilities, resources and support

5.1 Facilities

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

The programmes are delivered in an architecturally distinguished, state of the art building. The building was designed for 300 students but now accommodates more than double that number (Meeting 1). The SER (p.5) refers to projected further growth in student numbers to the BMus programme and the MMus Teaching (not under consideration here) which will put further pressure on space resources. In Meeting 1 the Review Team heard about some problems with the design concept: there is only one auditorium, and some rehearsal rooms are too small and have acoustic problems. The Directorate attempts to accommodate students' needs by teachers sacrificing space for themselves.

With the significant exception of the BMT programme the Review Team did not hear about any major problems from students in Meeting 2 beyond a need for additional practice rooms. Jazz students commented that they occasionally need equipment (drum stools, amps) that is not readily available.

The BMus SWOT analysis Annex IV a9 notes as weaknesses the lack of IT support, 'both in terms of equipment (few and obsolete computers with no computer rooms, for example), and expert personnel (ESML site, Moodle and the management of e-mail accounts, is ensured by one teacher alone)' and a lack of specialist analytical software for research (e.g. NVivo, SPSS). Staffing shortages in the library are also noted in the SER (p.13) and further commented on below (Standard 5.3). There are both online and physical archives and a virtual online journal.

BMus and MMus

The SER (p.13) notes pressure on practice rooms and this was supported by students in Meeting 2.

BMT

The SER (p.25) asserts that the specialist sound and laboratory equipment needed for this programme is regularly improved and developed to meet the standards of professional studios but also briefly acknowledges limitations. The Review Team observed a BMT class of 11 students where only 2 had access to a measurement device. It also observed that there is not enough audio equipment and studios to accommodate the quite large group of students. For example, there is only one digital mixing console. This means that if that console is in use for one of the numerous performances in the concert hall, it cannot be used in the studio for post production. The Review Team also observed that the students had not progressed to practical recording due to lack of equipment and were instead concentrating on theory. Much of the equipment was the teacher's own. One student does not own a laptop and out of date software was in use.

The Review Team was impressed by the facilities and the instrument inventory available at ESML, and finds the facilities appropriate for the delivery of the BMus and MMus programmes. Where there are problems with rehearsal space or practice rooms the Review Team found that these are negotiated by both students and teachers in a positive way.

The Library is small and currently understaffed (further commented on below, Standard 5.3) but the Review Team observed that ESML has put a great deal of effort into electronic documentation.

BMT

In its class observation of Meeting with both students and teachers, the Review Team found a remarkably positive attitude despite a lack of up to date specialist studios, equipment and software which can adversely affects the learning experience of students. The Review Team questions the choices of software and suggests that the programme investigates further use of open source software. A forward strategy that looked at the provision of fixed equipment for the concert hall and a house technician who could take care of the performances that are not educationally important for students would be beneficial. Finally, it is unacceptable for teachers to bring in their own equipment as essential learning tools for students. The Review Team would expect a forward plan for capital expenditure on equipment and software for this programme to be an urgent priority.

Compliance with Standard 5.1

On the basis of the information in the *SER*, further documentation including annexes and the meetings during the site-visit, the Review Team finds the ESML programmes compliant as follows with Standard 5.1:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor in Music	Fully compliant
Bachelor in Music Tech.	Not compliant
Master in Music	Fully compliant

Conditions for compliance have been formulated on page 49.

5.2 Financial resources

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

In the SWOT Analysis (Annex IV a 9), all the perceived threats are financial in nature. ESML is one of three performing arts specialist schools within IPL (the others being Dance and Theatre/Film). Although there is a good relationship between ESML and IPL's senior officers (Meeting 1) these specialist institutions present both financial and some regulatory difficulties in comparison with other disciplines (Meeting 1). For example, although class sizes are smaller and costs are greater for specialist higher education music teaching, longstanding governmental rules do not differentiate in financial allocations between music and other subjects. ESML's costs are approximately 3.1 million Euros; with central funding of 2.5 million Euros the remainder comes from student tuition fees (Meeting 3) as the only other source of revenue for ESML. The government is requiring increases in salary depending on qualification level without providing extra funding (Meeting 1).

The SER (p.6) refers to the 'deep social and financial crisis' which has affected the growth and development of ESML and (p.14) to a standstill budget but doubled student population. The SER (p.7) comments on the difficulty in competing with other institutions as it lacks funding for scholarships or resources to promote the programmes abroad. The Review Team heard (Meeting 5) that financial restraints can constrain its ability to hire scores and parts. The SER (p.13) argues that sponsorship or support from private institutions or industry is very limited, although in recent years when all higher education institutions underwent severe cuts this was a suggested route for seeking additional income (Meeting 1).

The Review Team understand the financial difficulties that ESML is working under, however, it feels that the institution is well-placed to challenge established attitudes towards seeking external funding and that there is considerable scope to diversify its funding streams. As an elite performance institution it could reach out to the private sector; both commercial and philanthropic partners would want to be associated with its 'brand' of excellence. It could also consider revising fee structures for both international and home students (the Review Team heard no complaints about fee levels in Meeting 2).

BMT

As noted above (Standard 5.1), the BMT programme is not adequately resourced. Opportunities for commercial sponsorship from equipment manufacturers are worth exploring.

Compliance with Standard 5.2

On the basis of the information in the *SER*, further documentation including annexes and the meetings during the site-visit, the Review Team finds the ESML programmes compliant as follows with Standard 5.2:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor in Music	Fully compliant
Bachelor in Music Tech.	Partially compliant
Master in Music	Fully compliant

5.3 Support staff

Standard 5.3. The programme has sufficient qualified support staff.

In the BMus SWOT analysis (Annex IV a9) the insufficient number of non-teaching staff in administrative services, in the library and in the production and marketing services is stated as a weakness. The SER (p.14) confirms that, due to austerity policies, all programmes work with a 'dramatically' low number of support staff, and that this puts those staff under pressure. The Review Team also heard that there is no provision for cover for staff absence due to long-term sickness (such as in the Library) and that this has an adverse effect on service provision (Meeting 1, Meeting 3). There has been a recent appointment (after much lobbying) of a second position in the Production Office. Meeting 1 acknowledged supportive colleagues and passionate helpers at ESML but also commented that this is not an appropriate way to run a conservatoire.

The SER (p.14) lists the educational level and roles of the 12 support staff and the application of an integrated management and performance evaluation of public servants (SIADAP). The SER also states that staff are encouraged to continue their professional development with workshops and events but the Review Team did not see examples or hear about these specifically. The SWOT Analysis (Annex IV a 9) cites provision of training for all staff as an opportunity and the Annex IV self assessment reports refer to IPL provision for continuing professional development in non-academic areas such as human resources.

Finance and HR services are provided by central IPL services (Meeting 3). All other academic areas (e.g. enrolments, examinations) are managed by ESML independently, which is different from the other schools due to the unique nature of conservatoire education.

The Review Team understands that at least 8 academic staff undertake non-academic roles, including running the web email server, international relations and Erasmus (although in Meetings 1 and 3 the Review Team heard that there is a central IPL office and that all other student services apart from admissions are centralized), and translating material into English for the website.

The Review Team found that support staff are appropriately qualified but not sufficient in number. It heard of 'heroes' in the support staff who will work beyond their remit to fix issues and how prolonged staff illness can have a disproportionate effect on service provision (such as in the Library).

The Review Team agrees with the assessment that a conservatoire should not rely on the goodwill of passionate staff and helpers. Academic staff are undertaking support roles that ideally need to be developed and professionalized for quality not to be compromised. Academic staff running the email system goes far beyond normal expectations of what a teacher should be doing and is not sustainable. However, the Review Team heard no major complaints from students and saw no evidence of serious issues in surveys; rather, it is in ESML's culture to find operational solutions and acceptable workarounds.

Compliance with Standard 5.3

On the basis of the information in the *SER*, further documentation including annexes and the meetings during the site-visit, the Review Team finds the ESML programmes compliant as follows with Standard 5.3:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor in Music	Partially compliant
Bachelor in Music Tech.	Partially compliant
Master in Music	Partially compliant

6. Communication, organisation and decision-making

6.1 Internal communication process

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

The SER (p.14, with the same statement for all programmes under consideration) interprets this standard quite narrowly, citing communications mechanisms such as email and social media as well as individual communications between staff and students. The latter is confirmed in Annex IV a7 which notes that 'Given the relatively small size and the predominance of individual or in small groups teaching, communication is often direct and personal, and through meetings of teachers and course coordinator meetings with students'.

ESML personnel expanded on mechanisms for communication at various levels (Meeting 4 with Department coordinators):there is frequent informal and at least annual formal review of the content of curricular units, and teachers are encouraged to evaluate curricular units and propose new ideas to the coordinator responsible for that curricular unit as well as the overall subject. Feedback from students to teachers works well in this relatively small institution (Meeting 4), which was confirmed by students met by the Review Team who expressed themselves positively about the accessibility and willingness of their teachers to discuss their personal study progress, doubts and questions (Meeting 2). Some students in Meeting 2 were not fully aware of formal mechanisms for communications and student representatives commented that it was sometimes difficult to engage their peers in discussion above that immediate problem-solving local level.

An important vehicle for communication and influence on the curriculum is the Pedagogic Council which is comprised of equal numbers of students and teachers (Meeting 2). Student representatives gather student feedback and any suggestions; student representatives can act as envoys to teachers to solve problems. The student representatives also run a Facebook page, and both musical and social events.

The Review Team noticed that the communication between students, staff and teachers is effective, open and natural. It was clear to the Review Team that students feel well cared-for and are confident to raise questions and issues in informal one-on-one conversations with their teachers and in more formal settings such as the Pedagogic Council. The Review Team was not made aware of any communication problems from students who seem most often able to solve problems at a local, personal, level.

The Review Team noticed at all times collegial discussions among staff including respectful disagreements and found a culture of informal, yet effective and friendly, communication including across departments. More cooperation between the BMus and MMus and the BMT programmes might be achieved by better communication between students in the courses; this is improving but needs to be further enhanced (see Standard 2.1 above).

Compliance with Standard 6.1

On the basis of the information in the *SER*, further documentation including annexes and the meetings during the site-visit, the Review Team finds the ESML programmes compliant as follows with Standard 6.1:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor in Music	Fully compliant
Bachelor in Music Tech.	Fully compliant
Master in Music	Fully compliant

6.2 Organisational structure and decision-making processes

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

The SERs for BMus and BMT (p.15) share the same brief statement outlining the BMus and BMT organisational and decision making structures, from coordinators for profiles, branch and curricular units (Annex IV), through to programme coordinators, programme commissions and assessment commissions (which include student representation) and both the Pedagogical and Technical-Scientific Councils which approves changes. The MMus has a scientific commission that coordinates the whole programme (SER, p.30). The mechanisms to ensure the active participation of academic staff and students in decision-making processes by both informal and formal means are described in detail (Annex IV c 2.1.2): course amendments are collected by the coordinators and course commissions and directed to the overall Pedagogical and Technical-Scientific Councils for approval. The annual QA report brings together these reviews and proceedings (Annex XV and SER p.15). In Meeting 4 and elsewhere the Review Team heard about the frequency and efficacy of informal interactions between staff, students and management. The Review Team heard in Meeting 6 that employers would welcome taking a more formal part in ESML's processes.

ESML is completely independent of IPL in academic and pedagogical terms. ESML proposes new programmes to IPL; IPL provides the Quality Assurance scrutiny and then submits programmes to the national agency for accreditation.

It was clear to the Review Team that the programmes are supported by formalised and appropriate organisational and decision-making structures that involve students (often with equal representation of students and teachers)

and that information flows well between the various constituent parts. The Review Team found evidence of both bottom-up and top-down decision making, and that often 'corridor diplomacy' solves problems.

The Review Team, however, finds the decision making structure quite complex and suggest that, for example, a simpler tree diagram showing the various levels and both how and what they consider would be useful and would make the structure clearer, particularly to students who were vague (Meeting 2) about the reach and remit of the Pedagogical Council in particular.

The Review Team also suggest that staff responsibilities could also be more clearly defined; staff wear many different 'hats' which can be potentially confusing for students; for example, in the opinion of the Review Team it is not good practice for a programme or unit co-ordinators to be from the senior management team.

Based on the interest of employers in taking a more formal part in ESML's processes, the Review Team suggests that this is considered (see Section 8.2 below).

Compliance with Standard 6.2

On the basis of the information in the *SER*, further documentation including annexes and the meetings during the site-visit, the Review Team finds the ESML programmes compliant as follows with Standard 6.2:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor in Music	Substantially compliant
Bachelor in Music Tech.	Substantially compliant
Master in Music	Substantially compliant

7. Internal quality culture

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

The SER (p.15, same statement for all programmes) states that there is a quality assurance system in place which relies heavily on surveys of various constituencies (students, former students, teachers and non-teaching staff, external stakeholders both in the music community, including employers, and the local community). The surveys cover a range of issues (pedagogical, professional, logistic) and are used as 'one of the basic tools […] to enhance the program" (SER p.15). The annual QA report (Annex IV) is the culmination of a number of inputs and is ratified by the Representatives' Council (SER p.15). The SER (p.9) describes how the programme development is monitored annually by consideration of these inputs, including survey data from students, teachers and employers and annual statistical data. The Review Team did not see examples of these surveys.

As of this year student participation in the annual survey is obligatory and delivered via an online platform and that grades are not awarded until it is completed (Meeting 5 with Artistic and academic staff). This is seen as progress from the former system where student participation was low and possibly skewed towards those with complaints but teachers confirmed that face to face feedback and discussion is most effective. The Review Team also heard of widespread practice of meetings with students to reflect and feedback on curricular units, some of which are not formally minuted, and that formal and informal mechanisms complement each other (Meeting 5). The employers survey (Annex XVI c) had a low return rate of c12% (747 sent, 92 respondents).

Matters for investigation arising from the surveys or other interventions are considered by both the Pedagogic and Technical-Scientific Councils.

Annex IV a9 (SWOT analysis) cites an internal Quality Assurance System implementation as an opportunity.

The Review Team considers that ESML has effective quality assurance and enhancement procedures within a strong, informal, quality culture. The Review Team notes due respect for the IPL QA system (Meeting 5) and an understanding of the necessity at the larger institutional level for comparable data gathered via surveys, even though it is not obvious how much use is made of these results and how feedback is acted upon. ESML personnel feel that the reliance on surveys is at odds with their culture of rich, informal, face to face qualitative interaction with students and teachers - a culture that they wish to keep intact. The Review Team supports this and in its opinion the frequency of student interaction is a sign of a strong internal quality culture.

ESML is aware (Annex IV a9) that it has a challenge in developing its QA culture. It needs to work with the IPL system but preserve the benefits of its current distinctive informality. Its QA system needs to be more fully understood, engaged with and acted upon, yielding useful data to ESML for development and enhancement.

Compliance with Standard 7

On the basis of the information in the *SER*, further documentation including annexes and the meetings during the site-visit, the Review Team finds the ESML programmes compliant as follows with Standard 7:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor in Music	Substantially compliant
Bachelor in Music Tech.	Substantially compliant
Master in Music	Substantially compliant

8. Public interaction

8.1 Cultural, artistic and educational contexts

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

The SER (pp.16-17) argues strongly for artistic citizenship and the importance of the arts in social cohesion and cultural progress and growth; it also asserts that this is not a political priority in Portugal and that it is beyond the resources of ESML to exert such political influence.

In Meeting 4 (Department coordinators) the Review Team heard that in Portugal there is little evidence of entrepreneurship in the cultural industries outside those subsidised by the state. ESML recognises that there is rapid change in this area and it has taken steps such as recruiting an overseas consultant to look at how best ESML could contribute to creating new audiences.

ESML collaborates to a limited extent with the other performing arts schools of IPL (Meeting 1). At the end of the academic year, the composition department works on an event with the dance and theatre schools but there are practical challenges as their buildings are 10km away from ESML. Video footage on the ESML website demonstrates some good examples of this collaboration. In Meeting 4 the Review Team heard of a proposal to start an ensemble degree with theatre and cinema that was not approved. The Review Team also heard of strong collaborations in research (Meeting 8 and Standard 2.1 above).

BMus

The SER (p.16-19) notes ESML's contribution to contemporary Portuguese composition, its many orchestras and ensembles and lists many video and audio recordings that are publically available on the web.

BMT

The SER repeats the same statement as for the BMus.

MMus

The MMus SER (p.30) describes many channels for public concerts, academic and artistic activities such as Masterclasses, workshops and seminars, publications and partnerships, although it does not give explicit examples of these.

The Review Team supports the assertion (SER, p.16) that ESML makes an important contribution to culture in Portugal and there is ample evidence of this in its artistic, educational and research outputs and its status as a national leader (as in Standard 1 above).

However, the Review Team finds that ESML could become more strategically proactive in response to its cultural environment and that it underestimates its own agency and influence in culture in Portugal. The Review Team

disagrees that it is beyond ESML's capacity to influence policy and suggests that it could play a more visible and energetic role in influencing culture and audience development, setting the standard as a cultural leader. This was confirmed in Meeting 6 by employers who saw ESML as a cultural beacon with a role to educate and combat prejudice against 'high culture'.

With the notable exception of research, relationships with other institutions are not clearly developed and programmes do not seem to be outward-facing. The Review Team sees potential synergies with IPL's schools of health and business as well as more obvious possibilities of joint projects with its sister artistic schools in IPL.

The BMT programme could reach out to professional companies in order to make it possible to set up internships and to invite professionals to give clinics or masterclasses.

The Review Team sees great potential for growth in social engagement and entrepreneurship; the research arm (Meeting 8) is in the vanguard here and it has set a good example.

Compliance with Standard 8.1

On the basis of the information in the *SER*, further documentation including annexes and the meetings during the site-visit, the Review Team finds the ESML programmes compliant as follows with Standard 8.1:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor in Music	Partially compliant
Bachelor in Music Tech.	Partially compliant
Master in Music	Partially compliant

8.2 Interaction with the artistic professions

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

Throughout its visit the Review Team noted that ESML is very well connected to the music profession, either through links from teachers who work in one of Lisbon's orchestras or through the employers met by the Review Team in Meeting 6, who confirmed the active networks and exchange between the school and the profession.

The SER (p.19) cites an example of the ESML's links with institutions in other artistic disciplines but notes that it lacks the financial resources to support further formal engagement.

BMus and MMus

The SER (p.19) refers to the lifelong learning opportunities provided particularly in 2nd and 3rd cycles to professional artists and these were confirmed by Meeting 6.

BMT

The SER (p.26) refers to events that are produced in collaboration with other schools and universities including in different artistic fields, but there is no specific detail on this.

> The Review Team commends the programmes on their close links with the profession. As noted elsewhere the links are very strong, but often informal. The Review Team considers it good practice that employers are invited formally to participate in curriculum development and it found support for this from its meeting with employers (Meeting 6).

Compliance with Standard 8.2

On the basis of the information in the *SER*, further documentation including annexes and the meetings during the site-visit, the Review Team finds the ESML programmes compliant as follows with Standard 8.2:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor in Music	Substantially compliant
Bachelor in Music Tech.	Substantially compliant
Master in Music	Substantially compliant

8.3 Information provided to the public

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

The SER (p.19) notes that all public information is 'permanently verified' by the governing bodies of ESML, but gives no further detail on how this is operationalised and monitored. The ESML website is comprehensive in its provision of clear recruitment information and in addition has a great deal of audiovisual content. The ESML Facebook page is useful and well put together. The SER (p.7) notes that the institution sees the website as a vital tool in making available to the public evidence of its activities. In Meeting 4 the Review Team heard that the website is under renovation and the aim is to make all information available by two clicks.

> The Review Teams agrees that the website is a vital tool to promote the institution and it commends the wealth of audiovisual content that serves this aim well, as well as the project to ensure that all information is accessible by two clicks.
>
> However, there are still areas of the website in Portuguese only; all web content needs to be translated. The Review Team suggests that there should be a policy and rolling programme for updating and monitoring currency of content on the website and that this task should not be devolved to a member of academic staff.

Compliance with Standard 8.3

On the basis of the information in the *SER*, further documentation including annexes and the meetings during the site-visit, the Review Team finds the ESML programmes compliant as follows with Standard 8.3:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor in Music	Substantially compliant
Bachelor in Music Tech.	Substantially compliant
Master in Music	Substantially compliant

Summary of ESML's BMus, BMT and MMus programmes' compliance with the Standards

Programmes / MusiQuE Standards for Programme Review	Bachelor in Music	Bachelor in Music Tech.	Master in Music
1. The programme goals are clearly stated and reflect the institutional mission.	Partially compliant	Partially compliant	Substantially compliant
2.1 The goals of the programme are achieved through the content and structure of the curriculum and its methods of delivery.	Substantially compliant	Substantially compliant	Fully compliant
2.2 The programme offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international perspective.	Substantially compliant	Not compliant	Substantially compliant
2.3 Assessment methods are clearly defined and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes.	Partially compliant	Partially compliant	Substantially compliant
3.1 There are clear criteria for student admission, based on an assessment of their artistic/academic suitability for the programme.	Fully compliant	Substantially compliant	Fully compliant
3.2 The programme has mechanisms to formally monitor and review the progression, achievement and subsequent employability of its students.	Fully compliant	Substantially compliant	Substantially compliant
4.1 Members of the teaching staff are qualified for their role and are active as artists/pedagogues/ researchers.	Fully compliant	Fully compliant	Fully compliant
4.2 There are sufficient qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the programme.	Fully compliant	Fully compliant	Fully compliant

5.1 The institution has appropriate resources to support student learning and delivery of the programme.	Fully compliant	Not compliant	Fully compliant
5.2 The institution's financial resources enable successful delivery of the programme.	Fully compliant	Partially compliant	Fully compliant
5.3 The programme has sufficient qualified support staff.	Partially compliant	Partially compliant	Partially compliant
6.1 Effective mechanisms are in place for internal communication within the programme.	Fully compliant	Fully compliant	Fully compliant
6.2 The programme is supported by an appropriate organisational structure and decision-making processes.	Substantially compliant	Substantially compliant	Substantially compliant
7. The programme has in place effective quality assurance and enhancement procedures.	Substantially compliant	Substantially compliant	Substantially compliant
8.1 The programme engages within wider cultural, artistic and educational contexts.	Partially compliant	Partially compliant	Partially compliant
8.2 The programme actively promotes links with various sectors of the music and other artistic professions.	Substantially compliant	Substantially compliant	Substantially compliant
8.3 Information provided to the public about the programme is clear, consistent and accurate.	Substantially compliant	Substantially compliant	Substantially compliant

The recommendations made by the review team relating to the relevant standards are listed below:

Bachelor in Music

The Review Team concludes that the BMus programme complies with the *MusiQuE Standards for Programme Review* as follows:

1. Programme's goals and context	
Standard 1. The programme goals are clearly stated and reflect the institutional mission.	**Partially compliant**
Recommendations · the Review Team strongly recommends that the BMus programme produces a Programme Handbook (in both Portuguese and English) which is easily available on the website, clearly sets out the programme's goals in appropriate detail and explicitly links to the ESML institutional mission. · ESML considers how it might benefit from a closer academic relationship with its parent institution, IPL, particularly exploring inter-disciplinary opportunities. · ESML places itself in the forefront of political debates as an advocate for the arts and higher education artistic education.	
2. Educational processes	
Standard 2.1. The goals of the programme are achieved through the content and structure of the curriculum and its methods of delivery.	**Substantially compliant**
Recommendations · As for Standard 1, the Review Team strongly recommends that the BMus programme produces a Programme Handbook (in both Portuguese and English) which is easily available on the website, clearly sets out the programme's goals in appropriate detail and explicitly links to the ESML institutional mission. · e-Learning as a method of delivery could be developed in the BMus programme.	
Standard 2.2. The programme offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international perspective.	**Substantially compliant**
Recommendations · The Review Team recommends that ESML should create an international strategy, including targets for international recruitment, and a language policy for programme documentation and teaching.	

· The Review Team recommends that ESML should be better supported financially in its internationalisation efforts as these are not at an appropriate level for an elite national institution.	
Standard 2.3. Assessment methods are clearly defined and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes.	**Partially compliant**
Recommendations · ESML should increase clarity and transparency about the programme's assessment methods; rather than over-generalised statements, methods of assessment should be specifically aligned to learning outcomes. · ESML should clarify the role of external examiners and invite external members of the profession to assessment panels.	
3. Student profiles	
Standard 3.1. There are clear criteria for student admission, based on an assessment of their artistic/academic suitability for the programme.	**Fully compliant**
No recommendations	
Standard 3.2. The programme has mechanisms to formally monitor and review the progression, achievement and subsequent employability of its students.	**Fully compliant**
Recommendations · The Review Team recommends that ESML uses data from the QA reports more strategically.	
4. Teaching staff	
Standard 4.1. Members of the teaching staff are qualified for their role and are active as artists/pedagogues/ researchers.	**Fully compliant**
Recommendations · The ESML should consider a strategy for continuing professional development of its staff and should apply for funding to IPL to implement it.	
Standard 4.2. There are sufficient qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the programme.	**Fully compliant**
No recommendations	

5. Facilities, resources and support	
Standard 5.1. The institution has appropriate resources to support student learning and delivery of the programme.	**Fully compliant**
No recommendations	
Standard 5.2. The institution's financial resources enable successful delivery of the programme.	**Fully compliant**
Recommendations · The Review Team recommends that ESML takes steps to diversify its funding streams and produces a financial strategy which takes account of this.	
Standard 5.3. The programme has sufficient qualified support staff.	**Partially compliant**
Recommendations · The Review Team strongly recommends that academic staff are not required to undertake support roles and that the ESML management team and IPL should take steps to rectify this. Paying students to undertake tasks such as being on duty in the Library may be one small solution; devolving more core support to central IPL services, and/or properly funding and professionalizing support roles (Registry roles, Erasmus administration, web and email support) is an urgent priority.	
6. Communication, organisation and decision-making	
Standard 6.1. Effective mechanisms are in place for internal communication within the programme.	**Fully compliant**
No recommendations	
Standard 6.2 The programme is supported by an appropriate organisational structure and decision-making processes.	**Substantially compliant**
Recommendations · The Review Team recommends that the decision making process of ESML could be made more transparent. · The Review Team recommends that staff roles and responsibilities should be more clearly defined;	

further, that individuals should not undertake more than one main role. As well as overloading that individual it can compromise innovation and debate and could, at worst, at lead to conflict of interest.

7. Internal quality culture

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

Recommendations

- ESML is substantially compliant with this standard: it has an informal QA culture as well as all the formal mechanisms in place, yet the informal and the formal IPL QA system are not quite integrated. The Review Team recommends that ESML continues to develop its QA and enhancement procedures in partnership with IPL, and makes efforts to act upon feedback from surveys after they become mandatory. It also notes that this area of QA is professional, and is ideally carried out by specialist academic managers (often in other conservatoires in Registry or Academic Services departments). There are possibilities of working in partnership with IPL's other arts schools on this.

8. Public interaction

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

Recommendations

- The Review Team recommends that ESML should be generally more proactive and outward facing. It has an obvious role as an advocate of the arts of the Portuguese cultural sector.
- The Review Team recommends there is much to be gained by greater engagement with ESML's local IPL context in extending its reach and entrepreneurial spirit.

Standard 8.2. The programme actively promotes links with various sectors of the music and other artistic professions.	**Substantially compliant**

Recommendations

- The Review Team recommends that employers could be invited to take part in ESML's curricular development to ensure formally that the curriculum continues to reflect professional requirements.

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

Recommendations

- The Review Team recommends that as part a policy and rolling programme for updating and monitoring currency of content on the website, that all web content is available in English.

Bachelor in Music Technologies

The Review Team concludes that the BMT programme complies with the *Standards for Programme Review* as follows:

1. Programme's goals and context	
Standard 1. The programme goals are clearly stated and reflect the institutional mission.	**Partially compliant**

Recommendations

· the Review Team strongly recommends that the BMT programme produces a Programme Handbook (in both Portuguese and English) which is easily available on the website, clearly sets out the programme's goals in appropriate detail and explicitly links to the ESML institutional mission.

· ESML considers how it might benefit from a closer academic relationship with its parent institution, IPL, particularly exploring inter-disciplinary opportunities.

· ESML places itself in the forefront of political debates as an advocate for the arts and higher education artistic education.

2. Educational processes	
Standard 2.1. The goals of the programme are achieved through the content and structure of the curriculum and its methods of delivery.	**Substantially compliant**

Recommendations

· As for Standard 1, the Review Team strongly recommends that the BMT programme produces a Programme Handbook (in both Portuguese and English) which is easily available on the website, clearly sets out the programme's goals in appropriate detail and explicitly links to the ESML institutional mission.

· e-Learning as a method of delivery could be developed in the BMT programme.

· The BMus and MT are academically and administratively separated; there would be advantages to some shared provision for BMT and BMus students, not least to encourage a spirit of true collaboration rather than the current 'service' relationship. For example, it could be a shared goal between BMT and performance departments to make doing a sound check an educational process for both 'sides'; also the processes of editing and mixing involve artistic concepts which would be fruitfully shared.

· The implicit research content of the BMT programme could be made explicit and reflected in programme documentation.

· In due course, a Masters in Music Technology would be a valuable addition to the ESML portfolio.

Standard 2.2. The programme offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international perspective.	Not compliant

Condition

·   The Review Team found that the BMT programme needs to adopt a more international perspective and keep up to date with international developments in the field, for example, through affiliation to the AES (Audio Engineering Society); it also needs to ensure that international opportunities are equally open to BMT students. Therefore this standard will only be met on condition that the programme affiliates itself to an appropriate international organisation and that BMT students are offered the same international opportunities as their peers on the BMus.

Recommendations

·   The Review Team recommends that ESML should create an international strategy, including targets for international recruitment, and a language policy for programme documentation and teaching.
·   The Review Team recommends that ESML should be better supported financially in its internationalisation efforts as these are not at an appropriate level for an elite national institution.

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

Recommendations

·   ESML should increase clarity and transparency about the programme's assessment methods; rather than over-generalised statements, methods of assessment should be specifically aligned to learning outcomes.
·   ESML should clarify the role of external examiners and invite external members of the profession to assessment panels.

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

Recommendations

·   The Review Team recommends that criteria for student admission should be available in English.

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

Recommendations	
· The Review Team recommends that ESML uses data from the QA reports more strategically. · The Review Team recommends that, particularly as it is relatively new, that more scrutiny is given to the BMT programme in the area of progression, achievement and employability.	
4. Teaching staff	
Standard 4.1. Members of the teaching staff are qualified for their role and are active as artists/pedagogues/ researchers.	**Fully compliant**
Recommendations	
· ESML should consider a strategy for continuing professional development of its staff and should apply for funding to IPL to implement it.	
Standard 4.2. There are sufficient qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the programme.	**Fully compliant**
No recommendations	
5. Facilities, resources and support	
Standard 5.1. The institution has appropriate resources to support student learning and delivery of the programme.	**Not compliant**
Condition	
· The space, equipment and software for the BMT is not adequate or wholly fit for purpose. The standard will only be met on the condition that additional funding for capital expenditure on equipment including but not limited to an additional digital mixing console and measurement devices and software (although open source software could be better utilised) is made available to avoid unacceptable contingency measures, such as staff using their own equipment, as observed by the Review Team.	
Standard 5.2. The institution's financial resources enable successful delivery of the programme.	**Partially compliant**
Recommendations	
· The Review Team recommends that ESML takes steps to diversify its funding streams and produces a financial strategy which takes account of this.	

· The Review Team recommends that the BMT programme explores opportunities for commercial sponsorship to assist in funding its equipment and software shortages.	
Standard 5.3. The programme has sufficient qualified support staff.	**Partially compliant**

Recommendations

- · The Review Team strongly recommends that academic staff are not required to undertake support roles and that the ESML management team and IPL should take steps to rectify this. Paying students to undertake tasks such as being on duty in the Library may be one small solution; devolving more core support to central IPL services, and/or properly funding and professionalizing support roles (Registry roles, Erasmus administration, web and email support) is an urgent priority.

6. Communication, organisation and decision-making

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

No recommendations

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

Recommendations

- · The Review Team recommends that the decision making process of ESML could be made more transparent.
- · The Review Team recommends that staff roles and responsibilities should be more clearly defined; further, that individuals should not undertake more than one main role. As well as overloading that individual it can compromise innovation and debate and could, at worst, at lead to conflict of interest.

7. Internal quality culture

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

Recommendation

·   ESML is substantially compliant with this standard: it has an informal QA culture as well as all the formal mechanisms in place, yet the informal and the formal IPL QA system are not quite integrated. The Review Team recommends that ESML continues to develop its QA and enhancement procedures in partnership with IPL, and makes efforts to act upon feedback from surveys after they become mandatory. It also notes that this area of QA is professional, and is ideally carried out by specialist academic managers (often in other conservatoires in Registry or Academic Services departments). There are possibilities of working in partnership with IPL's other specialist arts schools on this.

8. Public interaction	
Standard 8.1. The programme engages within wider cultural, artistic and educational contexts.	**Partially compliant**

Recommendations

·   The Review Team recommends that ESML should be generally more proactive and outward facing. It has an obvious role as an advocate of the arts of the Portuguese cultural sector.
·   The Review Team recommends there is much to be gained by greater engagement with ESML's local IPL context in extending its reach and entrepreneurial spirit.

Standard 8.2. The programme actively promotes links with various sectors of the music and other artistic professions.	**Substantially compliant**

Recommendations

·   The Review Team recommends that employers could be invited to take part in ESML's curricular development to ensure formally that the curriculum continues to reflect professional requirements.

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

Recommendations

·   The Review Team recommends that as part a policy and rolling programme for updating and monitoring currency of content on the website, that all web content is available in English.

Master in Music

The Review Team concludes that the MMus programme complies with the *Standards for Programme Review* as follows:

1. Programme's goals and context	
Standard 1. The programme goals are clearly stated and reflect the institutional mission.	**Substantially compliant**
Recommendations · the Review Team recommends that the MMus programme produces its Programme Handbook in English and explicitly links programme goals to the ESML institutional mission. · ESML should considers how it might benefit from a closer academic relationship with its parent institution, IPL, particularly exploring inter-disciplinary opportunities. · ESML places itself in the forefront of political debates as an advocate for the arts and higher education artistic education.	
2. Educational processes	
Standard 2.1. The goals of the programme are achieved through the content and structure of the curriculum and its methods of delivery.	**Fully compliant**
No recommendations **Commendation** · The Review Team commends the ESML research arm and considers it a very valuable asset to the MMus.	
Standard 2.2. The programme offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international perspective.	**Substantially compliant**
Recommendations · The Review Team recommends that ESML should create an international strategy, including targets for international recruitment, a language policy for programme documentation and teaching, and solutions to current obstacles such as timing of the thesis requirement in the MMus. · The Review Team recommends that ESML should be better supported financially in its internationalisation efforts as these are not at an appropriate level for an elite national institution.	

Standard 2.3. Assessment methods are clearly defined and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes.	**Substantially compliant**
Recommendations · ESML should increase clarity and transparency about the programme's assessment methods; rather than over-generalised statements, methods of assessment should be specifically aligned to learning outcomes. · ESML should clarify the role of external examiners and invite external members of the profession to assessment panels.	

3. Student profiles

Standard 3.1. There are clear criteria for student admission, based on an assessment of their artistic/academic suitability for the programme.	**Fully compliant**
No recommendations	
Standard 3.2. The programme has mechanisms to formally monitor and review the progression, achievement and subsequent employability of its students.	**Substantially compliant**
Recommendations · The Review Team recommends that ESML uses data from the QA reports more strategically.	

4. Teaching staff

Standard 4.1. Members of the teaching staff are qualified for their role and are active as artists/pedagogues/ researchers.	**Fully compliant**
Recommendations · The ESML should consider a strategy for continuing professional development of its staff and should apply for funding to IPL to implement it.	
Standard 4.2. There are sufficient qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the programme.	**Fully compliant**
No recommendations	

5. Facilities, resources and support	
Standard 5.1. The institution has appropriate resources to support student learning and delivery of the programme.	**Fully compliant**
No recommendations	
Standard 5.2. The institution's financial resources enable successful delivery of the programme.	**Fully compliant**
Recommendations · The Review Team recommends that ESML takes steps to diversify its funding streams and produces a financial strategy which takes account of this.	
Standard 5.3. The programme has sufficient qualified support staff.	**Partially compliant**
Recommendations · The Review Team strongly recommends that academic staff are not required to undertake support roles and that the ESML management team and IPL should take steps to rectify this. Paying students to undertake tasks such as being on duty in the Library may be one small solution; devolving more core support to central IPL services, and/or properly funding and professionalizing support roles (Registry roles, Erasmus administration, web and email support) is an urgent priority.	
6. Communication, organisation and decision-making	
Standard 6.1. Effective mechanisms are in place for internal communication within the programme.	**Fully compliant**
No recommendations	
Standard 6.2 The programme is supported by an appropriate organisational structure and decision-making processes.	**Substantially compliant**
Recommendations · The Review Team recommends that the decision making process of ESML could be made more transparent. · The Review Team recommends that staff roles and responsibilities should be more clearly defined;	

further, that individuals should not undertake more than one main role. As well as overloading that individual it can compromise innovation and debate and could, at worst, at lead to conflict of interest.

7. Internal quality culture	
Standard 7. The programme has in place effective quality assurance and enhancement procedures.	**Substantially compliant**

Recommendations

· ESML is very substantially compliant with this standard: it has an informal QA culture as well as all the formal mechanisms in place, yet the informal and the formal IPL QA system are not quite integrated. The Review Team recommends that ESML continues to develop its QA and enhancement procedures in partnership with IPL, and makes efforts to act upon feedback from surveys after they become mandatory. It also notes that this area of QA is professional, and is ideally carried out by specialist academic managers (often in other conservatoires in Registry or Academic Services departments). There are possibilities of working in partnership with IPL's other specialist arts schools on this.

8. Public interaction	
Standard 8.1. The programme engages within wider cultural, artistic and educational contexts.	**Partially compliant**

Recommendations

· The Review Team recommends that ESML should be generally more proactive and outward facing. It has an obvious role as an advocate of the arts of the Portuguese cultural sector.
· The Review Team recommends there is much to be gained by greater engagement with ESML's local IPL context in extending its reach and entrepreneurial spirit.

Standard 8.2. The programme actively promotes links with various sectors of the music and other artistic professions.	**Substantially compliant**

Recommendations

· The Review Team recommends that employers could be invited to take part in ESML's curricular development to ensure formally that the curriculum continues to reflect professional requirements.

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

Recommendations

·   The Review Team recommends that as part a policy and rolling programme for updating and monitoring currency of content on the website, that all web content is available in English.

Conclusion

The Review Team found at ESML a clear focus on excellence, well aligned to its position as the premier national higher education specialist music institution. The curriculum gives room for individual artistic flexibility and exposes students to a wide range of artistic activities. The Review Team was impressed by the vitality and forward focus of research initiatives. Both students and staff have a strong sense of pride in the institution and there is a culture of informal, yet effective and friendly, communication. The Review Team was impressed by the professional standards of teaching staff and encountered strong (informal) engagement with and debate about quality and artistic and pedagogical standards in the staff team. Students find work and are employable.

ESML has a state of the art building with very good facilities overall, but student numbers are now much greater than the building was designed for. ESML faces financial challenges which pose problems in various areas: there are deficiencies in equipment for the Bachelor in Music Technologies programme; academic staff work in vital non-academic roles and thus wear many different 'hats'; the institution heavily relies on the goodwill of both the support and academic staff. The Review Team found that there is a need for greater clarity and transparency in student-facing documentation.

The Review Team felt that ESML has great potential to set the standard in Portugal as a cultural leader as well as to develop its international standing and profile. It has excellent existing relationships with the artistic professions and could involve them more closely in its academic affairs at the curricular level to mutual benefit. Closer relationships with technical companies would be beneficial for the Bachelor in Music Technologies programme. Finally, again on an outward-facing theme, there is great scope for finding private or corporate financial support as an elite institution.

Proposal for accreditation

Based on the programmes' compliance with *MusiQuE Standards for Programme Review* stated above, it is proposed that the following programmes be accredited:

- Bachelor in Music
- Master in Music

Based on the programmes' compliance with *MusiQuE Standards for Programme Review* stated above, it is proposed that the following programme be accredited with two conditions:

- Bachelor in Music Technologies (see conditions on page 48 regarding standard 2.2. and on page 49 regarding standard 5.1)

Annex 1. Site-visit schedule

Monday 11 December

Time	Session (venue as notified by the institution)	Names and functions of participants from the visited institution	BM & MM activities	MT activities	Room
08:40	Transfer to ESML. Review Team members meet at 08:40 in the hotel lobby.				
09:00-11:00	**Preparatory meeting of the Review Team (Rosa Bento joins at 09:00)**				M.12
11:00-11.30	Break				M.12
11:30-12:30	**Meeting 1 with IPL President, ESML Board of Directors, Technical-Scientific Council (TSC) President, Pedagogic Council President**	**Ana Cristina Perdigão -** IPL Vice-President **Miguel Henriques –** Director and TSC President **José Massarrão –** Sub-Director **Carlos Marecos –** Sub-Director **José João Gomes dos Santos –** Pedagogic Council President		GA – 10h-13h Audio setup (amplification) for the evening concert	M.12
12:30-13:00	Review Team meeting: Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary				M.12
13:00–14.00	Lunch	N/A			ESML Cafeteria
14:00-14:45	**Guided tour** - Review of the facilities relevant to the 3 programmes to be accredited (studios, concert venues, practice facilities, libraries etc.)	**José Massarrão** – Sub-Director **Carlos Marecos** – Sub-Director **Manuel Esturrenho** – Administration Director **Paulo Maciel** – ESML Student Association President	Room 0.69 13h-17h Early music	Room 0.60 14h00-16h Selective and Critical Listening	

15:00-16:00	**Meeting 2 with students**	**Paulo Maciel** – ESML Student Association President **Francisco Henriques** – Performance (Voice & Violin) Jazz **Mafalda Pereira** - DCFM **Rodrigo Cardoso** - Composition **Margarida Pinto** - MT **Martim Souto** - MT **José João Martins** – MM (Comp.) **Javier Subatin** – MM (Jazz)	Room 0.72 15h-19h Chamber music GA 15h-18h Winds Orchestra rehearsal Room 0.81 15h-17h Jazz Repertoire Orchestra rehearsal		M.12
16:00-16.30	Break and Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary			Room 0.60 16h-17h30 Audio Fundamentals	M.12
16:30-17:30	**Meeting 3 with Senior Administrative Officers**	**Miguel Henriques** - Director **Manuel Esturrenho** – Administration Director **Manuel Jerónimo** – Quality Assurance Coordinator **João Pedro Duarte** – International Office Coordinator **Carla Ruivo** – IPL International Relations Office		Room 0.62 16h-20h MT Projects	M.12
17:30-18:30	Review Team meeting: Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary				M.12
18:30-20:15	Dinner with representatives of ESML			GA – 19h Sound check for the evening	ESML Cafeteria

Time	Session		ESML relevant activities		Room
				concert	
20:30-21:30	**Concert: Jazz Big Band Concert**			GA Concert sound amplification	GA
21:30	Transfer back to the hotel				

Tuesday 12 December

Time	Session	Names and functions of participants from the visited institution	ESML relevant activities		Room
08:40	Transfer to ESML				
09:00-09:30	**Review Team meeting**				M.12
09:30–11:00	**Meeting 4 with Department Coordinators**	**Miguel Henriques** - Bachelor in Music Coordinator **Cristina Brito da Cruz** (CCME Profile Coord.) **José Massarrão** (Performance Profile Coord.) **João Moreira** (Jazz Profile Coord.) **Carlos Marecos** – Bachelor in Music Technologies Coordinator **Ricardo Pinheiro** – Master in Music Coordinator		GA 10h-13h Audio setup (recording) for the evening concert	M.12
11:00-11.30	Break and Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary				M.12
11.30-12.30	**Meeting 5 with Artistic and Academic Staff Members**	**António Pinho Vargas** - Composer **João Vaz** - Organist **Alberto Roque** – Orchestral Conductor **Luis Madureira** - Tenor **Tiago Neto** - Violinist **Paulo Gaspar** - Clarinetist **Pedro Moreira** – Jazz Saxophonist and			M.12

		Conductor **Sérgio Henriques** - MT			
12:30–13.30	Lunch	N/A	- 0.81 – 12h-14h – Jazz Repertoire Orchestra rehearsal		
13.30-14:30	**Review Team meeting**				M.12
14:30-15:30	**Meeting 6 with representatives of the profession and former students**	**Maj. João Cerqueira** – GNR (National Republican Guard – Symphonic Band) **Comiss. José Brito** – PSP (Public Security Police – Symphonic Band) **Sg. Ch. Paulo Gaspar** – Navy (ESML graduate) **Ten. Cor. Fernando Moreira –** Army **Pedro Wallenstein** – (GDA) Artists' Rights Management **Miguel Azguime** - MisoMusic Portugal		Room 1.136 15h-16h Notation and Analysis Room 2.01 15h-18h Room Acoustics	M.12
15:30-16:00	Break and Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary				M.12
16:00-17:00	**Meeting 7: Visits of classes and activities**	See schedule of classes and activities proposed by the institution *(available on Monday 11 December)*	Room 0.70 16h-20h Jazz Combos PA 16h30-18h00 Clarinet Ensemble	Room 1.136 16h-18h Audio Mathematics	
17:00-17:30	**Meeting 8 with the Research Centre Coordinator**	**Carlos Caires** – CESEM/ESML section Coordinator		Room 0.60 17h-19h Mesures and Equipment	M.12

17:30-18:00	**Review Team meeting**			M.12
18:15	Transfer to hotel			
18:30-19:00	Free time		Room 0.60 19h-21h Electroacoustics GA - 19h Audio recording sound check for the evening concert	
19:00-20:30	Review Team dinner at restaurant "People Restaurant"			
20:30	Transfer to ESML – pick up of the Review Team at the restaurant			
21:00	**Concert Masters' Final Recital Exam – Voice – «8 Songs for a Mad King» by P. M. Davies**		GA Concert Sound recording	
22:30	Transfer back to hotel			

Wednesday 13 December

9:00-10:00	**Meeting 9: extra session if required by the Review Team**	As notified by the Review Team on Tuesday 12 December afternoon		Rooms 0.63 & 0.64 Audio post production work	M.12
10:00-12:00	**Review Team meeting - Preparation for the feedback meeting**		Room 0.81 9h30-13h Choir rehearsal		M.12

			Room 0.79 10h-12h Jazz Combos		
			GA – 11h-13h - Strings Camerata reh1earsal		
12:00-13:00	**Feedback to the institution**	Senior staff members Staff and Students who may wish to attend			M.12
From 13:30 pm	*ESML to assist Review Team members to arrange taxis to the aiport of transfer back to the hotel*				

Annex 2. List of documents provided to the Review Team

The following documents were provided by ESML to the Review Team in advance of the site-visit:

1. *Self-evaluation Report (SER)*

2. *Statutes ESML 2017*

3. *Organization chart ESML 2017*

4. *Bachelor in Music 2017 Curricular Plan*

5. *Bachelor in Music Technologies 2017 Curricular Plan*

6. *Master in Music 2017 Curricula r Plan*

7. *Bachelor in Music - Curricular Units*

8. *Bachelor in Music - Equipment*

9. *Bachelor in Music - ESML - Activities*

10. *Bachelor in Music - Methodologies, Assessment and Results*

11. *Bachelor in Music - Non-Teaching Staff*

12. *Bachelor in Music - Partnerships*

13. *Bachelor in Music - Quality Assurance*

14. *Bachelor in Music - Self-Assessment full report*

15. *Bachelor in Music - SWOT Analysis*

16. *Bachelor in Music - Teaching Staff*

17. *ESML Coordinators by Profile, Branch and Curricular Units*

18. *ACEF_1415_04752 - Bachelor in Music Technologies - Self-Assessment full report*

19. *ACEF_1415_04757 - Master in Music - Self-Assessment full report*

20. *ESML Pedagogic success Bachelor in Music - Composition Conducting and Musical Education records 15-16*

21. *ESML Pedagogic success Bachelor in Music - Jazz records 15-16*

22. *ESML Pedagogic success Bachelor in Music - Performance records 15-16*

23. *ESML Pedagogic success Bachelor in Musical Technologies records 15-16*

24. *Interinstitutional Agreements ESML - April 2016*

25. *Erasmus mobility report*

26. *Teaching Staff*

27. *ESML Activities Report 2016*

28. *ESML Research Center IDEA - Statutes*

29. *The Arts at the National Pantheon*

30. *Entre a Casa e o Corpo*

31. *Artistic Creativity Assessment*

32. *Composition Festival Week, 2014 (IDEA)*

33. *Master in Music Handbook*

34. *Graduates Report ESML 2013-14*

35. *Graduates Report ESML 2014-15*

36. *Quality Report ESML 2015_16*

37. *Bachelor in Music Candidates Survey Report 2015-16*

38. *Bachelor in Music Technologies Candidates Survey Report 2015-16*

39. *Employers Report ESML 2014-15*

40. *Master in Music Candidates Survey Report 2015-16*

41. *New Students Survey Report 2015-16*

42. *Non-Teaching Staff Survey Report 2015-16*

43. *Students Pedagogic Survey Report 2014-15*

44. *Teaching Staff Survey Report 2015-16*

45. *Orquestra Sinfónica ESML 2015-16*

46. *Orquestra Sinfónica ESML 2016-17*

47. *Orquestra de Sopros 2015-2016*

48. *Orquestra de Sopros 2016-2017*

49. *Winds Camerata Silva Dionisio 2015-2016*

50. *Winds Camerata Silva Dionisio 2016-2017*

51. *Strings Camerata Gareguin Aroutiounian 2014-17*

52. *Bachelor in Music Technologies - Projects' audio samples*