MusiQuE Standards for Joint Programme Review

MusiQuE – Music Quality Enhancement
The Foundation for Quality Enhancement and Accreditation in Higher Music Education
Brussels, March 2015

Revised in November 2019

Contents

Introduction

The *MusiQuE Standards for Joint Programme Review* aim to guide higher music education providers in evaluating their activities and enhancing quality. They can be used in various contexts and should be perceived and understood as 'guidelines' in all these contexts. The MusiQuE Standards are meant to assist higher music education providers to demonstrate that they are meeting their aims and objectives: they are mission-driven. Therefore, the document should in no way be understood as focusing on the fulfilment of a set of prescriptive normative standards.

Which target group does this document address?

This document is intended to serve different target groups:

- Higher music education providers interested in conducting a self-evaluation of the education they provide, with the overall aim to enhance its quality.
- Institutions or other stakeholders intending to set up a higher music education study programme.
- Higher music education providers undergoing an external quality enhancement review (at their own initiative or in the context of an evaluation or accreditation required by law). The document will first be used by the music education provider in order to conduct a self-evaluation process, resulting in a self-evaluation report. This report will be sent to a Review Team, composed of international peers, which will then carry out a review procedure including a site-visit and use the document to lead the site-visit and structure their external evaluation report.
- Quality assurance agencies interested in conducting a review procedure in collaboration with MusiQuE. As part of the preparations for a collaborative process, a comparison is made between the national agency's standards and the MusiQuE standards. Arising out of this exercise, a merged set of standards is produced ensuring that no aspect found in either of the separate standards is omitted. Generally, the level of correspondence between standards is found to be high and the comparison process results in enhanced mutual trust.

How shall this document be used?

Be it in the context of a quality enhancement review of a formal accreditation review, higher music education providers are encouraged to use these standards to reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of the joint programme. The document aims to stimulate institutions (including all individual actors such as teaching staff members) to consider what works and what does not (fully) work in the institution or programme, what is unique in their offering and functioning, and especially how the situation can be changed and improved, how the programme settings can face challenges and meet changing requirements. The outcomes of the reflection process can also provide evidence to the programme as well as to external stakeholders that requirements and objectives are met.

The set of standards is divided into three columns:

- The first column 'Standards' lists the 17 standards to be met, in the context of a self-evaluation process but mostly of an external evaluation process. These standards are distributed across the 8 themes/domains of enquiry listed below and serve as threshold (minimum) standards. The domains are as follows:

    1. Programme's Goals and Context
    2. Educational Processes
    3. Student Profiles
    4. Teaching Staff
    5. Facilities, Resources and Support
    6. Communication, Organisation and Decision-making

7. Internal Quality Culture
8. Public Interaction

- The second column 'Questions to be considered when addressing this standard' includes, for each standard, a series of questions, which aim at facilitating the understanding of each standard and at illustrating the range of topics that could be covered by that standard. The function of these questions is not that they all should be answered separately in detail, but rather that they should provide guidance to the issues to be possibly addressed in the self-evaluation process in relation to each standard. These issues may differ according to the institutional context and the review procedure being used.

- The third and last column 'Supportive material/evidence' should not be seen as an obligatory list, but rather provides examples of the kinds of supporting material which an institution or programme team could provide to the peer-reviewers as evidence of good practice.

Programmes to be reviewed will receive an indicative template for their self-evaluation report based on the MusiQuE standards (available online at http://www.musique-qe.eu/documents/templates). Each of the 17 standards listed in the first column needs to be addressed, while the second and third columns are meant as guidelines for the self-evaluation process (see clauses 8.2.2.1 and 8.2.2.2 for more information on the self-evaluation report and the supportive material/evidence).

MusiQuE standards and the ESG

Standards and Guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) have been developed in 2005 and revised in 2015 by the key stakeholders in the field of quality assurance at European level: the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), the European Students' Union (ESU), the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE) and the European University Association (EUA). A major goal of the ESG is to contribute to the common understanding of quality assurance for learning and teaching across borders and among all stakeholders. One of the principles the ESG are based on is the primary responsibility of higher education institutions for the quality of their provision and its assurance.

The first part of the ESG (Part 1) aims to provide higher education institutions with standards and guidelines for internal quality assurance. When the first set of criteria for institutional review in higher music education was developed in 2007, Part 1 of the ESG were considered as a reference tool (in their 2005 version). More recently, the MusiQuE standards have been mapped against Part 1 of the ESG in their 2015 version. This way, programmes reviewed by MusiQuE are ensured that all the ESG (Part 1) are addressed in MusiQuE review procedures.

The Standards and their rationale

Domain 1: Programme's Goals and Context

Standard 1: The joint programme goals are clearly stated and are compatible with the institutional mission statement of each member of the consortium.

This first standard sets the context for those that follow and establishes at a broad level the extent to which the institution has reflected on what it is doing and why. Statements on vision and mission reflect the value system on which an institution is founded and they will normally define that institution's background and context, its distinctive features and its educational and artistic objectives. Such statements are broad and, if effectively formulated and communicated, provide the framework and context for all activity that takes place within the institution. This is an important feature of institutional reviews; equally, programme and joint programme reviews will find it relevant to take into consideration the relationship between the educational aims and objectives of the programme and the vision and mission statements of the institution. All reviews should also consider the national legal and educational frameworks within which institutions and programmes operate.

Domain 2: Educational Processes

The educational process is the sum total of the work that takes place in teaching rooms, studios, performance spaces, reading rooms, practice rooms and during individual study. It should be based on a written curriculum that relates to the institutional mission and vision and states formal objectives and learning outcomes that are both clear in their purpose for all students and flexible enough to allow for individual study patterns.

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

Standard 2.1 addresses the extent to which programme teams, having established what they want to do and why, have succeeded in translating this into the content and structure of the curriculum.

The ways in which, as part of this process, programme teams have used international sectoral tools, such as the Polifonia/Dublin Descriptors and/or AEC learning outcomes[1], either following them or consciously reacting against them for clearly articulated reasons, should be taken into account as part of considering the educational process.

Where research is a part of the institutional vision and mission, it should also inform the educational process. Because higher music institutions engage with research at different levels of intensity, this element is not addressed in a separate standard; nevertheless, its importance is considerable, and only likely to grow in future, and reviews will look for ways in which institutions and programmes can be encouraged to introduce it or to develop it further.

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

Standard 2.2 reflects the fact that institutions should not only strive for internal coherence between institutional mission and the content and structure of the curriculum; they also need to be aware of the wider context and, especially, the link that is increasingly made at the political level between modernisation and internationalisation, whether in terms of higher education or the professions. The EU agenda for the modernisation of Europe's higher education systems includes strengthening quality through mobility and cross-border cooperation and supporting the internationalisation of higher education. Reviews will take into consideration the institution's internationalisation strategy, where it exists, the extent to which the international perspective is embedded in the curriculum, the scope of international partnerships and activities and the opportunities presented by these for students and staff. It is important that the review should also look into the support provided to incoming international students by the programme.

Institutional review is likely to consider the educational curriculum in broader holistic terms than programme review but the international perspective should be present at both levels.

[1] The AEC learning outcomes and the Polifonia/Dublin Descriptors can be found in the brochure Reference Points for the Design and Delivery of Degree Programmes in Music (appendices A, page 51 and B, page 55).

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

Standard 2.3 underlines the need to connect learning and teaching with the way that the competences gained through these are then measured in assessment. Student achievement in higher music education is commonly assessed by a range of methods including practical as well as written examinations. Choosing the appropriate mode of assessment to the competence that is being assessed is critical. In all forms of assessment there should be clarity and consistency in what is being assessed and why, and a strong relationship between assessment criteria and learning outcomes. As well as delivering valid and reliable verdicts (ones that truly do measure what they set out to and ones that come to the right conclusion) assessments should also contribute to the learning process through the provision of feedback. Feedback should be timely and constructive.

Domain 3: Student Profiles

This domain addresses the ways in which programmes manage the entire 'life-cycle' of their students, from entrance through progression to completion and in terms of their subsequent destinations. It looks for evidence of good management in two directions: the quality of the information with which students are provided to complete their journey satisfactorily and the quality of the information that institutions gather about students to assess how well their needs are being served.

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

Standard 3.1 focusses on the admission of students to the programme and how their suitability is reliably evaluated. As the standards show, suitability depends on both artistic and academic considerations. In order to address the former, an audition is an important requirement for admission to any of the three cycles of higher music education. This form of selection at the beginning of each cycle is also a critical mechanism for the institution to achieve balance between the various disciplines and instrumental groups so that certain ensembles can be formed and relevant repertoire can be studied. Student admission process should enable the institution to identify artistic potential in students of all types and to evaluate their suitability, artistically and academically, for the programme(s) offered.

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

Standard 3.2 examines how the programme team, gathers and retains information on everything that happens to students during their study and subsequently. Reviews consider the mechanisms for monitoring the progression of students through the study period and their achievement of the programme's final qualification/award. They also consider the mechanisms in place to monitor employability and the contribution of graduates to the enhancement of cultural life.

Domain 4: Teaching Staff

Having the right teachers with the right skills and experience is indispensable to the quality of a programme. Increasingly, the question of the formal qualifications held by teaching staff is also becoming an important consideration, although this issue takes on special characteristics in relation to higher music education because of its blend of the artistic and academic.

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

Standard 4.1 is concerned with the qualification of teachers to carry out the activities asked of them by the programme. Teachers in HME may be qualified for this through their professional profiles as musicians and/or the diplomas or degrees they have obtained. Institutions should have a clear policy in relation to the appropriate qualifications of staff for particular roles. There should be clear policies on staff development, including ongoing professional activity, updating of qualifications and/or conducting research.

Standard 4.2: There are sufficient qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the joint programmes.

Standard 4.2 builds on Standard 4.1 by making explicit the link between teachers' competences and the demands of the programmes they expected to deliver. As curricula are updated to reflect the continuously evolving musical profession and increased internationalisation, it is necessary to ensure that suitably qualified teaching staff are available. This may require updating of skills or the recruitment of new staff. Institutions need to have policies in place to achieve this.

Domain 5: Facilities, Resources and Support

While teaching staff may be in the 'front line' of quality in terms of learning and teaching, they and their students depend upon a range of supporting facilities and infrastructure. Inadequacies here can undermine the institution's striving for quality just as seriously as those elsewhere, and ensuring appropriate standards in this area can often be heavily dependent upon financial support – often determined at ministerial level and therefore a matter beyond the direct control of an institution. Reviews are sensitive to this aspect, but reviewers will feel free, when appropriate, to record their observations concerning the funding regime under which the institution operates and whether this is demonstrably introducing obstacles to quality enhancement.

Standard 5.1: The institution has (partner institutions have) appropriate resources to support student learning and delivery of the programme.

Standard 5.1 recognises the fact that higher music education has special and diverse requirements in terms of concert venues, teaching rooms, instruments, technologies, libraries and other learning resources. Strategies should be in place to ensure that resources properly support the learning and teaching of the institution. Where this may not be an immediately realisable prospect, there should still be a longer-term and incremental plan to move in the direction of enhancement.

Standard 5.2: The institution's financial resources (financial resources of the partner institutions) enable successful delivery of the study programmes.

Standard 5.2 is especially relevant to higher music education, which is based on one-to-one and small-group teaching in dedicated facilities. Institutions should therefore be able to demonstrate, within the context of their national situation, appropriate measures to maintain a secure and sustained funding stream for the delivery of their programmes.

In joint programme reviews, it is important to ensure that the partner institutions, which may be operating under very different funding regimes, have addressed any potential inequalities or other difficulties that this may introduce.

Standard 5.3: The joint programme has sufficient qualified support staff.

Standard 5.3 turns to the question of whether the support staff of an institution or programme have the appropriate skills. Higher music education depends upon both specialist and general support staff (technical, administrative, non-teaching staff, etc.). As programmes are modernised, some of the skills required from these individuals will change correspondingly. Institutions should ensure that policies are in place for the appropriate deployment and the professional development of their support staff.

Domain 6: Communication, Organisation and Decision-making

For all of the domains described above to function properly, adequate communication, organisation and decision-making are essential. Moreover, as described below, there are particular challenges to the effective functioning of these elements in the higher music education environment; the review therefore examines them as a domain in their own right.

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

Standard 6.1 examines the appropriateness of the communication mechanisms at programme level. Higher music education involves an unusually large proportion of part-time and hourly paid teaching staff. It is therefore a major challenge to make them feel part of the institution. This should be taken into consideration when looking at the effectiveness of mechanisms for internal communication.

The challenges of effective communication are multiplied in the case of joint programmes and require a commitment from every partner at both institutional and programme level. Reviews will look for evidence that all partners share an equal commitment to maintaining good communication about every aspect of the programme.

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

Standard 6.2 looks at how organisational structures can support or inhibit effective communication; it focusses specifically on how decisions are made and whether these processes help or hinder the efficient operation of the programme. Higher music education has traditionally been structured around the individual instruments and disciplines within music. These must be accommodated within the managerial structures adopted and decision-making processes employed. The organisational structure should be transparent and inclusive and should optimise the delivery of the study programmes.

Again, the challenges that arise with joint programmes of blending different organisational structures and finding the appropriate locus for decision-making amongst the partner institutions make this standard especially important when reviewing such programmes.

Domain 7: Internal Quality Culture

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

Standard 7 underlines the fact that quality assurance and enhancement cannot thrive in an environment where they are only considered at the points where a programme is undergoing external review. Attention to quality assurance and enhancement must be embedded in the day-to-day working patterns and procedures such that it becomes almost automatic.

The same challenges that affect internal communication, organisation and decision-making in higher music education institutions apply here. The different cultures surrounding music in higher education and in the profession can make it difficult to engage part-time and hourly-paid teaching staff in an approach to quality based on procedures and systematic documentation, rather than on musical instinct and a simple passion for excellence. Recognising that either approach is incomplete without the other, the review will examine systems and procedures, but will also consider how effectively the whole learning and teaching community is brought 'onside' in terms of its appreciation of the purpose and value of these tools for internal quality enhancement.

Institutional reviews will consider quality assurance and enhancement procedures more broadly in the context of the institution as a whole, its vision, mission and operations. Programme review will be focussed on programme management and systems of quality assurance and enhancement that operate at this level. In the case of joint programmes, the review will want to see evidence of a coordinated approach to quality assurance and enhancement within which staff and, in particular, students can always feel clear about what the systems are and how they should interact with them.

Domain 8: Public Interaction

A music conservatoire is a huge resource in society, first of all through staff's and students' knowledge and experience, but also through its physical facilities. Institutions are often expected to be present in the public sphere, through artistic and scholarly manifestations, and through participation in, and contribution to, arts, educational and cultural policies. This final domain is therefore an important additional measure of a programme's quality within the field of higher music education.

The domain of public interaction is likely to be explored in greater detail during institutional review although it will nevertheless be of some importance to programme review.

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

Standard 8.1 assesses the extent of a programme's external engagement. Such engagement may take a variety of forms, some of them bringing the wider public into the institution and others taking the institution out into the wider public. Engagement may also involve the institution contributing to the broader community or being itself a recipient of expertise and advice from external public agencies for its own activities and programmes.

External engagement is an area where and institution, and even an individual programme, can develop a distinctive profile, attuned to local, regional or national conditions. Reviews will be interested in examples of innovative practice or responsiveness to local needs.

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

The focus of Standard 8.2 is linked to, but distinct from, that of 8.1. Whilst, there, the emphasis was on public engagement, here the primary concern is on collaboration at the professional level. Students in higher music education are already, in some sense, members of the music profession, practising their art at a professional or near-professional level and frequently being paid for their musical activities outside their studies. Curricula increasingly recognise, and even encourage, this merging of the educational and professional spheres and one important manifestation of this is the emergence of the concept of the musician as 'creative entrepreneur', with elements of the curriculum being designed to enhance the entrepreneurial skills of music graduates.

The active promotion of links with the profession is an important component of helping students to think and act in a professional manner and begin to build professional contacts. It assists their transition into full professional status and is therefore an important component of quality enhancement in terms of the professional relevance of institutions and their programmes.

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

The final Standard, 8.3, addresses the important area of transparency. Institutions have a responsibility to present themselves in an honest, open and reliable way, whether inside their communities or in the public sphere. Transparency is also promoted or inhibited according to how well the information that is provided is attuned to the level of prior specialist knowledge of a particular audience. Public interfaces such as websites should be user-friendly, while someone with a more detailed or specialist enquiry should be able to access the relevant information without undue difficulty. The review will address all of these aspects and will also focus on the consistency between the public image that the institution projects of itself and the reality that the review team finds on the ground with regard to educational programmes, resources, facilities etc.

MusiQuE Standards for Joint Programme Review

These standards are meant to be used for the evaluation of a study programme jointly developed by several partners from different countries (not necessarily leading to a joint degree).

Specific requirements for self-evaluation reports produced in the preparation of a MusiQuE joint programme review:

- *Institutions are asked to describe clearly the elements of the joint programme organised jointly and those organised on an institutional level.*
- *Institutions involved in the programme are asked to provide homogeneous descriptions (e.g. in relation their mission or to facilities available) in order to ensure that the same information is provided by each partner.*

1. Programme's goals and context		

Standard 1
The joint programme goals are clearly stated and are compatible with the institutional mission statement of each member of the consortium.
	Questions to be considered when addressing this standard
	a) What are the mission/vision/goals of the joint programme and how have these goals been identified and formulated?
	
	b) How do the mission/vision/goals of the programme connect to those of the individual institutions?
	
	c) What is the rationale for the programme and the selection of its partners?
	
	d) What is the added value of the joint programme?
	
	e) What contribution does each partner make towards the development of the programme in terms of expertise?
		Supportive material/ evidence
		• Mission and/or policy statements
		• Admission profile of the study programme and description of the framework for admission
		• An overview of the programme and its goals
		• Description of the programme's profile (e.g. level of study, unique features - joint degree programme, distance learning programme, further education study programme)
		• Statistical data (institution/consortium) – at most for the 3 last academic years:
		  ○ Number of students/number of graduates (by semesters, gender, field of study, national/foreign)
		  ○ Number of students completing their studies within the normal duration of the programme

	f) How were procedures for formal approval and legal recognition of the programme taken into consideration in its development? g) What statistical information is collected, and how is it used to support the study programme? h) How are equal opportunities embedded in the progamme's mission/vision/goals?	○ Number of students that have changed to other institutions or dropped out (incl. analysis of the reasons for this) ○ Number of student applications each year (if possible by subject area/instrument) ○ Numbers of students accepted each year (if possible by subject area instrument) ○ Statistical information on labour market/employment (if feasible) • State-specific regulations, criteria set up by e.g. national quality assurance and accreditation bodies, qualifications framework • Evaluative reports on equal opportunities (e.g. results of surveys) • Documentation from partners on tuition fee, recognition of joint degree, etc. • Policies on equal opportunities, including appeals procedures.

2. Educational processes:		
2.1 The curriculum and its methods of delivery		
Standard 2.1 **The goals of the joint programme are achieved through the content and structure of the curriculum and its methods of delivery.**	*Questions to be considered when addressing this standard* a) How does the curriculum address the goals of the programme? b) How is the joint structure of the programme demonstrated by the curriculum? c) What are the learning outcomes of the programme and how do they take into account the various aspects of the 'Polifonia/ Dublin Descriptors' (PDDs) and/ or the AEC learning outcomes? d) What types of learning and teaching activities support the achievement of learning outcomes and how are they implemented by the partner institutions in a coordinated way? e) How does the programme enable students to develop individual study profiles? f) Where appropriate, is there a connection/ progression between this programme and other study programmes/cycles? g) How are students offered opportunities to present their work (creative, musical, artistic, research, educational, etc.)? h) How does the programme encourage critical reflection and self-reflection by the student?	*Supportive material/ evidences* • Course handbook and syllabi showing: ○ Overall structure of the curriculum ○ Learning outcomes of the programme ○ The use / comparative value of ECTS credits ○ Characteristics of individual modules (credits, content, specific learning outcomes, assessment methods) ○ Availability of options for personal study profiles within the course structure ○ Additional features such as joint presentation of modules, additional competencies and qualifications in respect to a standard Bachelor or Masters degree programme, international recognition of the degree being offered • Evidence of how the curriculum is linked to the PDDs and/or the AEC learning outcomes, or information about plans for the introduction and use of these • Educational approaches: information on learning and teaching methods and techniques (individual/group tuition, laboratories, workshops, professional integration schemes, mentoring, relationship to professional practice, use and integration of e-learning tools and appropriate music technology, projects, internships, etc.) • Student presentation opportunities: ○ Seasonal concert calendars ○ Student performance/other professional opportunities: research, educational projects, project during festival, interdisciplinary projects, etc. ○ Schedules for internal and external student concerts – other arenas for the exposure of students' work

	i) What role does research play within the programme and how do the research activities of staff impact teaching and curriculum? j) Are there formal arrangements for students to receive academic, career and personal guidance?	○ Information on methods for giving students feedback on their public presentations. • Student/staff feedback (focus groups, internal and external surveys) • Examples of activities drawing on staff research, samples of students' research projects, dissertations and other research projects • Documentation outlining the structure for academic, career and personal guidance
2.2 International perspectives		
Standard 2.2 **The joint programme offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international perspective.**	*Questions to be considered when addressing this standard* a) How is the programme aligned with the international strategies of the partner institutions? b) What mobility arrangements exist for students and staff? c) Are support mechanisms in place for housing and travel of students and staff? d) What is the language policy of the programme? e) In case of national joint programmes: f) To what extent do the curriculum and the extra-curricular activities offer international perspectives? g) Is the programme participating in international partnerships/exchanges? h) Does the programme have international teachers delivering parts of the curriculum? i) Do teachers in the programme have international experience (either as a student/teacher/artist?)	*Supportive material/ evidence* • Internationalisation strategy • Any other strategies to promote international cooperation, the inclusion of foreign students and staff and student and staff exchanges • Language policy • Information and services available for foreign students • Overview of international partnerships, co-operation agreements and participation in European/ international projects • International activities within and outside the curriculum ○ Masterclasses ○ International projects ○ Visiting performers/lecturers ○ Etc. • Student/staff feedback (focus groups, internal and external surveys) • Statistical data: ○ Numbers of international students and staff ○ Numbers of international visiting guest lecturers ○ Numbers of incoming and outgoing student and staff exchanges • Cooperation agreement - The agreement should in particular cover the following issues:

		○ denomination of the degree(s) awarded in the programme ○ coordination and responsibilities of the partners involved regarding management and financial organisation (including funding, sharing of costs and income etc.) ○ admission and selection procedures for students ○ mobility of students and teachers ○ examination regulations, student assessment methods, recognition of credits and degree awarding procedures in the consortium.
2.3 Assessment		
Standard 2.3 **Assessment methods are clearly defined and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes.**	*Questions to be considered when addressing this standard* a) What are the main methods for assessment and how do these methods show the achievement of learning outcomes? How are they being reviewed to consider issues such as consistency and fairness? b) How do these methods reflect the joint structure of the programme and function in a joint way? c) What kind of grading system is being used in examinations and assessments? d) Are the assessment criteria and procedures easily accessible to and well defined for students and staff? e) Are students provided with timely and constructive feedback on all forms of assessments?	*Supportive material/ evidence* • Evidence of a joint approach/philosophy to assessment • Samples of recordings of examination concerts, examination papers, coursework, reports and other relevant examples of assessed work of student • Regulations concerning the assessment of student performance • The transparency and publication of these rules and standards • Student/staff feedback (focus groups, internal and external surveys) • Other documentation relating to and explaining the joint programme's grading system • Methods for providing timely feedback to students

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 joint programme.**	*Questions to be considered when addressing this standard* a) What elements and factors are involved in determining admission capacity and profile? b) What admission procedures are in place within the joint construction of the programme and what are the recognition mechanisms (prior learning, etc.)? c) Does the programme have clear and appropriate criteria for admissions for all types of applicants (including mature students, Lifelong learning, etc.)? d) In what ways do the entrance requirements assess the abilities (artistic / technical / academic / pedagogical) of the applicants to successfully complete the programme? e) What arrangements for the mutual recognition of study periods and qualifications are in place within the joint programme consortium?	*Supporting material/ evidence* • Formal admission requirements and procedures (e.g. joint admission criteria, joint deadlines for application, presence of examiners from partner institutions) • Examples of reports of admission examinations
3.2 Student progression, achievement and employability		

Standard 3.2
The joint programme has mechanisms to formally monitor and review the progression, achievement and subsequent employability of its students.
	Questions to be considered when addressing this standard
	a) How are student progression and achievement monitored within the programme?
	
	b) What information does the programme collect on the professional activities/employment of the students after they complete the programme, and how is this information used?
		Supporting material/ evidence
		• Statistical data on student progression and achievement:
		  ○ Completion rate
		  ○ Pass rate
		  ○ Retention rate
		• Appeals procedures
		• Evaluative reports on student progression and achievement
		• Reports on any (joint) evaluations of student progression

	c) Are graduates successful in finding work/building a career in today's highly competitive international music life?	• Information on the presence of a shared system for joint students' academic records • Examples of diplomas/Diploma Supplement (DS)/transcripts of records that are handed out to students when finishing studies • Data on alumni career activities • Alumni perspectives on the value of the education offered • Employers perspectives (national and international) on the value of the education offered • Any other relevant documentation/reports

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.**	*Questions to be considered when addressing this standard* a) How do the partner institutions ensure that all members of the programme's teaching staff have appropriate qualifications as educators? b) How do the partner institutions ensure that the teachers' knowledge and skills are complementary within the programme's context? c) Is there a common strategy that supports and enhances the teaching staff's artistic/pedagogical/ research activity? d) Is there a policy in place for continuing professional development of teaching staff? e) How are teaching staff engaged in the different activities of the partner institutions (committees, concerts, organisation of events, etc.)? f) How are teaching staff encouraged to engage in ongoing critical reflection and to develop this quality in their students?	*Supportive material/ evidence* • Information on staff recruitment procedures • Artistic, professional and/or academic record of the teaching staff (e.g. curriculum vitae) • Evidence of teaching staff's activities in international contexts (teacher mobility, networks, conferences, competitions, festivals, articles, concerts etc.) • Relevant policy documents • Records of staff participation in continuing professional development • Student/staff feedback (focus groups, internal and external surveys)
4.2 Size and composition of the teaching staff body		
Standard 4.2 **There are sufficient qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the joint programme.**	*Questions to be considered when addressing this standard* a) How does the programme ensure that the number and experience of teaching staff are adequate to cover the volume and range of disciplines?	*Supportive material/ evidence* • Teaching staff details: ○ Number of staff in various subject areas (in fte[2]) ○ Total number of hours taught

	b) How does the composition of the teaching staff allow adaptation to new professional requirements and changes to the curriculum? c) How does the consortium's staff recruitment policy foster new developments within the programme?	○ Equal opportunities • Relevant policy documents on teaching staff profiles • Strategies for maintaining flexibility in the teaching staff • Student/staff feedback (focus groups, internal and external surveys)

[2] Fte stands for full-time equivalent.

5. Facilities, resources and support		
5.1 Facilities		
Standard 5.1 **The partner institutions have appropriate resources to support student learning and delivery of the joint programme.**	*Questions to be considered when addressing this standard* d) Are the building facilities (teaching and practice studios, classrooms, concert venues, etc.) appropriate? e) Are the number and standard of instruments (pianos, organs, percussion, etc.) appropriate? f) Are the IT, computing and other technological facilities appropriate? g) Is the library, its associated equipment (listening facilities, etc.) and its services appropriate? h) How does the programme ensure that students have equal access to all facilities?	*Supportive material/ evidence* • Information on facilities: ○ rooms and associate equipment available to students ○ quality of rooms relative to acoustical standards ○ IT, computing and technological facilities available to students ○ supporting statistical evidence ○ libraries, associated equipment and services available to students ○ opening hours of libraries and practice facilities. ○ feedback from staff and students ○ evaluative reports/documentation • General services provided to student and staff regarding mobility (travel, housing, insurance, etc.) • Student/staff feedback (focus groups, internal and external surveys) • Information about the role of the international offices in the management of the joint programme
5.2 Financial resources		
Standard 5.2 **The financial resources of the partner institutions enable successful delivery of the joint programme.**	*Questions to be considered when addressing this standard* a) What are the programme's financial resources, how are they administered and how do they sit within the overall budgets of the partner institutions? b) Is there a long-term financial plan in place to ensure the continued delivery of the programme?	*Supportive material/ evidence* • Budget data: ○ for teaching staff ○ for support staff ○ for running and upgrading facilities, instruments, and equipment ○ for artistic/academic/research activities. • Information on financial arrangements between institutions • Calculation of tuition fees • Strategies for improving the funding basis of the programme

		• Policies on dealing with dissimilar institutional costs
5.3 Support staff		

Standard 5.3
The joint programme has sufficient qualified support staff.
	Questions to be considered when addressing this standard
	a) Are there sufficient qualified support staff (technical, administrative, IT, non-teaching staff, etc.) to support the aims and the teaching, learning and artistic activities of the programme?
	
	b) Are policies in place for continuing professional development of support staff?
		Supportive material/ evidence
		• Statistical data on support staff (technical, administrative, IT, non-teaching staff, etc.):
		  ○ number in full-time equivalent
		  ○ composition and roles
		  ○ competency and qualifications
		• Policies on continuing professional development dedicated to the joint programme (language, IT/online learning, etc).
		• Evaluative documents/reports
		• Student/staff feedback (focus groups, internal and external surveys)

6. Communication, organisation and decision-making		
6.1 Internal communication process		
Standard 6.1 **Effective mechanisms are in place for internal communication within the joint programme.**	*Questions to be considered when addressing this standard* a) Is there an internal communication strategy for the programme? b) How do students and staff communicate? c) How does the programme communicate with part-time and hourly paid teaching and non-teaching staff and with external collaborators (guest teachers, examiners, etc.)? d) How does the programme ensure the continued effectiveness of its communication systems?	*Supportive material/ evidence* • Communication tools for the publication of information to students and staff (newsletter, boards, etc.) • Policies/procedures on communication process • Student/staff feedback (focus groups, internal and external surveys)
6.2 Organisational structure and decision-making processes		

Standard 6.2
The joint programme is supported by an appropriate organisational structure and decision-making processes.
	Questions to be considered when addressing this standard
	a) What is the organisational structure of the programme and how is it linked with that of the partner institutions?
	b) What are the decision-making processes within the programme?
	c) Are staff responsibilities in the programme clearly defined?
	d) Is there sufficient and appropriate representation (e.g. students, staff, external representatives, etc.) within the programme's organisational structure and decision-making processes?
	e) What evidence exists to demonstrate that the organisational structure and the decision-making processes are effective?
		Supportive material/ evidence
		• Documentation on the organisational structure (e.g. organisational charts) of:
		  ○ The position of the joint programme within the partner institutions
		  ○ the joint study programme
		  • detail of programme management,
		  • its committees (membership, links between committees, number of meetings per year, etc.)
		  ○ curriculum design decision-making process
		  ○ student involvement in decision-making processes
		• If available: copy of the contract in which agreements are laid down in terms of decision-making processes and the organisation structure of the joint programme
		• Examples of programme decision-making processes (e.g. agendas and minutes of meetings)
		• Student/staff feedback (focus groups, internal and external surveys)

7. Internal Quality Culture		
Standard 7 **The programme has in place effective joint quality assurance and enhancement procedures.**	*Questions to be considered when addressing this standard* a) What quality assurance and enhancement procedures are in place within the programme? How often is the programme being reviewed? b) How are the quality assurance and enhancement procedures monitored and reviewed? c) How do quality assurance and enhancement processes inform/influence each other? d) How are the partner institutions, their staff, students and former students involved in these quality assurance and enhancement systems? e) How are staff/students/alumni/external stakeholders/representatives of the music profession/quality assurance experts involved in the quality assurance and enhancement procedures, and how is their feedback used to enhance the programme? f) How are these procedures used to inform decision-making? g) How are students and staff informed if their feedback has led to change? ***h)*** How would the overall quality culture within the programme be characterised?	*Supportive material/ evidence* • Documentation of joint policies and procedures related to quality assurance and quality enhancement • Feedback from staff/students/alumni/external stakeholders (focus groups, internal and external surveys) • Agendas and minutes of meetings • Actions leading to improvements of the programme • Joint strategies/policies for improving the quality assurance and enhancement system • Monthly newsletters, website updates, emails

8. Public interaction		
8.1 Cultural, artistic and educational contexts		
Standard 8.1 **The joint programme engages within wider cultural, artistic and educational contexts.**	*Questions to be considered when addressing this standard* a) Does the programme engage in public discourse on cultural/artistic/educational policies and/or other relevant issues, and if so, how? b) What are the contributions of the programme to cultural/artistic/educational communities at the local, national and international level? c) How does the programme prepare its students to advance society through the use of their knowledge and skills?	*Supportive material/ evidence* • Supporting evidence of external activities (e.g. projects, community activities, educational initiatives and partnerships, membership of programme personnel on relevant external committees, etc.) • Alumni feedback
8.2 Interaction with the artistic professions		
Standard 8.2 **The joint programme actively promotes links with various sectors of the music and other artistic professions.**	*Questions to be considered when addressing this standard* a) How does the programme engage with various sectors of music and other artistic professions? b) What are the long-term plans for the (continued) development of links with the artistic professions? c) How does the programme assess and monitor the ongoing needs of the professions? d) How does the programme engage in and promote Lifelong Learning opportunities?	*Supportive material/ evidence* • Documentation showing: ○ structures for communication and collaboration with relevant sectors of the music and other artistic professions ○ initiatives taken to support students, graduates and staff in programme projects ○ evidence of the programme's commitment to Lifelong Learning activities and examples of specific initiatives • Student/staff/alumni feedback (focus groups, internal and external surveys) • Details regarding the interaction with the professions, its influence on the programme and its impact on the student experience • Action plans for meeting the needs identified through interaction with the professions
8.3 Information provided to the public		

Standard 8.3 **Information provided to the public about the joint programme is clear, consistent and accurate.**	*Questions to be considered when addressing this standard* a) What resources and delivery systems are used to convey information to the public? b) How does the programme ensure that information given to the public (students, audiences, parents, music education institutions at other levels, etc.) is consistent with the content of the programme? c) How is the accuracy of the information ensured on an ongoing basis? d) What mechanisms are in place to review information before it goes public? e) How is information made available to prospective students and other stakeholders? f) What (joint) arrangements are in place for student recruitment? g) What languages are used in the communication of the programme to the public	*Supportive material/ evidence* • Student/staff feedback (focus groups, internal and external surveys) • Programme handbooks • Programme information policies (recruitment policies, website and other information materials if appropriate). • Organisational structure • Newsletters, website updates, emails