

MUSIC QUALITY ENHANCEMENT



Education and Culture DG
Lifelong Learning Programme



What is MusiQuE?

- MusiQuE - Music Quality Enhancement
- An independent European-level subject-specific external evaluation organisation
- Registered on EQAR (the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education) since 2016

eqar

- Keywords: **Enhancement & Flexibility**

MusiQuE structure

- 3 partner organisations:
 - the Association Européenne des Conservatoires (AEC)
 - the European Music Schools Union (EMU)
 - the Performing Arts Employers Associations League Europe Pearle*
- 3 main bodies
 - MusiQuE Board (5 members including a student)
 - MusiQuE staff
 - Peer-reviewers register

MusiQuE Services

- **Quality enhancement reviews** for institutions, programmes and joint programmes
 - ‘Classic review’: 3 steps
 - Tailor-made services: innovative approaches to quality assurance
- **Accreditation procedures** for institutions, programmes and joint programmes
- **Joint procedures:** with national quality assurance and accreditation agencies

The MusiQuE Procedures

3 steps

- Preparation of analytical self-evaluation report
- Site-visit of peer-review team
 - At least 4 reviewers, including a student
 - Meetings with various stakeholders
 - Visits of classes and lessons, attendance of concerts/ recitals
- Report of the peer-review team

Activities 2018-2019

- Belgium: Koninklijk Conservatorium Antwerp, Koninklijk Conservatorium Brussel, Orpheus Instituut Gent, International Opera Academy Gent
- Sweden: Malmö Academy of Music, Lund University
- Finland: University of the Arts Helsinki – Sibelius Academy
- Switzerland: Haute Ecole de Musique de Genève, Conservatorio della Svizzera Italiana Lugano, Zürich University of the Arts (music faculty)
- Russia: “Tchaikovsky” State Conservatory Moscow
- Spain: Escola Superior de Música de Catalunya (ESMUC) Barcelona, Conservatori Liceu Barcelona, Real Conservatorio Superior de Música de Madrid
- United Kingdom: Royal Welsh College of Music & Drama, Cardiff
- Poland: Academy of Music Bydgoszcz, Academy of Music Wrocław, Academy of Music Łódź
- Singapore: Yong Siew Toh Conservatory
- Thailand: College of Music, Mahidol University, Bangkok

Key Principles of MusiQuE services

- Respecting the *special characteristics* of higher music education
- Bringing a *European/international dimension* to quality enhancement
- Encouraging institutions to *reflect* on their own practice, development and challenges
- Making quality assurance more *meaningful to teaching staff and students*
- Offering *tailor-made services* and *innovative approaches* to external review

MusiQuE standards

- 3 Sets of standards:
 - MusiQuE Standards for Institutional review
 - MusiQuE Standards for Programme review
 - MusiQuE Standards for Joint-programme review
- All three sets of standards can be found online at <http://www.musique-qe.eu/documents/musique-standards>.
- Based on / mapped against the *Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG)*

8 domains

1. Mission, Vision and Context
2. Educational processes
3. Student profiles
4. Teaching staff
5. Facilities, Resources and Support
6. Communication, Organisation and Decision-making processes
7. Internal Quality Culture
8. Public interaction

Example (standard 2.3)

2. Educational processes

(...) 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?
- b) Are the assessment criteria easily accessible to and clearly defined for students and staff?
- c) What kind of grading system is being used in examinations and assessments?
- d) Are students provided with timely and constructive feedback on all forms of assessments?

Supportive material/ evidences

- Samples of recordings of examination concerts, examination papers, coursework, reports and other relevant examples of assessed work of students
- Regulations concerning the assessment of student performance, including appeals procedures
- The transparency and publication of these rules and standards
- Student/staff feedback (focus groups, internal and external surveys)
- Any other documents relating to the grading system

Revision of standards and procedures

- Any member of AEC, EMU and Pearle*-Live Performance Europe is able to suggest changes.
- Reviewers and reviewed institutions invited to suggest improvements.
- Proposals should be submitted to the MusiQuE Board before January 31st each year
- A final proposal is prepared by the MusiQuE Board and submitted to the GA of each partner organisation

Training MusiQuE Peer-Reviewers

- Annual workshop
 - Information about MusiQuE
 - Being a MusiQuE Peer-reviewer
 - Elements of training and professional development in QA
 - Importance of knowledge sharing

Training reviewers

- The notion of 'peer' in peer-review:
 - nobody knows better how to evaluate the issues in question than those who are doing the same job themselves somewhere else
 - 'peer' means: someone like you
- What makes a good peer-reviewer:
 - Peers should show respect and understanding of
 - ✓ what has been achieved
 - ✓ cultural diversity
 - ✓ context
 - But they should also be open about their opinions
 - ✓ 'Critical friends'
 - To be a good peer-reviewer highly depends on the attitude

Training MusiQuE Peer-Reviewers

○ Day 1: 16:00 – 21:00

| Time | Format | Content | | Room |
|---------------|------------------|---|--|---------------------------------|
| 16:00 – 16:15 | Plenary session | Welcome and introduction A general introduction to MusiQuE, its structure and its review procedures. | | Kleiner Saal |
| 16:15 – 17:45 | Parallel session | Newcomers session 'Preparation, procedures and paperwork': the roles and responsibilities of peer-reviewers during MusiQuE review procedures. | 'Peer-to-peer' A session for colleagues with prior experience with MusiQuE activities. | Kleiner Saal and Seminarraum 14 |
| 17:45 – 18:00 | N.a. | Break | | / |
| 18:00 – 21:00 | Work in groups | Working dinner Practical exercise: participants prepare the role-play exercise (scheduled on day 2). | | Florentinersaal |

Training MusiQuE Peer-Reviewers

○ Day 2: 09:00 – 13:00

| Time | Format | Content | Room |
|---------------|----------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 09:00 – 10:00 | Work in groups | Role-play session: acting as a peer-reviewer Practical exercise: participants undertake a meeting during a mock institutional site-visit, assuming the role of either members of a review team or staff from within the institution being reviewed. | Seminarraum 14, 24 and 126 |
| 10:00 – 11:00 | Work in groups | Role-play session: acting as a peer-reviewer (Repeated, groups switch roles) | Seminarraum 14, 24 and 126 |
| 11:00 – 11:30 | N.a. | Coffee break | / |

Training MusiQuE Peer-Reviewers

○ Day 2 : 09:00 – 13:00

| Time | Format | Content | Room |
|---------------|------------|--|-------------------------------|
| 11:30 – 12:30 | World café | Working as part of the team Practical exercise: participants are asked to discuss questions posed by the session leaders in small groups and experience how to develop into a good team in a very short period of time. | Seminarraum 14, 24 and 126 |
| 12:30 – 13:00 | Plenary | Plenary discussion and conclusions A final session including a presentation of the MusiQuE Board, an opportunity to offer feedback on the training and an update about MusiQuE's ongoing and upcoming review activities. | Kleiner Saal |

Review Process

- **A - Before the review**
 - List of documents
 - How to read a self-evaluation report
- **B - During the review**
 - Preparing for a review team meeting
 - Guidelines and code of conduct
- **C - After the review**
 - Writing report process
 - Final outcome of the review

A. Before the review - invitation

- Briefing paper
- Questionnaire for peers invited to review institutions/programmes

A. Before the review - tools

- MusiQuE tools and key documents
 - MusiQuE standards
 - Self-evaluation report (SER) and annexes – based on template provided by MusiQuE
 - Template for the analysis of the SER
 - Review schedule
 - Meeting sheets



Review schedule: an example

Day 1

| Time | Session (venue as notified by the institution) | Names and functions of participants from the visited institution | Room |
|-------------|---|---|-----------------------|
| 08:30-10:00 | Review Team meeting | N/A | M 209 |
| 10:00-11:00 | Meeting 1: welcome and meeting with senior management | Rector and Vice-rectors | M 209 |
| 11:00-12:30 | Meeting 2: guided tour, visiting classes and exams (parallel) | A: Main subject lessons, coaching B: Technical examinations violin C: Classes D: Guided tour of the building | |
| 12:30-13:00 | Lunch concert | By students of the institution | Arnold Schönberg Zaal |
| 13:00-13:30 | Lunch | | M 209 |
| 13:30-14:15 | Meeting 3: meeting with students and alumni | Students selected by the institution | M 304 |

Review schedule: an example

Day 1

| | | | |
|--------------|--|---|-------|
| 14: 15-15:00 | Review Team meeting | N/A | M 209 |
| 15:00-16:00 | Meeting 4: guided tour, visiting classes and exams (parallel) | A: Main subject lessons, coaching B: Technical examinations violin C: Classes D: Guided tour of the building | |
| 16:00-16:20 | Break | | |
| 16:20-16:45 | Review Team meeting: Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary | N/A | M 209 |
| 16:45-17:30 | Meeting 5: teachers | Teachers from the various programmes as indicated by the institution | M 308 |
| 17:30-19:00 | Review Team meeting | N/A | M 209 |
| 19:30 | Dinner | Restaurant | |

Review schedule: an example

Day 2

| Time | Session (venue as notified by the institution) | Names and functions of participants from the visited institution | Room |
|-------------|--|---|---------|
| 09:00-09:30 | Review Team meeting | N/A | M 209 |
| 09:30-10:30 | Meeting 6: representatives of the profession | Representatives of the profession invited by the institution | AVO 204 |
| 10:30-10:40 | Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary | N/A | M 209 |
| 10:40-11:00 | Break | | |
| 11:00-12:30 | Meeting 7: visiting classes, exams and rehearsals (parallel) | A: Main subject lessons, coaching B: Technical examinations cello C: Classes D: School choir rehearsal | |
| 12:30-13:00 | Lunch | | |
| 13:00-14:00 | Meeting 8: meeting with Heads of Department | Heads of Departement | M 209 |
| 14:00-14:45 | Meeting 9: optional meeting | As notified by the Review Team | M 209 |
| 14:45-16:00 | Review Team meeting - Preparation for the feedback meeting | N/A | M 209 |
| 16:00-16:40 | Feedback to the institution | Institutional management | M 209 |

B. During the review: code of conduct

- All review team members are asked to adhere to a **code of conduct**:
 - Data confidentiality
 - Fruitful dialogue
 - Respect of the local culture of the institution
 - Consideration of the objectives and strategies of the institution with the help of the standards - mission driven

C. *After the review*

○ Report-writing process:

1. First draft prepared by Secretary - between 6 to 10 weeks after the site-visit
 - ✓ Checked by MusiQuE staff on consistency and completeness
 - ✓ Chair and Review Team members comment on first draft
 - ✓ Secretary finalises draft report
2. Opportunity offered to reviewed institution to check the report on factual accuracy
3. Review Team adapts the report according to comments of the institution
4. Report submitted to MusiQuE Board for approval
 - ✓ The Board may ask the Review Team to make changes if required
5. Final report submitted to institution

C. *After the review*

- Template for the peer-reviewers report:
 - Introduction
 - Main text structured to the MusiQuE standards - for each standard:
 - ✓ a description of the situation
 - ✓ an analysis of how each standard is met (fully / substantially / partially / not compliant)
 - ✓ recommendations for improvement
 - Conclusion
 - In the case of accreditation procedures: a proposal to the MusiQuE Board for accreditation

C. *After the review*

○ Role of the Board:

- In the case of **quality enhancement reviews**:

- ✓ reviewing the report for overall consistency with, and relevance to, the MusiQuE standards
- ✓ endorsing the report, or getting back to the review team for further clarifications

- In the case of **accreditation procedures**:

- ✓ checking if the justifications listed by the review team for each standard support the level of compliance with each standard
- ✓ endorsing the report, or getting back to the review team for further clarifications
- ✓ taking a decision concerning the accreditation of the institution or programme(s)

○ All reports published at:

- www.musique-qe.eu/completed-reviews

MusiQuE internal and external quality assurance

- Internal feedback mechanisms
 - Feedback questionnaires leading to improvement of the procedures
 - Mechanism to alert Board members
 - Annual report
- External quality assurance
 - External evaluator
 - External reviews (EQAR)

Looking for new review models to strengthen teachers' involvement

- Challenging the 'Classic Review Model' – the 'Critical Friends Approach':
 - Annual visits 'Critical Friends' at department level + one follow-up visit within 6-year period
 - Reports 'Critical Friends' + institutional responses form (part of) self-evaluation report
 - Prepares and informs ('light weight') 'classic review' every 6 years

Benefits...

- Personal contact to students and teachers
- Takes both aspects of the concept of quality into account
- Speaks the language of students and teachers
- Strongly focused quality enhancement because of qualified recommendations
- QA workload evenly divided

Contact

- Website: www.musique-qe.eu
- Further questions: info@musique-qe.eu