Content

What is MusiQuE – Music Quality Enhancement?

o An independent European-level subject-specific external evaluation body

o Its aim:
- assist institutions in quality enhancement
- improve quality of higher music education as a whole

o MusiQuE takes over and develops AEC review responsibility (29 reviews since 2008)

o Various services with one philosophy

Short trip into the past: more than 10 years of work on quality enhancement

Working groups with representatives of AEC members:

o 2002-2004: 'Music Study, Mobility and Accountability' project with NASM

o 2006-2007: first review criteria and procedures

o 2007-2014 (Polifonia projects): fine-tuning criteria and procedures, formulating standards

o 2 AEC-wide surveys showing broad support

o 2011: AEC Quality Enhancement Committee founded

o **7 October 2014: establishment of MusiQuE as an independent legal entity**

The structure of MusiQuE

3 partner organisations: AEC, EMU, Pearle*

3 main bodies:

o MusiQuE Board (5 members) responsible for overseeing all MusiQuE activities

o Peer-reviewers trained

o Supporting staff

The MusiQuE Services

- Quality enhancement reviews for institutions, programmes and joint programmes
- Accreditation procedures for institutions, programmes and joint programmes
- Joint procedures with national quality assurance and accreditation agencies
- Quality Assurance Desk

The MusiQuE Procedures
3 steps

o Preparation of analytical self-evaluation report

o 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

o Report of the peer-review team

MusiQuE Standards for Institutional, Programme and Joint Programme Review

3 Sets of Standards

8 Domains of enquiry

1) Mission and vision /Programme goals and context
2) Educational processes
3) Student profiles (admission to, progress through and completion of the programme)
4) Teaching staff
5) Facilities, resources and support
6) Organisation and decision-making processes and
7) Internal quality culture
8) Public interaction

Standard 2.2 The institution offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international perspective.	Questions to be considered when addressing this standard	Supportive material/ evidence
	a) What is the institutional strategy for offering international perspectives and experiences to students?	• **International strategy**
		• **Any other strategies to promote international cooperation, the inclusion of foreign students and staff and student and staff exchanges**
	b) To what extent do the study programmes and the extra-curricular activities broaden the students' international perspectives and experiences?	• **Language policy**
		• **Information and services available for incoming and outgoing students and staff**
		• **Overview of international partnerships, co-operation agreements and participation in European/ international projects**
	c) How is the institution participating in international partnerships/exchanges?	• **International activities within and outside the curriculum**
		o **Masterclasses**
	d) How are incoming and outgoing students and staff supported by the institution?	o **International projects**
		o **Visiting performers/lecturers**
		o **Etc.**
	e) Does the institution have international teachers delivering parts of the curriculum?	• **Student/staff feedback (focus groups, internal and external surveys)**
		• **Statistical data:**
		o **Numbers of international students and staff**
	f) How have teachers developed international expertise?	o **Numbers of international visiting**

[PROGRAMME REVIEW]	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.
	Questions to be considered when addressing this standard
	
	a) How does the curriculum reflect the institutional mission and address the goals of the programme?
	
	b) 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?
	
	c) How does the programme enable students to develop individual study profiles?
	
	d) Where appropriate, is there a connection/ progression between this programme and other study programmes/cycles?
	
	(etc.)
		Supportive material/ evidences
		
		• **Course handbook and syllabi showing:**
		   ○ **Overall structure of the curriculum**
		   ○ **Learning outcomes of the programme**
		   ○ **The use 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**
		   ○ **Any additional features such as in the case of Masters study, additional qualifications compared to a bachelor's degree**
		
		• **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**

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 | Supportive 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 |

Revision of standards and procedures

- Any member of AEC, EMU and Pearle*-Live Performance Europe is able to suggest changes.

- 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

MusiQuE internal and external quality assurance

o Internal feedback mechanisms
- Feedback questionnaires leading to improvement of the procedures
- Mechanism to alert Board members
- Annual report

o External quality assurance
- External evaluator
- External reviews (EQAR)

Why is it important for MusiQuE to be independent from AEC?

o Independence is needed for making objective assessments in the MusiQuE board

o We don't want the collegial and inclusive nature of AEC to be compromised

How will AEC and MusiQuE interact?

o 3 of the 5 MusiQuE Board members appointed by AEC Council and endorsed by GA

o Standing member of appeals committee endorsed by GA

o Input from AEC members on standards and procedures

o AEC Office staff and MusiQuE staff

o Reduced rates for AEC members

=> AEC should remain an inclusive and collegial membership organisation

Who can use MusiQuE and what are the benefits? (I)

o Institutions can use MusiQuE services and benefit from:

- Advice from international specialists
- The use of internationally accepted standards
- An emphasis on improvement
- Helping to establish an international reputation
- A comparable approach that will build trust
- MusiQuE's flexible structure with diverse services
- Guidance with targeted advice and professional development

o Staff and students will benefit from the QA Desk

o National QA and accreditation agencies

Who can use MusiQuE and what are the benefits? (II)

o Students in particular will benefit from:

- Improved quality of education and service
- An active involvement in the procedures
- Empowerment through feedback
- Improved recognition

Collaboration with national QA & Accreditation Agencies – examples from the past

- Agency organising the procedure(s) based on a merged set of standards and on AEC suggestion for experts (Romania, Armenia)

- AEC responsible for implementing the whole evaluation procedure and delivering the report to the agency (Germany, The Netherlands)

- AEC and Agency jointly organising the procedure(s) (Switzerland, Russia, Belgium)

MusiQuE's future development

o MusiQuE as the 'go-to' provider for review and accreditation in music

- Completion of EQAR registration to do formally recognised accreditation procedures

o Standards for pre-college training and music teacher training

o Supporting procedures in multi-disciplinary institutions with various performing arts disciplines

MusiQuE and you…

MusiQuE's potential involvement in ANMA countries

Denmark
Quality Assurance System

- Quality assurance on programme and institutional level
- *Accreditation Institution* (Accreditation Council + Agency) prepares accreditation reports
  - Institutions are allowed to contact external agencies for the preparation of the reports
  - External agencies need to be listed on the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)
- MusiQuE (once registered on EQAR) is able to assist in formal accreditation processes
- Final decision to accredit institutions or programmes will be made by the *Accreditation Council*

Estonia
Quality Assurance System

o Quality assurance on programme and institutional level

o *Estonian Quality Agency for Higher and Vocational Education* (EKKA) is responsible for:

- accreditation of institutions
- quality assessment of study programme groups

o Higher music education institutions can request EKKA to include a foreign assessment authority

- EKKA needs to approve of MusiQuE's participation
- If approved, MusiQuE is able to assist in formal accreditation processes

o Final decision to accredit institutions or programmes will be made by EKKA

Finland
Quality Assurance System

o Quality assurance on institutional level

o *Finnish Education Evaluation Centre* (FINEEC) is responsible for quality control

o Higher music education institutions can choose a foreign assessment agency such as MusiQuE for an external audit of their activities

o FINEEC's Higher Education Evaluation Committee will decide whether to accredit an institution based on audit report

Iceland
Quality Assurance System

o Quality assurance on subject and institutional level

- subject-level reviews are internal and are led by the higher music education institution itself

- institutional-level reviews are external and are coordinated by the *Quality Board for Icelandic Higher Education*

o The Ministry of Education, Science and Culture can delegate the administration of an external evaluation to a foreign agency such as MusiQuE

o The Ministry takes the final decision about the external evaluation of the institution

Latvia
Quality Assurance System

o Quality assurance on programme and institutional level

o *Higher Education Quality Evaluation Centre* (HEQEC) composes an Evaluation Committee

o Final decision about the accreditation is taken based on recommendations of HEQEC Evaluation Committee, by:

- the Council for Higher Education (for institutional accreditation)
- the Accreditation Commission set up by the Ministry for Education and Science (for study programmes accreditation)

o The Latvian legislation does not foresee the possibility for any other agency such as MusiQuE to have a formal role in the accreditation process

Lithuania
Quality Assurance System

o Quality assurance on programme and institutional level

o *Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education* (SKVC) is authorised to organise external evaluations

o For audits on programme level:

- higher music education institutions can choose a foreign assessment agency listed on EQAR to draft the evaluation report
- MusiQuE (once registered on EQAR) is able to assist in formal programme accreditation
- SKVC takes final decision about accreditation, based upon evaluation report

o For audits on institutional level: only SKVC is authorized to evaluate and accredit the institution

Norway
Quality Assurance System

- Audit of the internal quality assurance system at institutional level

- *Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education* (NOKUT) is empowered by law to be the only official agency for this quality audit

- The Norwegian quality assurance system is not open to international agencies such as MusiQuE for the required audit

- But MusiQuE can be used for internal quality assurance purposes

Sweden
Quality Assurance System

o Quality assurance on program level:

  • higher education institutions have full responsibility for their own quality assurance procedures and this is not evaluated by a central authority on institutional level

  • the *Swedish National Agency for Higher Education's Quality Evaluations* assesses the quality of the education on programme level

  • new evaluation system anticipated to be implemented in 2016

o The *Higher Education Act* does not mention a possibility for international agencies such as MusiQuE to operate but could MusiQuE be used for internal QA purposes?

'Social contracts'?

o This is all about:

- Being accountable

- Being focused on improving ourselves

- Confirming the international reality of our profession

- Strengthening credibility of the sector by showing this is something we can organise ourselves

MusiQuE – Music Quality Enhancement

Website : www.musique-qe.eu

Request MusiQuE reviews! Contact us!

info@musique-qe.eu