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## *Preamble to the MusiQuE Template for Reviewers’ Report (Programme Review)*

### *Aim of this template*

*MusiQuE provides this template in order to assist secretaries and reviewers in the process of drafting and structuring their final report and to ensure consistency between all the review reports.*

### *MusiQuE standards for programme review*

*The template is based on the MusiQuE standards for programme review, which are available for download on the MusiQuE website (see:* [*http://www.musique-qe.eu/documents/musique-standards*](http://www.musique-qe.eu/documents/musique-standards)*). The template lists the standards, it suggests for each of the standards a set of questions which should be considered when addressing them, and it provides an overview of the supportive material which needs to be presented. When drafting its standards, MusiQuE has considered Part 1 of the* [*Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG)*](http://www.enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/ESG_endorsed-with-changed-foreword.pdf)*, aiming to provide higher education institutions with standards and guidelines for internal quality assurance.[[1]](#footnote-1) This way, programmes reviewed by MusiQuE are ensured that all the European standards and guidelines for internal quality assurance are addressed in MusiQuE review procedures.*

### *How to proceed?*

*This template contains a short preamble which provides guidelines in relation to the report-writing, all the standards which need to be addressed divided into eight chapters, as well as summary and conclusion chapters.*

*When writing the report, this preamble should be deleted, so that the report starts with the actual introduction. In the chapters following the introduction, the indicated standards need to be carefully considered one by one, using the provided sets of questions for each standard as guidelines. These questions aim at facilitating the understanding of each standard and at illustrating the range of topics covered by that standard. The questions should be deleted when drafting the report, so that each chapter consists of the standard itself and the description of the way in which the standard is met. The answers should be inserted in the provided text boxes below each standard.[[2]](#footnote-2)*

*For each standard, the report should include:*

1. *A description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced*
2. *A statement assessing the compliance of the programme with this standard*
* *Fully compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in all respects)*
* *Partially or substantially compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in most, or some, respects). In such cases, one would expect a recommendation as to how full compliance might be achieved in future*
* *Not compliant (the institution/programme fails to meets the standard in all, or almost all, respects): In such cases, one would expect a condition (or strong recommendation in the case of a Quality Enhancement Review) to be imposed.*

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

*Elements from the self-evaluation report should be precisely quoted (for example, “[self-evaluation report (SER), p. 16]”) and findings from the site-visit duly referenced (for example, “Students met indicated that” or “[meeting with administrative staff]”).*

*The report may also address other issues which the Review Team finds relevant to the aims of the review exercise.*

## Introduction

*Information to be provided:*

* *Context of the review*
* *Data on the institution/programme*
* *Composition of the Review Team*

## 1. Programme’s goals and context

**Standard: the programme goals are clearly stated and reflect the institutional mission**

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. What is the institution’s mission, vision or goal?
2. What is the rationale for the programme and what are its unique features (in alignment with the institutional mission and/or in the regional, national and international context)?
3. What elements and factors are involved in determining admission capacity and profile?
4. What are the goals of the educational programme and how have these goals been identified and formulated?
5. Were procedures for formal approval and legal recognition of the study programme taken into consideration in its development?
6. What statistical information is collected, and how is it used to support the study programme?
7. How are equal opportunities embedded in the institutional mission/vision?

*Text to be inserted:*

1. *Description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced*
2. *Statement assessing the compliance of the programme with this standard (choose 1 option)*
* *Fully compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in all respects)*
* *Partially or substantially compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in most, or some, respects). In such cases, one would expect a recommendation as to how full compliance might be achieved in future*
* *Not compliant (the institution/programme fails to meets the standard in all, or almost all, respects): In such cases, one would expect a condition (or strong recommendation in the case of a Quality Enhancement Review) to be imposed.*

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

## 2. Educational processes

### 2.1 The curriculum and its methods of delivery

**Standard: 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:

1. How does the curriculum reflect the institutional mission and address the goals of the programme?
2. 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?
3. How does the programme enable students to develop individual study profiles?
4. Where appropriate, is there a connection/ progression between this programme and other study programmes/cycles?
5. How is the programme utilizing different forms of teaching in the delivery of the curriculum?
6. How are students offered opportunities to present their creative, musical and artistic work?
7. How does the programme encourage critical reflection and self-reflection by the student?
8. What role does research play within the programme?[[3]](#footnote-3)
9. How does research inform curriculum development and teaching?
10. How does research feed into students’ assignments/activities/tasks?
11. Are there formal arrangements for students to receive academic, career and personal guidance?

*Text to be inserted:*

1. *Description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced*
2. *Statement assessing the compliance of the programme with this standard (choose 1 option)*
* *Fully compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in all respects)*
* *Partially or substantially compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in most, or some, respects). In such cases, one would expect a recommendation as to how full compliance might be achieved in future*
* *Not compliant (the institution/programme fails to meets the standard in all, or almost all, respects): In such cases, one would expect a condition (or strong recommendation in the case of a Quality Enhancement Review) to be imposed.*

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

### 2.2 International perspectives

**Standard: the programme offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international perspective**

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. How is the programme aligned with the international strategy of the institution?
2. To what extent do the curriculum and the extra-curricular activities offer international perspectives?
3. Is the programme participating in international partnerships/exchanges?
4. How are international students on the programme supported?
5. Does the programme have international teachers delivering parts of the curriculum?
6. Do teachers on the programme have international experience (either as a student/teacher?)

*Text to be inserted:*

1. *Description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced*
2. *Statement assessing the compliance of the programme with this standard (choose 1 option)*
* *Fully compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in all respects)*
* *Partially or substantially compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in most, or some, respects). In such cases, one would expect a recommendation as to how full compliance might be achieved in future*
* *Not compliant (the institution/programme fails to meets the standard in all, or almost all, respects): In such cases, one would expect a condition (or strong recommendation in the case of a Quality Enhancement Review) to be imposed.*

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

### 2.3 Assessment

**Standard: assessment methods are clearly defined and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes**

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. What are the main methods for assessment and how do these methods show the achievement of learning outcomes?
2. Are the assessment criteria and procedures easily accessible to and clearly defined for students and staff?
3. What kind of grading system is being used in examinations and assessments?
4. Are students provided with timely and constructive feedback on all forms of assessments?

*Text to be inserted:*

1. *Description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced*
2. *Statement assessing the compliance of the programme with this standard (choose 1 option)*
* *Fully compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in all respects)*
* *Partially or substantially compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in most, or some, respects). In such cases, one would expect a recommendation as to how full compliance might be achieved in future*
* *Not compliant (the institution/programme fails to meets the standard in all, or almost all, respects): In such cases, one would expect a condition (or strong recommendation in the case of a Quality Enhancement Review) to be imposed.*

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

## 3. Student profiles

### 3.1 Admission/Entrance qualifications

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

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. Does the programme have clear and appropriate criteria for admissions?
2. In what ways do the entrance requirements assess the abilities (artistic/technical/academic/ pedagogical) of the applicants to successfully complete the study programme?

*Text to be inserted:*

1. *Description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced*
2. *Statement assessing the compliance of the programme with this standard (choose 1 option)*
* *Fully compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in all respects)*
* *Partially or substantially compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in most, or some, respects). In such cases, one would expect a recommendation as to how full compliance might be achieved in future*
* *Not compliant (the institution/programme fails to meets the standard in all, or almost all, respects): In such cases, one would expect a condition (or strong recommendation in the case of a Quality Enhancement Review) to be imposed.*

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

### 3.2 Student progression, achievement and employability

**Standard: the 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:

1. How are student progression and achievement monitored within the programme?
2. What are the recognition mechanisms (prior learning, study abroad)?
3. 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?
4. Are graduates successful in finding work/building a career in today’s highly competitive international music life?

*Text to be inserted:*

1. *Description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced*
2. *Statement assessing the compliance of the programme with this standard (choose 1 option)*
* *Fully compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in all respects)*
* *Partially or substantially compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in most, or some, respects). In such cases, one would expect a recommendation as to how full compliance might be achieved in future*
* *Not compliant (the institution/programme fails to meets the standard in all, or almost all, respects): In such cases, one would expect a condition (or strong recommendation in the case of a Quality Enhancement Review) to be imposed.*

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

## 4. Teaching staff

### 4.1 Staff qualifications and professional activity

**Standards: 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:

1. How does the institution ensure that all members of the programme’s teaching staff have appropriate qualifications as educators?
2. Is there an institutional strategy that supports and enhances the teaching staff’s artistic/pedagogical/ research activity?
3. Is there a policy in place for continuing professional development of teaching staff?
4. How are teaching staff engaged in the different activities of the institutions (committees, concerts, organisation of events, etc.)?
5. How are teaching staff encouraged to engage in ongoing critical reflection and to develop this quality in their students?

*Text to be inserted:*

1. *Description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced*
2. *Statement assessing the compliance of the programme with this standard (choose 1 option)*
* *Fully compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in all respects)*
* *Partially or substantially compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in most, or some, respects). In such cases, one would expect a recommendation as to how full compliance might be achieved in future*
* *Not compliant (the institution/programme fails to meets the standard in all, or almost all, respects): In such cases, one would expect a condition (or strong recommendation in the case of a Quality Enhancement Review) to be imposed.*

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

### 4.2 Size and composition of the teaching staff body

**Standard: there is sufficient qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the programme**

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. How does the programme ensure that the number and experience of teaching staff are adequate to cover the volume and range of disciplines?
2. How does the composition of the teaching staff allow adaptation to new professional requirements and changes to the curriculum?
3. How does the recruitment policy foster new developments within the programme?

*Text to be inserted:*

1. *Description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced*
2. *Statement assessing the compliance of the programme with this standard (choose 1 option)*
* *Fully compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in all respects)*
* *Partially or substantially compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in most, or some, respects). In such cases, one would expect a recommendation as to how full compliance might be achieved in future*
* *Not compliant (the institution/programme fails to meets the standard in all, or almost all, respects): In such cases, one would expect a condition (or strong recommendation in the case of a Quality Enhancement Review) to be imposed.*

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

## 5. Facilities, resources and support

### 5.1 Facilities

**Standard: the institution has appropriate resources to support student learning and delivery of the programme**

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. Are the building facilities (teaching and practice studios, classrooms, concert venues, etc.) appropriate?
2. Are the number and standard of instruments (pianos, organs, percussion, etc.) appropriate?
3. Are the computing and other technological facilities appropriate?
4. Is the library, its associated equipment (listening facilities, etc.) and its services appropriate?

*Text to be inserted:*

1. *Description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced*
2. *Statement assessing the compliance of the programme with this standard (choose 1 option)*
* *Fully compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in all respects)*
* *Partially or substantially compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in most, or some, respects). In such cases, one would expect a recommendation as to how full compliance might be achieved in future*
* *Not compliant (the institution/programme fails to meets the standard in all, or almost all, respects): In such cases, one would expect a condition (or strong recommendation in the case of a Quality Enhancement Review) to be imposed.*

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

### 5.2 Financial resources

**Standard: the institution’s financial resources enable successful delivery of the programme**

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. Does the programme have sufficient resources for its effective delivery?
2. Is there a long-term financial plan in place to ensure the continued delivery of the programme?

*Text to be inserted:*

1. *Description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced*
2. *Statement assessing the compliance of the programme with this standard (choose 1 option)*
* *Fully compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in all respects)*
* *Partially or substantially compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in most, or some, respects). In such cases, one would expect a recommendation as to how full compliance might be achieved in future*
* *Not compliant (the institution/programme fails to meets the standard in all, or almost all, respects): In such cases, one would expect a condition (or strong recommendation in the case of a Quality Enhancement Review) to be imposed.*

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

### 5.3 Support staff

**Standard: the programme has sufficient qualified support staff**

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. Are there sufficient qualified support staff (technical, administrative, non-teaching staff, etc.) to support the teaching, learning and artistic activities of the programme?
2. Are policies in place for continuing professional development of support staff?

*Text to be inserted:*

1. *Description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced*
2. *Statement assessing the compliance of the programme with this standard (choose 1 option)*
* *Fully compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in all respects)*
* *Partially or substantially compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in most, or some, respects). In such cases, one would expect a recommendation as to how full compliance might be achieved in future*
* *Not compliant (the institution/programme fails to meets the standard in all, or almost all, respects): In such cases, one would expect a condition (or strong recommendation in the case of a Quality Enhancement Review) to be imposed.*

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

## 6. Communication, organisation and decision-making

### 6.1 Internal communication process

**Standard: effective mechanisms are in place for internal communication within the programme**

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. How does the programme communicate with its students and staff?
2. How do students and staff communicate?
3. How does the programme communicate with part- time and hourly-paid teaching and non-teaching staff and with external collaborators (guest teachers, examiners, etc.)?
4. How does the programme ensure the continued effectiveness of its communication systems?

*Text to be inserted:*

1. *Description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced*
2. *Statement assessing the compliance of the programme with this standard (choose 1 option)*
* *Fully compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in all respects)*
* *Partially or substantially compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in most, or some, respects). In such cases, one would expect a recommendation as to how full compliance might be achieved in future*
* *Not compliant (the institution/programme fails to meets the standard in all, or almost all, respects): In such cases, one would expect a condition (or strong recommendation in the case of a Quality Enhancement Review) to be imposed.*

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

### 6.2 Organisational structure and decision-making processes

**Standard: the programme is supported by an appropriate organisational structure and decision-making processes**

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. What is the organisational structure of this programme and how is it linked with that of the institution?
2. What are the decision making processes within the programme?
3. Are staff responsibilities in the programme clearly defined?
4. Is there sufficient and appropriate representation (e.g. students, staff, external representatives, etc.) within the programme’s organisational structure and decision making processes?
5. What evidence exists to demonstrate that the organisational structure and the decision-making processes are effective?

*Text to be inserted:*

1. *Description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced*
2. *Statement assessing the compliance of the programme with this standard (choose 1 option)*
* *Fully compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in all respects)*
* *Partially or substantially compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in most, or some, respects). In such cases, one would expect a recommendation as to how full compliance might be achieved in future*
* *Not compliant (the institution/programme fails to meets the standard in all, or almost all, respects): In such cases, one would expect a condition (or strong recommendation in the case of a Quality Enhancement Review) to be imposed.*

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

## 7. Internal Quality Culture

**Standard: the programme has in place effective quality assurance and enhancement procedures**

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. What quality assurance and enhancement procedures are in place within the programme?
2. How are the quality assurance and enhancement procedures monitored and reviewed?
3. How do quality assurance and enhancement procedures inform/influence each other?
4. How are staff/students/alumni/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?
5. How are these procedures used to inform decision-making?
6. How are students and staff informed if their feedback has led to change?
7. How would the overall quality culture within the programme be characterised?

*Text to be inserted:*

1. *Description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced*
2. *Statement assessing the compliance of the programme with this standard (choose 1 option)*
* *Fully compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in all respects)*
* *Partially or substantially compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in most, or some, respects). In such cases, one would expect a recommendation as to how full compliance might be achieved in future*
* *Not compliant (the institution/programme fails to meets the standard in all, or almost all, respects): In such cases, one would expect a condition (or strong recommendation in the case of a Quality Enhancement Review) to be imposed.*

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

## 8. Public interaction

### 8.1 Cultural, artistic and educational contexts

**Standard: the programme engages within wider cultural, artistic and educational contexts**

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. Does the programme engage with the public discourse on cultural/artistic/educational policies and/or other relevant issues, and if so, how?
2. What are the contributions of the programme to cultural/artistic/educational communities at the local, national and international level?
3. Does the programme prepare its students to advance society through the use of their knowledge and skills, and if so, how?

*Text to be inserted:*

1. *Description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced*
2. *Statement assessing the compliance of the programme with this standard (choose 1 option)*
* *Fully compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in all respects)*
* *Partially or substantially compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in most, or some, respects). In such cases, one would expect a recommendation as to how full compliance might be achieved in future*
* *Not compliant (the institution/programme fails to meets the standard in all, or almost all, respects): In such cases, one would expect a condition (or strong recommendation in the case of a Quality Enhancement Review) to be imposed.*

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

### 8.2 Interaction with the artistic professions

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

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. How does the programme engage with various sectors of music and other artistic professions?
2. What are the long-term plans for the (continued) development of the links with the artistic professions?
3. How does the programme assess and monitor the ongoing needs of the professions?
4. How does the programme engage in and promote Lifelong Learning opportunities?

*Text to be inserted:*

1. *Description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced*
2. *Statement assessing the compliance of the programme with this standard (choose 1 option)*
* *Fully compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in all respects)*
* *Partially or substantially compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in most, or some, respects). In such cases, one would expect a recommendation as to how full compliance might be achieved in future*
* *Not compliant (the institution/programme fails to meets the standard in all, or almost all, respects): In such cases, one would expect a condition (or strong recommendation in the case of a Quality Enhancement Review) to be imposed.*

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

### 8.3 Information provided to the public

**Standard: information provided to the public about the programme is clear, consistent and accurate**

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. What resources and delivery systems are used to convey information to the public?
2. How does the programme ensure that information given to the public (students, audiences, parents, etc.) is consistent with the content of the programme?
3. What mechanisms are in place to review information before it goes public?
4. How is the accuracy of the information ensured on an ongoing basis?

*Text to be inserted:*

1. *Description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced*
2. *Statement assessing the compliance of the programme with this standard (choose 1 option)*
* *Fully compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in all respects)*
* *Partially or substantially compliant (the institution/programme meets the standard in most, or some, respects). In such cases, one would expect a recommendation as to how full compliance might be achieved in future*
* *Not compliant (the institution/programme fails to meets the standard in all, or almost all, respects): In such cases, one would expect a condition (or strong recommendation in the case of a Quality Enhancement Review) to be imposed.*

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

## 9. Summary of the programme(s)’ compliance with MusiQuE Standards

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **MusiQuE Standards** | **Compliance** | **Remarks** |
| *Standard 1* The programme goals are clearly stated and reflect the institutional mission. |  |  |
| *Standard 2.1* The goals of the programme are achieved through the content and structure of the curriculum and its methods of delivery. |  |  |
| *Standard 2.2* The programme offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international perspective. |  |  |
| *Standard 2.3* Assessment methods are clearly defined and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes |  |  |
| *Standard 3.1* There are clear criteria for student admission, based on an assessment of their artistic/academic suitability for the programme. |  |  |
| *Standard 3.2* The programme has mechanisms to formally monitor and review the progression, achievement and subsequent employability of its students. |  |  |
| *Standard 4.1* Members of the teaching staff are qualified for their role and are active as artists/pedagogues/researchers. |  |  |
| *Standard 4.2* There are sufficient qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the programmes. |  |  |
| *Standard 5.1* The institution has appropriate resources to support student learning and delivery of the programme. |  |  |
| *Standard 5.2* The institution’s financial resources enable successful delivery of the study programmes. |  |  |
| *Standard 5.3* The programme has sufficient qualified support staff. |  |  |
| *Standard 6.1* Effective mechanisms are in place for internal communication within the programme. |  |  |
| *Standard 6.2* The programme is supported by an appropriate organisational structure and clear decision-making processes. |  |  |
| *Standard 7* The programme has in place effective quality assurance and enhancement procedures. |  |  |
| *Standard 8.1* The programme engages within wider cultural, artistic and educational contexts. |  |  |
| *Standard 8.2* The programme actively promotes links with various sectors of the music and other artistic professions. |  |  |
| *Standard 8.3* Information provided to the public about the programme is clear, consistent and accurate. |  |  |

## 10. Summary of strong points, recommendations and conditions

This section offers a summary of the institutional attributes which stand out as being strong relative to the MusiQuE standards for programme review, as well as an outline of the areas in which potential for further development emerged.

*List of strong points*

* *Strong point 1*
* *Strong point 2*
* *Strong point 3*
* *Strong point 4*
* *…*

*Recommendations for further development*

* *Recommendation 1*
* *Recommendation 2*
* *Recommendation 3*
* *Recommendation 4*
* *…*

*Conditions for further development (if appropriate)*

* *Condition 1*
* *Condition 2*
* *Condition 3*
* *Condition 4*
* *…*

## 11. Conclusion

Concluding remarks to close the report

## Annex 1 – List of supporting documents

*Please insert here a list of supporting material/ evidences provided by the institution before and during the review. The supporting documents can be attached at the end of this report, or can be made available for download online on a page accessible to the peer-reviewers.*

Annex 1. *Title*

Annex 2. *Title*

Annex 3. *Title*

Annex 4. *Title*

Annex 5. *Title*

…

1. The 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 these Standards and Guidelines is to contribute to the common understanding of quality assurance for learning and teaching across borders and among all stakeholders. See <http://www.enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/ESG_endorsed-with-changed-foreword.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Whenever a text box doesn’t provide enough space, please copy it onto the next page and continue your text there. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The word ‘research’ is used to cover a wide variety of activities, with the context often related to a field of study; the term is used here to represent a careful study or investigation based on a systematic understanding and critical awareness of knowledge. The word is used in an inclusive way to accommodate the range of activities that support original and innovative work in the whole range of academic, professional and technological fields, including the humanities, and traditional, performing, and other creative arts. It is not used in any limited or restricted sense, or relating solely to a traditional ‘scientific method’. *Source: Glossary of the Shared ‘Dublin’ descriptors for Short Cycle, First Cycle, Second Cycle and Third Cycle Awards.* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)