

**Association Européenne des Conservatoires, Académies de Musique et Musikhochschulen (AEC)
Quality Enhancement Process**



Association
Européenne des
Conservatoires

AEC Programme Review

CoPeCo – Masters in Contemporary Performance and Composition

Site visit: 4-6 September 2013



Review Team:

Henk van der Meulen, Royal Conservatoire The Hague (Review Team Chair)

Mist Thorkelsdottir, Iceland Academy of Arts

Claus FINDERUP, Rhythmic Music Conservatoire Copenhagen

Secretary:

Linda Messas, AEC

Contents

- Introduction..... 3
- Review Visit Schedule..... 4
- 1. Programme goals and context..... 6
- 2. Educational processes 9
 - 2.1 Curriculum 9
 - 2.2. Delivery..... 11
 - 2.3 International perspectives 14
 - 2.4 Learning assessment 14
- 3. Student profiles 17
 - 3.1 Entrance qualifications..... 17
 - 3.2 Student progression and achievement..... 18
 - 3.3. Employability..... 18
 - 3.4 Equal opportunities 19
- 4. Teaching staff..... 20
 - 4.1 Artistic and scholarly activity and qualifications..... 20
 - 4.2 Qualifications as educators 20
 - 4.3 Size and composition of the teaching staff body 21
- 5. Facilities, resources and support 22
 - 5.1 Facilities 22
 - 5.2 Financial resources..... 22
 - 5.3 Support staff..... 23
- 6. Organisation and decision-making processes and internal quality assurance systems..... 25
 - 6.1 Internal communication process 25
 - 6.2 Organisation and decision-making processes 26
- 7. Public interaction 28
 - 7.1 Influence on cultural life 28
 - 7.1 How does the programme engage with wider cultural and musical contexts? 28
 - 7.2 Interaction with the profession..... 28
 - 7.3 Information to potential students and other stakeholders 29
- 8. Strong points and Suggestions for further development..... 31
 - Strong points 31
 - Suggestions for further development 32

Introduction

The visit to the Estonian Academy of Music and Theatre (EAMT) in Tallinn was undertaken in the framework of the LLP ERASMUS Curriculum Development project CoPeCo, a two-year joint master's programme in Contemporary Performance and Composition developed by EAMT, the Royal College of Music in Stockholm (KMH), the National Superior Conservatory of Music and Dance in Lyon (CNSMDL) and the Hamburg University of Music and Theatre (HfMT). CoPeCo is a joint study programme, i.e. a programme to be carried out jointly by several institutions in different countries, and which does not lead to a joint degree.

The Association Européenne des Conservatoires, Académies de Musique et Musikhochschulen (AEC) was involved in the project, with the responsibility to organise an external review of the programme before its first implementation year, in order to provide the four institutions with suggestions for the further development and the improvement of the programme.

As first step in this evaluation process, two experts (Elisabeth Gutjahr, Hochschule für Musik Trossingen, and Claus Finderup, Rhythmic Music Conservatoire) and AEC Chief Executive Jeremy Cox observed the CoPeCo Pilot Week. This event was organised from 12th to 19th December 2012 by the CNSMD in Lyon to test the learning modules and teaching methods drawn up for CoPeCo under real conditions. It involved nine students and teachers from the four institutions and featured workshops, master-classes and courses.

For the second step, an international group of experts was appointed to review the CoPeCo programme and used for this purpose the *AEC Framework Document Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Music Education*, a set of common European standards and procedures for the external review of institutions and programmes in higher music education. Before the site-visit, the CopeCo partners produced a self-evaluation report based on AEC criteria for programme review and a set of appendices. Based on the visit which took place on 4-6 September 2013, and the materials sent to the Review Team beforehand, the present report was produced.

The representatives of the four partner institutions (later on referred to as the CopeCo Team) were

- prof. Helena Tulve, prof. Margus Pärtlas, programme academic leader Taavi Kerikmäe, programme administrator Hanneleen Pihlak (for EAMT)
- programme administrator Charlotte Göransson, programme academic leader Mattias Sköld (for KMH)
- programme administrator Katharina Strauer, programme academic leaders Georg Hajdu, prof. Fredrik Schwenk (for HfMT)
- programme administrator Isabelle Replumaz, and programme academic leader Michele Tadini (for CNSMDL).

The members of the Review Team were chair Henk van der Meulen, Royal Conservatoire The Hague, Mist Thorkeldsottir, Iceland Academy of Arts and Claus Finderup, Rhythmic Music Conservatoire Copenhagen. The Secretary was Linda Messas (AEC).

The Review Team would like to express its thanks to the CoPeCo Team for the organisation of the visit and for welcoming the Review Team in such a friendly and hospitable way. All participants contributed to the establishment of an atmosphere of sincere and fruitful cooperation in which many issues – current situation, problems, strengths and weaknesses - were discussed.

The Review Team would like to express its appreciation for the hard work done by the CoPeCo Team with the production of its self-evaluation report, recognising the challenges of producing a report for a joint programme organised by four institutions, and of using AEC criteria for programme review while the programme was still in its designing phase. The self-evaluation report was found good and interesting. The Review Team could feel a very positive atmosphere between the CoPeCo partners, and could sense the collaborative spirit in which they are working, which gave them the impression of a “wonderful CoPeCo spirit”.

Review Visit Schedule

4th September

Time	Location	Content	Participants
14.30 – 16.30	A202	Preparatory Meeting of the Review Team	Review Team only
16.30 – 17.00	A202	Meeting with EAMT management	EAMT Rector prof. Peep Lassmann, Vice Rector for Development prof. Helena Tulve, Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs and Research, Margus Pärtlas
17.00 – 18.00	A202	Joint introductory session	Review Team Programme Team: EAMT: prof. Helena Tulve, prof. Margus Pärtlas, programme academic leader Taavi Kerikmäe, programme administrator Hanneleen Pihlak KMH: programme administrator Charlotte Göransson, programme academic leader Mattias Sköld HfMT: programme administrator Katharina Strauer, programme academic leaders Georg Hajdu, prof. Fredrik Schwenk CNSMDL: programme administrator Isabelle Replumaz, programme academic leader Michele Tadini.
18.00	Opera Studio (A403)	Performance Event	
19.30		Dinner	

5th September

Time	Location	Content	Participants
9.00 – 09.30	A202	Review Team Meeting	Review team only
09.30 – 11.00	A202	Meeting with	Review Team

		Programme Administrators	Margus Pärtlas (EAMT) Hanneleen Pihlak (EAMT) Head of the Study Department, Jane Kreek (EAMT) Charlotte Göransson (KMH) Katharina Strauer (HfMT) Isabelle Replumaz (CNMSDL)
11.00 – 11.15	A202	Break	
11.15 – 12.45	A202	Meeting with Programme Academic Leaders	Review Team Helena Tulve (EAMT) Taavi Kerikmäe (EAMT) Georg Hajdu (HfMT) Fredrik Schwenk (HfMT) Michele Tadini (CNSMDL) Mattias Skold (KMH)
12.45 – 14.00		Lunch	Review team separately
14.00 – 14.45	A202	Meeting Potential Students	Review Team Potential Student Candidates (EAMT)
14.45 – 15.00	A202	Break	
15.00 – 15.45	A202	Meeting Potential Employers (Estonia)	Review Team Potential employers (Estonia)
15.45 – 16.15	A202	Coffee break	
16.15 – 17.00	A202	Overview of study facilities of KMH, HfMT and CNSMDL	Review Team Partner school representatives
17.00 – 17.30	A202	Tour of the facilities (EAMT)	Hanneleen Pihlak Taavi Kerikmäe/Tammo Sumera (electronic music studio)
17.30 – 18.30	A202	Review Team Meeting	Review Team only
19.30		Dinner	

6th September

Time	Location	Content	Participants
09.30 – 10.30	A202	Review Team Meeting	Review Team only
10.30 – 11.30	A202	Feedback Session	Review Team Programme Team
		Departure	

1. Programme goals and context

1-a. What is the institution's mission, vision or goal?

The self-evaluation report lists the vision and mission of each CoPeCo partner institution [Self-Evaluation Report (SER), pp. 3-5].

The Review Team would like to suggest, in preparation for any future evaluation/accreditation situation, that the descriptions of the partner institutions and their mission and vision are presented in a more analytical way in order to highlight the elements shared by all partner institutions, and especially to demonstrate how the CoPeCo programme relates to them. Such a reflection would also provide the CoPeCo Team with arguments making the case for the continuation of the programme in future, by showing the contribution of the programme to the fulfilment of the institutional mission and vision.

1-b. What are the goals of the educational programme and how have these goals been identified and formulated?

“CoPeCo is a joint masters programme, aiming to integrate the traditionally separate disciplines of contemporary composition and performance and encourage an interdisciplinary approach with the inclusion of other art forms into the curriculum. (...) The programme aims to create a common collaborative platform for composition and performance students (...) and will offer up-to-date specialised education in contemporary music with a focus on live electronics, improvisation, crossdisciplinary interaction and cooperation.” [SER, pp. 5-6].

The CoPeCo programme builds on experiences and results of short-term projects in which the four institutions were involved: two IP projects coordinated by EAMT and involving KMH and HfMT had been realised in previous years, which resulted in the development of modules of improvisation, classical, jazz and contemporary music, which were used to develop the CoPeCo curriculum; in parallel, the CNSMDL was interested in sustaining the examples of joint work between composers and performers, which were being developed in some classes or projects, such as the Summer Academy in Contemporary Music, through a longer-term process [meeting with the CoPeCo Team].

The programme goals are clearly expressed and have been identified through previous short term experiences and projects undertaken by the partner institutions. The Review Team however feels that some key concepts at the core of the programme, such as *contemporary music*, *inter-disciplinary*, *cross-disciplinary*, *musical practice*, *diversity*, *intercultural*, should be defined and further analysed - in terms of their meaning in the programme and the reasons why they are considered as core elements.

1-c. What is the rationale for the programme and what are its unique features?

“The programme’s unique features include:

- Transdisciplinary approach (composition and performance; music and other arts)
- New technology and new media integrated into the programme on the levels of pedagogy and artistic expression
- Mobility built into the core of the programme
- Emphasis on group work and synergy (between students; between students and teachers) [SER, p.6]”

Students met by the Review Team pointed out the following features in the CoPeCo programme which they found attractive:

- The opportunity to work with a group of liked-minded people
- The CoPeCo network (“bringing students to the right contacts”)
- The focus on the musician (as opposed to a distinction between performers and composers)
- The environment which seem to let students realise their ideas
- The interesting cities where the programme will be delivered
- The length of the programme (as opposed to an IP course) [meeting with potential students].

The Review Team believes that CoPeCo’s unique feature lies in its innovative nature, which can be found in two aspects: first, the fact that the cohort stays together throughout the programme while migrating from site to site and the second, that members of the cohort are interchangeably composers, performers, group improvisers, etc., creating their own music, assisting in the performance of their fellow-students' music and generating music collaboratively. There are certainly units or modules of other courses which include such elements too, but it is truly original to find it informing a whole programme. Students met by the Review Team were conscious of this specificity and were certainly valuing it, as well as some other elements of the programme.

Although these innovative aspects are exciting, the Review Team feels that they could also be the source of many unique potential dangers (bad group dynamic, consequences of individuals dropping out during the programme, etc.). The Review Team would therefore like to encourage the CoPeCo Team to explore all possible dangers and prepare some responses/solutions in anticipation.

1-d. Which statistical information is used to support the study programme?

This question is meant for programmes which are operating and is therefore not applicable to the CoPeCo programme, which was not in place at the time of the AEC review. In terms of programme capacity, the “maximum number of study places will be 12, and the lowest number of accepted students 8. Regular intake is planned every second year” [SER, p. 7].

1-e. How was compliance with legal regulation taken into consideration and guaranteed in the development of the study programme?

The CopeCo partners have compared their national and institutional regulations (in the fields of admission process, enrolment, awarding of the degree, issuing of the diplomas and diploma supplements etc.): “The regulations were discussed and the general programme regulations designed accordingly [SER, p.7]”. The Joint Programme Cooperation Agreement signed by all four partners indicates that “each institution shall represent the programme in dealing with the government authorities organizing higher education in its own country and be responsible for the conformity to national legislation of the programme and the academic work taking place on the basis thereof [CoPeCo Cooperation Agreement]”.

Some brief references are made in the Student Handbook concerning the application of various regulations: thus, students are required to submit the application and supporting documents to the institution of their choice “in accordance with the local regulations” [CoPeCo Student Handbook, p.5] and to “pay tuition fees according to the regulations of [their] home institution during all four semesters [idem, p. 12]. The CopeCo Team also gave examples of the difficulty to find common ground when national legislations differ substantially, for example in relation to the grading system and to the character/form to be taken by the research outcome (oral, written, other) within the unit *Independent Project* [meeting with the CoPeCo Team].

In terms of degree awarded, as CoPeCo is a joint study programme (as opposed to a joint degree), students will receive upon graduation a degree certificate and diploma supplement from their home institution only, but together with a certificate stating that they have completed a joint programme, signed by the heads of all four institutions [Student Handbook, pp. 4-6].

The Review Team acknowledges the hard work achieved by the partners, and more specifically the administrative staff, in comparing all national and institutional regulations in order to ensure compliance with these regulations, and in preparing a programme agreement.

Based on the examples given above, the Review Team feels that the information provided to students would benefit from being more transparent in relation to the different national regulations: students could be clearly informed about what these regulations are, how they differ, and which impact this has on the programme. This would also help them to understand the choices which have been made in the programme, and give them a clear framework for their work depending on the institution in which they are enrolled.

Finally, it seems to the Review Team that addressing these differences could result to tackling certain problems. The CoPeCo team is therefore encouraged to explore alternative ways to solve the problems they have identified and which are classified in the “cannot be solved because national legislation differ” category.

2. Educational processes

2.1 Curriculum

2.1-a. How does the curriculum address the institutional mission and the goals of the educational programme?

The following programme aims are mentioned in the self-evaluation report:

- To equip the students with skills in management and entrepreneurship needed for succeeding in the rapidly changing arts market - through workshops in arts management included in the curriculum
- To create links with new music festivals and new performing venues, enabling the students to reach the market already during their training period
- To generate a strong group feeling and synergy between the students created by the dynamics of student and teachers mobility (all students will spend one semester at each partner institution)
- To encourage cooperation and interaction between different nationalities and disciplines,
- To establish strong international networks, share and gain competencies and experience different cultures [SER, pp. 5-6].

“The aim of the curriculum is the creation of a dynamic environment that supports and promotes contemporary musical expression in all aspects including creation, production, performance and relation to the society” [CoPeCo Cooperation Agreement, article 2].

The CoPeCo team explained that the curriculum in Tallinn did include management workshops, lectures about contemporary art, performing in the public space, a seminar about the link with society in Hamburg, a laboratory experience in Lyon (artistic practice for composers or performers) putting students in a real life situation (outside the institution, with a new public...) [meeting with the CoPeCo Team]. The programme coordinators shared their willingness to maintain a high level of flexibility and openness in the programme beyond the content of the programme description (“it is understood that we can offer things outside compared to what is on paper”) [idem].

The CoPeCo Team reported that, in the general context of financial pressures, each institution had had to consider the CoPeCo programme in relation to its other regular activities and to explore all possibilities to integrate it, both in terms of content and administration, into the institution’s ways of working and educational offer, in order to limit the additional workload for the staff members. The content of the CoPeCo programme was therefore the result of a balance between the vision, ambitions and wishes of the programme designers and what could be done in practice (which explains the integration of certain courses in the curriculum, e.g. folk music).

The curriculum is very thinly divided over many subjects, in addition to the Lab and the individual projects, which makes the direct connection with the five programme aims quoted above slightly more difficult. Overall, the curriculum addresses the programme aims in a rather general way, however a common mission of all four institutions needs to be articulated further. The connection between the labs crucial to this curriculum, the individual projects and the added subjects has not sufficiently been drawn..

However, the Review Team was surprised that all the information gathered during the meeting did not appear in the programme documents. Many questions raised by the Review Team on the basis of the programme documents were answered by the CoPeCo Team, which demonstrated that a substantial amount of discussion and reflection had taken place in the partnership about these questions. Thus, the CoPeCo Team is strongly encouraged to add all information that is known and agreed upon to the programme description in order to anticipate questions that both potential and enrolled students may have. For example, the Student Handbook

would be enriched if the following information was added:

- The HfMT has a programme in multimedia composition with a strong focus on video
- The course offer in all institutions depends on the language: students are allowed to follow other courses than the compulsory curriculum, even if it is in other universities, but it may not be in English
- The limited choice of electives, especially in the first year, is meant to facilitate the creation of a group, as it is felt that increasing the amount of electives will increase distance between students
- The reason why some courses such as folk music are integrated in the curriculum and compulsory.

The Review Team feels it would also be relevant to introduce the course description by presenting in broad terms how each of the five programme aims is addressed: in relation to the first aim, the programme documents could mention in which courses management and entrepreneurship are trained over both programme years, and how this will be achieved. For the second aim, how the programme relates to society and how CoPeCo students will be expected to work out in society, etc.

In relation to the CoPeCo Team's desire to maintain a high level of flexibility, the Review Team feels it is extremely important to show this flexibility and openness by mentioning it clearly in the Handbook. If no information or clarification is given, students may consider this as a lack of structure rather than as a sign that there is a high degree of flexibility.

2.1-b. Does the curriculum take into account the various aspects of the 'Polifonia/ Dublin Descriptors' (PDDs) and/ or the AEC learning outcomes?

2.1-c. Where appropriate, is there a connection/ progression between this programme and other cycles?

The intended learning outcomes for the programme are listed on page 3 of the Programme Syllabus, and each course description starts with a list of the skills, abilities and competences the student are expected to have acquired on completion of the course [Programme Syllabus]. "Defining the general learning outcomes of the curriculum was one of the first tasks undertaken during the development process", based on various sources:

1. "Polifonia/Dublin Descriptors and AEC learning outcomes
2. National requirements for learning outcomes for the 2nd cycle
3. The goals of the curriculum/programme and expert reviews of the expected skills and competencies of the future graduates" [SER, p.8].

The Review Team noted that the 'Polifonia/ Dublin Descriptors' (PDDs) and the AEC learning outcomes had been used adequately and that the CoPeCo learning outcomes were in line with requirements of master level programmes.

The Review Team finds very interesting the idea that students are made responsible for reaching their learning outcomes in their own way, which mirrors the students responsibility for their own career and creative production.

2.2. Delivery

2.2-a. How is the programme utilizing different forms of teaching in the delivery of the curriculum?

“Maintaining an open collegial and non-hierarchic atmosphere between tutors and students is one of the main goals of the consortium [SER, p. 27]”. Various teaching forms are mentioned in the Programme Syllabus, such as seminars and practical workshops, practical field work, group-work, presentations, individual tutoring, acoustic ensemble participation, lecture series, whole group, small groups and individual work, research, lectures, debates, reflection on appropriate literature [CoPeCo programme syllabus].

The CoPeCo Team explained that each semester starts with an intensive workshop, with all members of the CopeCo academic team present, leading to a student production. Students then work together each week in the CoPeCo Lab, which represents a place where they are free to make experiments but are supposed to produce an output together. The core elements of the curriculum are indeed the CoPeCo Lab and the student’s artistic project (candidates have to present their project). The Lab takes different forms:

- It requires and provides open space for new ideas and generates a merge of individual artistic projects.
- Students will take part (as a group) in workshops outside the institutions, and go to the professional field (for example in halls and venues having an agreement with the institution, but also in communities, in the nature to work there, or will build instruments)
- Students will be introduced to the work with other art disciplines (e.g. dance in Lyon, theatre in Tallinn) through creative projects [meeting with the CoPeCo Team].

Each institution is responsible to organise its own CoPeCo Lab, and it is expected that the content will develop both with the ideas of students and with a progression from the first to the fourth semester [idem].

As mentioned above, the CoPeCo team pointed out the high level of flexibility in the programme which is, in their eyes, the key innovation [idem]. Students will attend lectures, field sessions, practicing depending on their experiments and the methods which will be used cannot be described/known beforehand [idem]. The CoPeCo Team considers this element as the selling point of the programme but also a challenge [idem]. The Lab will call for new teaching [idem].

The Review Team is generally supportive of the way the curriculum will be delivered. However, the Team feels that several points could be clarified in the documents available to students:

- All the information above, which was given by the CoPeCo Team during the meeting, would be very useful for students to gain a better understanding and a more concrete view of the content of the programme, of the CoPeCo spirit and of what the Lab really is. The description in the programme syllabus should also reflect the enthusiastic tone in which the coordinators expressed the concept of the Lab.
- The intensive workshop at the beginning of each semester could be described more clearly considering the importance this workshop has in a joint programme
- It should be explained that students will be expected to take advantage of the courses, projects and disciplines offered/undertaken in each of the four institutions where they will study, such as dance, theater, movement, video, etc [meeting with the
- CoPeCo Team].
- The approach of openness as regards the programme content and the Lab could be described.

The Review Team feels that a balance will need to be found between a certain necessary framework and a

flexible and open approach: the CoPeCo Team will need to ensure that there will be interesting projects with added-value and is therefore encouraged to assess this approach and how it works in practice - including by staff among themselves.

2.2-b. How are students offered opportunities to present their work?

“Public performances are an important part of CoPeCo studies and during each semester. (...) It is envisaged that a student performance will take place already approximately two weeks after the start of each semester [SER, p.11].

The opportunities will be provided by each of the four institutions, either directly in the form of regular events, concerts formats, festivals, etc. organised by the institutions themselves (and which may involve projects undertaken in cooperation with regular students of these institutions), or through the institution’s cooperation with external festivals and venues.

The Review Team did not investigate further in this area of enquiry. It seems that a strong focus will be put on performance outside the institution, but that many opportunities will be determined in the course of the programme, making it difficult to plan.

2.2-c. Are there formal arrangements for students to receive academic, career and personal guidance?

- For academic guidance, including the Master Degree projects, students will be assisted by the programme co-director of their home institution (referred to as tutor);
- Personal/administrative guidance will be provided by the programme administrator (the administrative representative) of the home institution or of the institution where the student is studying when a problem occurs; Guidance of administrative procedures regarding study affairs will be provided by the Study departments of each institution;
- Personal career and business development counselling is provided by institutional career consultants [SER, p.11].

In practice, students tend to develop strong bonds with their main teachers, so the career advisor may very well be the main subject teacher, and general career guidance rather an additional possibility for assistance [meeting with the CoPeCo team]. The CoPeCo Team explained that students will be followed by the tutor from their home institution during the whole study period and that clarification will need to be given to students in relation to the respective roles of the tutor and the main subject teacher [idem].

In terms of career advice, examples were given to demonstrate that the support to students would be relevant (also in the field of contemporary music):

- In Tallinn, the person responsible for career advice is the one delivering the arts management seminar. In addition, a career platform has been developed in cooperation with institutions in Finland and Sweden which will provide a useful network.
- When students will be completing their fourth semester in Hamburg, they will be able to receive assistance from the Career Center of the Hochschule (<http://www.cc-hfmt-hamburg.de/kontakt/>)

There are formal arrangements for academic, career and personal guidance which will be offered to students, both by their home institution and by the three host institutions. In order to clarify the terminology used and avoid students’ confusion between all the persons involved in assisting them, it is suggested to develop a glossary of terms (e.g. define the words tutor, programme coordinator, academic coordinator, as well as their roles). Some clarifications concerning how frequently students and their tutors will be able to meet could also be provided.

The Review Team would also like to stress the importance of the communication between all these actors, which is one of the keys for success of a joint programme (see also section 6.1 about internal communication). Beyond the most involved actors in the programme, the career offices could also connect in order to enhance the relevance of the assistance provided.

Once the applicants have been selected for the programme, it is crucial to put them in contact, and possibly even to establishing a sort of pre-programme, i.e some sessions with the home tutor before the programme starts in order to already offer them some training in terms of soft skills and entrepreneurship. The team must ensure that the students from all the institutions get to meet their tutor at the same time. The review team would like to recommend that regular contact points between students and tutors over the course of the two years are set up.

2.2-d. What role does research play within the programme?

“The main role of research is to support and reflect the artistic production of the students. (...) During the 1st semester, the students are required to define/specify their research topic that is connected to their artistic project [SER, p. 12]. Students are introduced to the principals of research and methods during the first semester through a special seminar (within the course "Masters Degree Project") at the EAMT, are expected to demonstrate the progress at the end of each semester and will present their artistic project at the end of the programme along with written research [idem].

CoPeCo programme syllabus mentions that “the artistic development work, which occurs within this project, shall be documented by an independent project exam or a presentation in other form if it corresponds to the character of the degree project.(...) The course is assessed by five different part examinations, given by oral seminars and artistic seminars or concerts.” [Syllabus, Description of the *Independent Project*]. This formulation has been used to ensure that the nature of the output would remain open in order to respect the different national regulations on this issue and also to encourage students to innovate. Most of the local regulations require written outcomes, which can be a research thesis, a reflection on a process of artistic development, an analysis, etc. The CoPeCo partners therefore tried to find some common ground, rather than to write about the differences of regulations [meeting with CoPeCo Team].

The link between the CoPeCo Lab and the emergence of artistic research was also mentioned, with the idea that the framework of research helps to bring a certain focus to the Lab [meeting with the CoPeCo Team].

The Review Team supports the role given to research in the programme. It is suggested that the national regulations about the nature of the research output are explained in the documentation for students in order to provide them with clear background information. The CoPeCo Team is also encouraged to describe and articulate the nature of their expectations for this output.

2.3 International perspectives

2.3-a. *Is there an international strategy for the programme?*

2.3-b. *Is the programme participating in international partnerships?*

2.3-c. *To what extent do the curriculum and the educational processes offer international perspectives?*

“The CoPeCo programme is designed to be an international partnership with built-in mobility. The consortium combines four music academies of four countries. International cooperation, mobility and international student body and administrative /academic staff are therefore essential features of the programme. The official language of CoPeCo will be English. The programme offers international perspectives by (...) providing the skills necessary for, after graduation, being capable of easily adjusting to the changing demands of the global arts scene and taking a proactive and creative approach in leading an international freelance career as well as working within the framework of arts institutions and organizations [SER, p13].”

The programme is by nature international. It offers the students a strong international network platform and shall have a knock-on effect on each institution involved at various levels: international perspectives within the institution, amount of courses taught in English, level of cooperation between teachers from the four institutions, amount of international students studying in each institution, etc. The high level of internationalisation of the programme will be a strong argument in a grant application (e.g. within the Creative Europe programme), especially if the link between educational practice and education is highlighted.

If the programme is evaluated in the framework of national accreditation procedures, it is advised to describe how this programme is contributing to the international strategy of each institution.

Finally, the international character of the programme is also reflected in the Student Handbook, in which information has been gathered to assist students with immigration procedures, tuition fees, scholarships, student support and counselling, accommodation, insurance and health care in each of the four countries where the programme takes place.

2.4 Learning assessment

2.4-a. *What are the main methods for assessment and how do these methods support the achievement of learning outcomes?*

“Assessment criteria are always derived from the expected learning outcomes set in the course syllabus. It is the obligation of each institution and professor of the subject to guarantee that the evaluation corresponds to the learning outcomes of the subject.

Different assessment methods and assessment situations will be used:

- Presentation of artistic production/creative work (Improvisation, CoPeCo Lab, Instrument Design, Initiation to Dance Movement Improvisation with Dancers, Artistic Practice for Performers, Artistic Practice for Composers,)
- Written exam/test (Analysis of Contemporary Music, Sound Synthesis, Introduction to Electronic and Electroacoustic Music, Orchestration/Instrumentation, Fundamental Pedagogy and New Audiences, Analysis, Musicology, Culture and Media Management)
- Group discussion, interview (Arts Management Seminar)
- Oral presentations (Art and Environment, Sound Synthesis, Introduction to Electronic and Electroacoustic Music, Fundamental Pedagogy and New Audiences, Musicology) [SER, p.14].

The evaluation of the Lab is based on the observation of the teacher during the semester. Thus, in Lyon, three teachers will be responsible to observe what will happen in the Lab and how students get involved in

this “control free” area, to assess the group social skills and to give advice [meeting with the CoPeCo Team].

The CoPeCo Team indicated that thoughts had been given the balance between the individual and the group in the assessment: it is expected that the group will build the performance programme together (and possibly perform together), the group should therefore be apprehended in the assessment [meeting with the CoPeCo Team]. A scheme with learning outcomes related to the final event was shown to the Review Team, which included a learning outcomes about cooperation, collaboration, etc. [idem].

In relation to the assessment results, “Since the students in this programme stay in one institution only for one semester, all planned courses should be passed within that semester. If a student is not able to pass the course exam before the end of the semester, one of the following options can be applied:

- the student returns for a short time to the institution where the failed exam was taken to retake the exam
- the programme co-directors give permission for substituting the course that was not passed to another course in another institution; the course that was chosen as a substitute should have similar learning outcomes with the originally planned course. [SER, p.16].”

Appeal procedures have been discussed by the CoPeCo partners: in most of the cases, the regulations applied will be those of the institution where the problem is encountered (including appeal rules); if the problem is of a more general matter (such as a student not being able to continue the programme), it is the regulations of the home institution which apply [idem].

The Review Team commends the diversity of assessment methods used and the connection made with the learning outcomes. The documents available and the meeting held with the CoPeCo team give a clear indication that assessment methods, learning outcomes, and their relationship have been discussed by the partners.

However, some clarifications would need to be added in the Student Handbook: it should be made very clear to students that in case they do not pass the course, the first option above will be at their own expenses. In addition, the second option mentioned above (the possibility to choose substitute courses) should also be mentioned in the Student Handbook.

The Review Team recommends that, for reasons of transparency, assessment to some extent is harmonised between the four institutions (in terms of form and format) and that a choice is made in relation to the assessment method (rather than leaving it open to oral or written work).

The Review Team strongly recommends the introduction of peer-assessment in the programme (e.g. in the group activities such as the Lab) in parallel to teachers evaluation. This would also reinforce the programme aim of maintaining a non-hierarchical atmosphere in the programme.

It is essential that soft skills and non-discipline-specific skills are assessed and learning outcomes need to be defined for the group as part of the outcome of the courses. The CoPeCo Team seems to have started this process and is encouraged to continue it and to publish the group learning outcomes in the programme documents. A general assessment shall then be needed, taking these group assessment criteria (“super learning outcomes”) into consideration.

In relation to the feedback from teachers, the Review Team strongly advises the CoPeCo partners to systematically provide students with a written assessment: written feedback is helpful for the further

development of the students and will facilitate communication among teachers about the students' results and development. This will also contribute to the consistency of evaluation throughout the whole programme.

Finally, the Review Team would also like to suggest that teachers from the other CoPeCo institutions are involved as external examiners in the CoPeCo examinations.

2.4-b. What kind of grading system is being used in examinations and assessments?

“Students are assessed on a pass-fail basis at the end of each course (...). In addition to the formal examination grade, the academic instructors are expected to give all students detailed oral or written feedback regarding the level of achieving the learning outcomes. Less formal assessment can take place throughout a course as part of the learning process and way of providing feedback on a student's work. Most courses are assessed through a combination of coursework and final examination [SER, p14]”.

Because the grading systems are so different from a partner institution to another, it was not possible to find common ground for the marks [meeting with the CoPeCo Team]. The system applied is the one from the institution where students are studying at the time of the assessment, and the final results for the programme is expressed in terms of a pass/fail result [idem].

The Review Team is concerned that a mark may be needed when students wish to apply for a PhD in other institutions in Europe after completing the CoPeCo programme. The Team would therefore like to advise a reconsideration of this decision.

3. Student profiles

3.1 Entrance qualifications

3.1. In what ways do the entrance requirements assess the artistic, technical, academic and mental capacities of the applicants to accomplish the various aspects of the study programme within the expected timeframes?

The admission procedure is described extensively in the self-evaluation report (pp. 13-15) and in the Student Handbook (pp. 5-8). The entrance examination takes place in two rounds:

- 1) Submission of documents (including CV, motivation letter and the student's degree project proposal) and portfolio to the institution where the student has decided to apply. Applicants must choose to apply as performers, composers or composers/performers.
- 2) Live audition at the institution chosen by the student [Student Handbook].

“The applicants are asked to provide evidence of their academic qualification (at least Bachelor's Degree or equivalent) and artistic and technical quality. As a precondition, they should have some experience in performing and/or composing contemporary instrumental, vocal, electroacoustic or live-electronic music and possess at least an elementary understanding of new technologies or be willing to bring their knowledge to an acceptable level within the first study semester [SER, p. 14].”

The CoPeCo team will first admit students every other year in order to see a whole CoPeCo cycle but also for financial reasons [meeting with the CoPeCo team]. The CoPeCo team indicated that the harmonisation of the examination requirements and procedures was a challenge and had required a substantial amount of work; admission criteria were being worked on at the time of the AEC Review [idem].

Financial limitations prevent the programme from organising admission procedures in one of the institutions, which would enable the team to test students in a group situation and evaluate the compatibility of students; for the first admission procedure, teachers in each institution will evaluate students' potential to work in a group and share information with the other teachers; the programme team will then evaluate how the procedure and the group-testing element could be improved in future application rounds- within the available means [idem].

In relation to the acknowledgement of prior knowledge, the CoPeCo team explained that students will generally be encouraged to take all courses, but exceptions may be possible on an individual basis [idem]. It is important to ensure that the group will be kept together as much as possible, but adjustments will need to be made due to the diversity of students' levels in the various fields, which will involve more individual attention, and possibly an exchange between more and less advanced students. Flexibility and further adjustments will be needed [idem].

The Review team could observe that the CoPeCo team had analysed in depth matters concerning the admission procedures, including issues specific to joint programmes and issues specific to CoPeCo needs, and was well aware of the challenges ahead.

The Review Team would like to suggest that the first two years of the programme are implemented as a pilot project, where students would have a pioneer role in shaping the future programme. The fact that the first admission procedures were described as needing to be tested and complemented in future years supports this suggestion. Indeed, presenting the first programme cycle as a pilot project is expected to decrease the pressure on the project team and ensure that all the individuals involved will be more flexible when confronted with

problems.

3.2 Student progression and achievement

3.2. *How are student progression and achievement followed within the programme?*

“The continuous development of the Master Degree Project will be followed and supervised by the appointed home institution tutor who stays in regular contact with the student throughout the semesters. The gradual progress of the artistic projects in the form of live performance and the development of the written reflection will be evaluated at the end of each semester according to home institution’s requirements. All teachers are responsible for providing feedback to the student about his/her progression in their specific course [SER, p.16]”.

Each partner will collect students’ records and pass them on to the next institution and a staff member from the Estonian Academy will be responsible for transferring all students’ records throughout the programme [meeting with CoPeCo partners]. In addition, the tutors will be in contact with the pedagogical team in each institution and the teachers from all four institutions will inform each other about the development of the students [idem]. It was also mentioned that in this programme, compared to other programmes, students have the opportunity to get a new start and to prove themselves every semester [idem].

The Review Team supports the way the transfer of records and feedback is organised and the decision to clearly allocate this responsibility to a staff member. As mentioned earlier, the Review Team is in favour of written feedback in all situations, in order to facilitate this transfer.

One of the challenges of the programme is to ensure that students improve, and therefore that there is progression from one semester to another, including in the Lab. This challenge needs to be kept in mind and followed up in programme reviews.

3.3. Employability

3.3-a. *Are graduates successful in finding work/building a career in today’s highly competitive international music life?*

The CoPeCo programme does not aim to prepare students for a particular profession but to train them to be able to meet the challenges of a multimedia society and to compete with other free lancers [meeting with the CoPeCo Team], to easily adjust to the changing demands of the arts scene and to be prepared to work within the framework of arts institutions [SER, p. 16].

The potential employers and/or programme partners met by the Review Team stressed the importance of providing students with real life experiences during the programme, and expressed their willingness to cooperate with the programme on this aspect [meeting with potential employers] – see also section 7.2. They pointed out the importance of providing students with the opportunity to collaborate with great personalities inspiring them, and highlighted the need to encourage students through the programme to fine-tune their higher artistic education and to develop an outstanding creative ambition with and artistic content and message [idem].

Although not all institutions do have alumni follow-up practices in place [meeting with the CoPeCo team], it is planned after the first implementation year of the programme that “the employment and further professional engagement of the graduates will be closely monitored and considered as an additional quality assurance mechanism of the programme [SER, p.16]”.

This question cannot be answered as the CoPeCo programme has not started to operate yet. However, it is clear that the CoPeCo team has placed the preparation for the profession at the core of the programme in its reflections and has initiated a network of external partners in order to put students in real-life situation during their master programme. The Review Team found the contribution of the external partners very valuable and would like to encourage the CoPeCo partners to involve these partners/potential employers further in the development of the programme.

In terms of contact with alumni, the Review Team supports the initiative to put in place a system enabling the collection of feedback from alumni from the first years of operation, not only for quality assurance purposes, but also to build up a database in order to support the existence of the programme in future. The CoPeCo website, for example, could include a space which could enable the creation of an active community in the creative sphere.

3.4 Equal opportunities

3.4. To what extent are equal opportunities taken into consideration?

The self-evaluation report describes the practices and policies in place in each institution with regards to equal opportunities.

All four institutions have developed or are currently developing policies in order to ensure equal opportunities. The Review Team would like to recommend that a short statement on this issue is written for the programme to be included on the website or in the Student Handbook, possibly with some information on the situation in each institution. This could contribute to the promotion of the programme but also to increasing transparency for potential students.

4. Teaching staff

4.1 Artistic and scholarly activity and qualifications

4.2 Qualifications as educators

4.1-a. *Are members of teaching staff active as artists and/or scholars/researchers?*

4.1-b. *Is there an institutional policy and practice to support and enhance the teaching staff's artistic and scholarly/research production?*

4.2-a. *Does the institution ensure that all members of the teaching staff have appropriate qualifications as educators?*

4.2-b. *Are policies and strategies in place for continuing professional development of teaching staff?*

“High-level competence in new music performance and analysis has been gathered from all partner schools. The members of the teaching staff are active as artists or researchers [SER, p.17]. It is the responsibility of each institution to guarantee the appropriate qualifications of their teaching staff involved in the CoPeCo programme. The CoPeCo teachers are members of the regular staff of the partner academies, thus their qualifications correspond to the institutional requirements and national education systems, which can be considered a quality guarantee for the programme in general [idem, p.19]. The teaching staff of the institutions is encouraged to participate in various national and international training courses, seminars and conferences contributing to the continuing professional development of individual teachers [idem, p.20]”.

The self-evaluation report describes briefly the practices and policies in place within each institution with regards to the teaching staff's artistic and scholarly activity, their artistic and pedagogical qualifications and competences, and the opportunities they are provided for continuing professional development.

Most of the questions asked by the AEC framework in this part are referring to institutional policy and therefore not fully applicable to the present case of a joint programme. In case of future accreditation process, the Review Team would like to recommend that the institutional information is given in a more consistent way in order to ensure that the same amount and type of information is given for each institution (this conclusion will also help the AEC develop a special set of questions for joint programmes more adapted to the current exercise).

Based on the CVs provided to the Review Team, it is evident that all members of the teaching staff involved in the CoPeCo programme are active as artists and/or researchers. There seem to be willingness in each institution, and concrete practices in place in some of them to support this activity and the continuing professional development of the teaching staff.

Beyond these institutional situations, the Review Team would like to encourage the CoPeCo partners to reflect on the special needs of the CoPeco programme in terms of teaching staff, its needs and its skills and competences. Although the key word put forward by the CoPeCo team is flexibility, including in the teaching methods, it still appears as necessary to the Review Team that the CoPeCo teaching staff is given the opportunity to think about teaching methods, to exchange about how they teach, how they implement this flexibility in their teaching, how they deal with assessment matters, and to learn from each other.

In addition, the Review Team would like to suggest that a course/workshop on the art of mentoring is offered to teachers involved in the programme, especially in the pilot phase. This could be done by having all the teachers meet and exchange on their mentoring practices, and could also address the difficulties linked with teaching in English. This aspect is particularly important in the pilot phase and might be financed as part of the institution's own staff development policies.

4.3 Size and composition of the teaching staff body

4.3-a. Is the number of teaching staff adequate to cover the teaching volume and curriculum within a frame of acceptable quality?

4.3-b. Does the teaching staff cover all areas and disciplines included in the study programme?

4.3-c. Does the composition of the teaching staff allow flexible adaptation to new professional requirements?

“The subjects included in the curriculum are taught by the new music specialists of the partner academies. The consortium also plans to invite guest professors and practitioners of different fields to conduct practical workshops and lectures to offer an even more versatile and up-to-date approach [SER, p.20] [and to] guarantee a dynamic flow of knowledge as well as a comprehensive coverage of the specialty and a variety of teaching methods [idem, p.21].

The self-evaluation report provides an overview/mapping of the teaching staff members involved in delivering courses, per main area taught/addressed in the programme [CoPeCo Teaching Staff Overview].

The CoPeCo team seems confident that there is sufficient expertise in the current staff involved in the programme to ensure its delivery as intended. The invitation to invite guest professors and practitioners certainly represents a way to ensure that all areas of the programme, including any newly identified field, may be covered rapidly. The CoPeCo team will need to ensure that needs for such guests will be identified (for example through student feedback) and met.

The Review Team appreciated the CoPeCo Teaching Staff Overview provided and would like to recommend that such a list is included in the material for students, as it provides a very clear overview of the teaching staff's subject area, courses taught, teaching hours. This list could also be further developed and used as a tool to map the music fields the programme wants to address and check internally and regularly how these fields are covered by the teaching staff from the various institutions.

5. Facilities, resources and support

5.1 Facilities

5.1-a. *Are the building facilities (teaching and practice studios, classrooms, rehearsal places, concert venues, etc.) adequate to support curriculum requirements?*

5.1-b. *Are the instruments (pianos, organs, percussion, etc.) of a number and standard adequate to support curriculum requirements?*

5.1-c. *Are the computing and other technological facilities adequate to support curriculum requirements?*

5.1-d. *Is the library, its associated equipment (listening facilities, etc.) and its services adequate to support curricula/programmes requirements?*

“The consortium compiles the leading music academies of the regions; therefore the conditions for providing high-level study in terms of facilities are fulfilled. However, full integration of the group of CoPeCo students and a high-level delivery of the programme in all four institutions requires specific technical devices, but the studios might not be sufficiently equipped for the studies of a full semester and the existing devices may not be sufficient for sharing with other departments, students and creative activities organized in the institutions. Therefore the programme co-directors are compiling a “programme survival-kit” with a list of technical devices needed to see what equipment could be shared between the institutions and if it is needed to invest in some complementary material [SER, p.21-22]”.

The self-evaluation report describes the facilities available in each institution for all students (building, instruments, technological equipment and library). The Review Team received a written description of the electronic music studios of the KMH in Stockholm and visited the studio at the EAMT in Tallinn.

The Review Team would like to recommend that, for any future accreditation procedure, a clearer distinction is made in the self-evaluation report between the general features applicable to the institution as a whole, and the elements specifically applicable to the CoPeCo programme. Pointing out which facilities exactly will be at the disposal of the CoPeCo students when they come could also be a promotional tool on the website.

The concerns shared by the CoPeCo team in its report in relation to the possible insufficiency of existing devices reinforce the Review Team’s suggestion that the programme could operate as a pilot project in its first two implementation years. This would ensure that students show more understanding if lack of facilities are noticed which hinder the delivery of the programme, and that they will contribute to finding solutions as part of their involvement as pioneer students.

5.2 Financial resources

5.2-a. *What are the programme’s financial resources and how do they sit within the overall budget of the institution?*

5.2-b. *Is there long-term financial planning?*

The programme’s financial resources are the institutions’ budgets, tuition fees where applicable and possibly some other sources [SER, p.25]. “Each institution will fund the part of the studies taking place at their institution from their own budget [idem]”.

The lack of sustainable financing is presented in the self-evaluation report as “the main problem area” [idem]. The CoPeCo Team indicated that the costs for running the CoPeCo programme in each institution have been kept to an affordable amount, but shared that their main concern was to find ways to support student mobility (e.g. travel costs from an institution to another each semester, living expenses during each of the three other semesters) [meeting with the CoPeCo team]. The CoPeCo partners expressed their

willingness to make efforts to support students, which is also stated in the CoPeCo Joint Programme Agreement, and to find a system which would assist all students equally [idem]. The idea of creating a foundation was mentioned [idem].

The students met by the Review Team indeed shared their hope/expectation that support would be provided for their mobility costs [meeting with potential students].

The Review Team understands the difficult situation faced by the CoPeCo partners, who are confronted with the need to adjust the CoPeCo programme features to the resources available and abandon some of their initial ideas and ideals due to the confrontation with the financial reality. Several adjustments in the programme depend on resources/ e.g. holding all admission procedures in one venue only, organising a big meeting with all CoPeCo teachers, etc.

The Review Team supports the determination of the CopeCo partners to look for additional sourced of funding, and suggests that they connect with all their professional partners (current and potential) with the aim to build a consortium and apply for a culture grant. Initially each partner would have to show their contribution to the consortium, and the subsidy could cover the extra needs. However it is hoped that in the long-term these cooperation schemes could result in the professional partners co-financing CoPeCo (e.g. by covering the expenses of the CoPeCo students who would be part of their programming).

5.3 Support staff

5.3-a. Is the technical and administrative staff adequate to support the teaching, learning and artistic activities?

5.3-b. Are policies and strategies in place for continuing professional development of technical and administrative staff?

The support staff directly involved in the CoPeCo programme is composed of four administrative representatives (programme administrator), appointed respectively in each of the four institutions, one of them being appointed, by the programme Board, as CoPeCo general administrative coordinator [SER, p.25]. In addition, all programme activities are supported by the staff of the international relations offices, study departments, libraries and IT departments of all institutions during the semester in which the institution is hosting the CoPeCo students [idem]. “Each institution is responsible for the continuing professional development of its technical and administrative staff (LLP Erasmus Staff Training etc).”

The CoPeCo team pointed out to the reflections and thoughts put into ways of integrating administratively the programme into each institution’s administrative practice and ways of working, in order to avoid creating extra workload which could not be handled by the various institutions [meeting with the CoPeCo Team]. Negotiations were necessary to convince the administration in each institution of the need for this additional programme [idem].

There is staff responsible to assist the programme delivery, and a substantial amount of work has been dedicated by the CoPeCo Team in ensuring that this programme would not create extra workload and costs. The first implementation year of the programme will show if the technical and administrative staff support is adequate.

The Review Team would like to commend the strong commitment of all staff members met during the site-visit, who strongly believe in the project and have been investing a substantial amount of time, work and energy to overcome the numerous challenges. It was evident to the Review Team that the CoPeCo representatives they met form a strong and tight group, and have succeeded in building a high level of trust

6. Organisation and decision-making processes and internal quality assurance systems

6.1 Internal communication process

6.1-a. Is there an internal communication strategy for the programme?

The self-evaluation report describes the two main “internal academic and administrative communication channels of the programme [SER, p25]”:

- The programme co-directors, responsible for “academic consulting, monitoring and supervision, programme content-related communication with the students and with one-another regarding the academic progression of the students, artistic projects, master degree projects etc. [idem]”
- The administrative representatives, responsible for “daily communication link between the students and the programme in terms of administrative support – guaranteeing a smooth flow of information, providing mobility support, offering personal counselling and problem solving etc [idem]”.

“The groups will communicate via e-mail and regular Skype meetings. In-person meetings will be organized both internally within each institution and on the level of the whole partnership [idem]”.

The CoPeCo team indicated that communication was a key element in the success of the programme [meeting with the CoPeCo team]. Although real meetings between the academic leaders will be rare due to the lack of funding schemes, the latter will be in constant contact by email and Skype to ensure that each of them is involved in the processes taking place in the three semesters outside his/her institution: for example, the responsible for individual research and project will be in contact with the artistic pedagogical team in each institution, staff members teaching the same subject in each institution will plan together and regularly discuss the organisation of the course for the whole programme duration in order to ensure a progression across the semesters [idem].

As far as the communication with students is concerned, the channels used will be the Student Handbook, where students will find detailed information about academic and practical matters, the programme webpage (with general overview of the programme, news and developments) as well as e-mails with regular updates and announcements [SER, p.26]. The CoPeCo Team also wished to involve the students in sharing responsibility for addressing communication gaps with the pedagogical team [meeting with the CoPeCo team].

Finally, the CoPeCo team mentioned its project to create a web platform with various functions: a management and coordination tool to run the programme between the four institutions, both at pedagogical and administrative levels, a pedagogical tool for students, as well as an artistic and communication tool [idem]. It has not been decided yet how the platform will be administered and by who.

The Review Team feels that the internal webportal/online platform is crucial for the success of the programme, given that communication in such a setting is challenging and that a constant flow of information needs to be in place. The Review Team would therefore like to recommend that the tasks to develop, maintain and monitor this platform be clearly identified and allocated.

More generally, internal communication as a whole would benefit from being allocated, as a full responsibility, to one of the administrative bodies mentioned in the *Table demonstrating the administrative bodies of the programme and their responsibilities* [SER, p. 26]. The body/person in charge would ensure that communication actually takes place at the various levels, for example that teachers do indeed communicate regularly to discuss their practice, reflect on it and on possible ways to improve/adjust/develop their delivery

methods.

Finally, the Review Team would like to emphasize two elements stated in other sections above, which are linked to the area of communication:

- The Review Team strongly supports the partners' plan to start each semester with an intensive workshop (see section 2.2-a.). This is a crucial element for the communication between students and teachers.
- Systematic written feedback to students would facilitate communication among teachers about the students' results and development. (section 2.4-a.).

6.2 Organisation and decision-making processes

6.2-a. *How are the curriculum and the teaching and learning processes supported by:*

- *the organisational structure of the study programme*
- *curriculum decision-making process?*

As mentioned above, the self-evaluation report contains a *Table demonstrating the administrative bodies of the programme and their responsibilities*, which describes how the programme is organised [SER, p.26].

In terms of curriculum decision-making process, the following bodies/persons are involved:

- The programme Board, composed of the programme co-directors, one student or alumni representative, an AEC representative, one employers' representative, meets at least once a year and is responsible for general management and development of the curriculum and assurance of programme quality;
- The programme co-ordinators are responsible for coordinating the education pursuant to the curriculum in the home institution

The CoPeCo cooperation agreement includes a *Procedure for introducing changes to the curriculum*, where the responsibility lies either with one of the institution (in line with its own internal regulations) or with the programme Board, depending on the type of change foreseen. "Proposals for changes received from institutions, students, teachers or other interest groups shall be discussed and approved by the programme Board, whereupon the new version of the programme must be approved by all institutions. The new version of the programme shall enter into force for the new study group to be accepted. Changes in material elements of the curriculum in the middle of the study period are not possible [SER, p.27]".

The organisational structure of the study programme is clearly presented in the self-evaluation. The table mentioned above could be inserted also in the Student Handbook in order to provide students with a complete overview of how the programme is organised beyond their direct contact persons.

The curriculum decision-making process is addressed in the Joint Programme agreement. The procedure in place, which leaves a certain freedom to each institution, seems to be pragmatic and to allow for rapid changes if needed. The possibility for students, teachers or other interest groups to suggest changes is important and part 4.7 of the Student Handbook could indicate that changes suggested by students in their feedback will be discussed by the Programme Board.

The Review Team was surprised to see that AEC was mentioned as a member of the Programme Board. This needs to be discussed with the AEC Office.

6.3 Internal quality assurance systems

6.3-a. *What quality assurance and enhancement systems are in place?*

6.3-b. *How are staff, students and former students involved in these systems?*

6.3-c. *To what extent are these systems used to improve the educational programme and continuously analysed and reviewed?*

“The learning processes, teaching methods, subjects and their content, the study programme as a whole and its specialty parts etc. will be continuously analysed. Curriculum process, student progress and other academic matters will be reviewed, discussed and assessed on the level of teachers of the separate courses and programme co-directors, both institutionally and on the level of the whole consortium. The results of the assessment will be discussed at the annual Board meeting. (...) [R]egular feedback on the study programme and activities will be gathered from students both through informal discussions and in the form of evaluation questionnaires distributed at the end of each semester. (...) After the first cohort of CoPeCo students has graduated, monitoring the employment (level) of the graduates will be considered as an additional evaluation and quality assurance mechanism of the programme. [SER, p. 27]”

The CoPeCo team mentioned that the programme was still in a designing process and shared their ambition to improve and adjust it, during the first two years, following this first implementation period but also constantly in future [meeting with the CoPeCo team]. The Pilot Week organised in December 2012 was a way of testing the programme (in a very condensed form) in order to make adjust it before its official launch [idem]. The potential employers met indicated that they had read the programme syllabus and had been approached for collaboration, but had not been invited to give input on the programme content at that stage [meeting with potential employers].

The quality enhancement system is based on the opportunity for various actors to give feedback and make recommendations for improvement of the programme. The feedback and suggestions are then discussed by the programme Board. The Review Team supports the high importance given to students in the process, both in the phase of giving feedback and suggestions, and in the decision-making phase.

In the framework of its recommendation to launch the first programme cycle a pilot project, the Review Team suggests developing focus groups with the students enrolled in the pilot phase, as well as with administrative and academic staff involved in the pilot, in order to collect their feedback and progressively adapt the programme delivery. Presenting the first programme cycle as a pilot project is expected to enable the project team to collect input from all sides at an early stage and to share their goal of improving the programme.

Given that the programme takes place in four different countries, having an employers' representatives from one of the countries in the programme Board may not be sufficient to collect feedback from the various partners and potential employers. The CoPeCo team is encouraged to ensure that feedback from all partners involved in the programme is collected regularly, either by organising a meeting between each institution and its partners or by collecting a written feedback, which will be analysed by the programme Board.

7. Public interaction

7.1 Influence on cultural life

7.1 How does the programme engage with wider cultural and musical contexts?

“It is expected that by educating contemporary music specialists with a high proficiency in working with new technologies and necessary skills for collaborating within the field of music and across disciplines, the programme will affect the contemporary music performing community and different types of audiences (existing contemporary music audience, but through cross-discipline projects also dance audience, live- and visual art audiences, new media consumers etc) [SER, p. 27]”.

The main ways of engaging with cultural and musical contexts will be:

- The public festival and concert performances integrated in the studies (see section 2.2-b), including the live performances of the artistic Master Degree Projects at the end of the fourth semester in Hamburg;
- Links created by the programme with new music festivals and performing venues of the four countries;
- Active contacts and partnerships with various international academic, cultural and professional networks and organizations [idem].

7.2 Interaction with the profession

7.2-a. How does the programme communicate and interact with various sectors of the music profession in order to keep in touch with their needs?

7.2-b. Is there a long-term strategy for the development of the links with the profession?

“The consortium foresees various means for interaction between the profession and the programme. Several artists active in the field of new music / potential employers/ colleagues of the future graduates are connected to the academies/programme as faculty members or (external) project partners. Guest professors and practitioners of different fields will be invited to give practical workshops throughout the studies. The final degree projects shall be monitored by a committee headed by a recognized expert in contemporary music invited from outside the institutions. The degree projects will be performed publicly at contemporary music festival, thus reaching different groups of audiences, practitioners, decision makers. An employers’ representative belongs to the programme Board. Employers’ assessments on the theoretical knowledge and practical skills of the graduates are therefore available and can be directly applied in adjusting the study programme and improving the quality assurance system. [SER, p.28]”

The Review team met a representative of the composers union, a representative of a new venue in Tallinn, programming and initiating new projects and producing a festival, and a representative of a concert agency, operating in concert halls in the four principal Estonian cities as well as in St-Petersburg. All three representatives shared their interest in giving opportunities to young composers, by promoting new music events, opening residency programmes, commissioning projects every year, etc. So far the collaboration in place includes master classes delivered at EAMT by the artists engaged with these partners, and a close connection through EAMT teachers who are active as performers [meeting with potential employers].

The invited representatives were already collaborating with other departments of the EAMT, and expressed their full support for this new programme, which was considered as bringing the education to a higher level, better equipping composers and players, and contributing to the employers’ own goal to

enhance innovation and bring different kind of artists together [idem]. The invited representatives expressed their readiness to help and coach students from the programme, to serve as external advisors, as well as to contribute to organising a second performance in Tallinn of the final CoPeCo projects performed in Hambourg (e.g. possibly by covering flight costs and expenses) [idem]. The partners shared the theme they had planned to follow in 2015: *International musicians performing Estonian music*, and indicated their willingness to involve as many young peers as possible and to provide them with an open space [idem]. Finally, they shared their interest in some of EAMT courses offered as lifelong learning opportunities.

The other members of the CoPeCo Team also reported on the discussions they had had with potential external partners, such as the Groupe Spécialisé d'Acoustique Musicale (GSAM) in Lyon, which has accepted to be closely connected to the programme by offering master classes, welcoming students when the Group has ensembles in residence, possibly also by providing some technical support and offering residence to some programme alumni [meeting with the CoPeCo Team].

The Review Team found the meeting with the partners/potential employers very positive and their support for the programme and readiness to be involved very encouraging.

All CoPeCo partners seem to have been very active in working on establishing collaborations with professional organisations to provide students with various opportunities to connect with the profession. However, the Review Team observed with surprise that none of the CoPeCo documents was referring to these external partners, and would therefore like to suggest that an appendix is included in the study guide listing the partners the programme is working with, institution by institution. This would contribute to making the programme more attractive and would be useful for students to develop networks before their arrival at the next institution. A notice could mention the indicative character of this list, as partners and possibilities offered to students may change during the course of the programme.

The Review Team would like to stress the importance of identifying the programme partners in order to build a cultural network/consortium, which would be beneficial for both sides. This would increase the chances of winning EU cultural grants (see section 5.2).

Finally, the programme's potential to provide a lifelong learning course offer may also be useful to apply for grants and could be advertised more explicitly in the programme documents and website.

7.3 Information to potential students and other stakeholders

7.3-a. Is the actual course programme consistent with the information given to the public?

7.3-b. What are the communication strategies for the publication of information to the public?

“The main communication channel of the programme for publication and dissemination of information is the programme webpage (www.copeco.net)”, which will have three functions:

- 1) “a [...] communication platform for potential future applicants and for dissemination in higher education institutions in the field of music”;
- 2) “an internal communication platform for the programme tutors and students admitted to the programme (communication regarding the development of collaborative projects, master degree projects, uploading of study materials)” ;

- 3) “an external dissemination platform for the public (News section giving an overview of the developments and progress of the programme, video recordings and overviews of the artistic collaborative projects/master degree projects etc. [SER, p.28].”

The programme syllabus and the Student Handbook are available on the website [CoPeCo website].

Strategies to communicate information to the public will also involve the distribution of flyers at relevant fairs and events, as well as any public events organised by the four CoPeCo partners or involving these partners [SER, p.28].

The first question is not applicable, as the programme has not been launched at the time of the review. The information given to the public about the course content is quite detailed, as the programme syllabus and the Student Handbook are available online, but suggestions have been made in other sections of this report aiming at ensuring that complete and transparent information is provided to the public.

The Review Team finds the CoPeCo website clear and well structured. However, the CoPeCo Team is encouraged to explore ways to make the website more attractive and to clearly and truly present to potential students what CoPeCo is (e.g. what it contains, what its ambitions are, what the CoPeCo philosophy is – many aspects which are self-evident for the CoPeCo partners but need to be clarified for potential students or possible founding bodies). Thus, one of CoPeCo’s aims to provide students with a network (with teachers, students from the programme and from non-CoPeCo students in all four institutions, as well as with externals) could be referred to more explicitly; the flexibility in terms of programme content, methods of teaching and assessment, which is put forward as a key element of the programme by the CoPeCo team could be described; the teachers involved in the programme delivery could be listed, etc – see recommendations from previous sections).

The Review Team would like to point out the need to ensure that students “get” what they have read in the documents and would therefore like to recommend that all national specificities which have an impact on students’ situation (due to the implementation of different national laws) are clearly mentioned and explained in the Student Handbook (e.g. in relation to the final project) in order to avoid any misconceptions.

8. Strong points and Suggestions for further development

The Review Team found in CoPeCO a unique, special and very worthy initiative. The Team also noticed a great spirit and comradeship between the partners, which is essential to develop projects implying such close cooperation between institutions and individuals. It is clear from the documents read and from the various meetings held during the site-visit that a lot of work and thought has been put into the CoPeCo project. It is an ambitious adventure and, although much work still needs to be done, it feels important to the Review Team that the CoPeCo partners start offering the programme in the timeframe they had initially envisioned, in order to keep the momentum.

This summary contains two sections; firstly a list of items which stand out as being strong relative to the AEC criteria, secondly an outline of the areas in which further improvement seems needed.

Strong points

- Unique feature: this programme does answer a need/a question and will certainly generate students' interest. It is innovative in the way it deals both with composition and performance in relation to musical practice and with the aim of building networks. The concept of the CoPeCo Lab, where students are free to try out their personal project is very powerful.
- Internationalisation: the programme is by nature international, offers the students a strong international network platform and shall have a knock-on effect on each institution involved at various levels: international perspectives within the institution, amount of courses taught in English, level of cooperation between teachers from the four institutions, amount of international students studying in each institution, etc.
- Master level: The Polifonia Dublin Descriptors and AEC Learning Outcomes have been used in the elaboration of the programme's outcomes and the learning outcomes of the programme clearly reflect second cycle expectations. Based on the documents read by the Review Team, the programme indeed corresponds to a Master programme bridging a bachelor education to the professional world.
- Staff commitment and cohesion: the commitment of both academic and administrative staff members is to be commended. All staff members involved strongly believe in the project and have been investing a substantial amount of time, work and energy to overcome the numerous challenges. It was evident to the Review Team that the CoPeCo representatives they met form a strong and tight group, and have succeeded in building a high level of trust.
- Link with professional organisations: all CoPeCo partners seem to have been very active in working on establishing collaborations with professional organisations to provide students with various opportunities to connect with the profession: terms of collaboration involve for example master classes for CoPeCo students, a possible residence for CopeCo graduates, performance opportunities, etc. In addition, the organisations met in Tallinn have expressed their interest in promoting the CoPeCo programme as a lifelong learning opportunity for musicians willing to undertake further studies.
- Workshops at the start of every semester: the Review Team strongly supports the partners' plan to start each semester with an intensive workshop. This is a crucial element for the communication between students and teachers.

Suggestions for further development

Re-writing the documentation about the programme:

The Review Team's main recommendation is that the CoPeCo partners rewrite the documents (programme syllabus and Student Handbook). The Review Team feels it would be very beneficial to commission an external expert with the task to present more explicitly the programme content and its unique features, the initiatives and ambitions behind it, the DNA of the course and how it combines elements which are not usually combined, while at the same time ensuring consistency. Many aspects of the programme are self-evident in the partners mind but need to be clarified to really attract students and convince funding bodies.

Recommendations on how the text could be rewritten are as follows:

- A concise analysis of the current practice contemporary music is needed to introduce the documents, as well as texts addressing the rationale of the programme, its aims, vision and spirit. The ambitions and the philosophy of the CoPeCo programme shall be presented.
- Specific references to the networks and contacts which will be offered to students within the programme should be added. Even if these text parts will have to be reviewed often (and possibly adjusted before each new semester), a list of partners each institution is working with would be an important promotional tool (e.g. as appendix in the Student Handbook, including the contact details to enable students to set up contacts early on), as well as the list of teachers involved in each course element, and, possibly in future, examples of alumni paths.
- In order to clarify the terminology used, it is suggested to develop a glossary of terms (e.g. define the words tutor, programme coordinator, academic coordinator, as well as their roles).
- Course descriptions could be more precise and concrete in order to give students a picture of the programme as close to reality as possible. Although the documents provided to the Review Team seemed overly general, the verbal explanations given during the meetings were often clear and detailed, showing that additional information could easily be provided about some of the courses. Examples:
 - Course contents could be more detailed (while still highlighting that a certain level of flexibility will apply), and mention for example:
 - that management workshops in Tallinn may include lectures about contemporary art, performing in the public space, and how this would connect to the aims of the programme;
 - that Hamburg has a programme in multimedia composition, with video strongly featured;
 - that intensive workshops are organised at the start of each semester.
- The literature list could be updated and more versatile, also referring to forums and websites
- The differences in local regulations which have an impact on the programme delivery, outputs or assessment could be identified and pointed out so that students would be aware of differences depending on the institution in which they are enrolled.
- Harmonisation of language in general and partner “branding” profiles in specific
- Career guidance to be further described

Launching the first programme cycle as a pilot:

- It seems more prudent and beneficial to the Review Team to start implementing the first two years of the programme as a pilot project. This should not have an impact on the degree delivered at the end of the programme (cf. the Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice – NAIP, which first operated as a pilot project with institutions delivering Master degrees). Communication around this pilot project could highlight that the first students will have a pioneer role in shaping the future programme.
- The Review Team recommends that a project coordinator is chosen for this first pilot phase, and made responsible for ensuring a smooth traffic in terms of mobility of students and staff, but also in terms of knowledge exchange about students, their progress and their results, etc.). The coordinator would also control the material posted online.
- The Review Team suggests developing focus groups with the students enrolled in the pilot phase, as well as with administrative and academic staff involved in the pilot, in order to collect their feedback and progressively adapt the programme delivery. Presenting the first programme cycle as a pilot project is expected to decrease the pressure on the project team, ensure that all the individuals involved will be more flexible when confronted with problems, and enable the project team to collect input from all sides at an early stage and to share their goal of improving the programme.
- The Review Team recommends that clear distribution of practical tasks among the partners is decided (eg. Internal web portal, external communication).

Making the curriculum more reflective and specialised, and improving the way it is described:

- Overall, the Review Team would like to suggest that a branding profile is defined for each institution (and therefore) each semester. Thus, the general course description could be enhanced by some short promotional descriptions of each institution's profile.
- Although it is key for the CoPeCo partners to ensure a high level of flexibility in terms of what will happen in the course - so that students are able to shape the programme -, the Review Team believes that some kind of 'guiding thread' should be in place (e.g. through the definition of generic competences to be developed by students.) so that the programme does not only depend on unpredictable elements: students need be informed about what they apply for, as well as about the limits of the flexibility offered, it is important that the programme attracts the right students. A balance should be found between the partner's wish to be fully flexible and the need for a certain framework to ensure that the course provides students with the announced learning outcomes.
- The Review Team would like to encourage the CoPeCo partners to describe the kind of competences which will be addressed in each course and to connect them with the learning outcomes.
- The Review Team would like to recommend that more elements of reflection are introduced in the curriculum, in order to provide students with tools to empower themselves.
- This could take the form of a portfolio including evaluation elements, with students being asked to reflect on ways in which they could improve, to analyse everything they do (for example, in the CoPeCo Lab) and to find out successful elements on which to build their following projects.
- It feels very important to the Review Team that students are given the same responsibility as teachers to reach their learning outcomes (while being granted a large amount of freedom/flexibility in terms of the way these outcomes shall be reached – as envisioned by the CoPeCo team). This feature would highly strengthen the innovative aspect of the CoPeCo programme and train students to be responsible for their own career and creative production.

- The Review Team would also like to support a comment heard from one of the professional organisations' representative, who suggested a wider openness of the programme towards other influences, such as scientific or philosophical inputs.
- The Review Team feels that the way the CoPeCo Lab will work needs to be envisioned more precisely and described with more clarity:
- It is essential to ensure that students improve, and therefore that there is progression in the Lab from one semester to another. The soft skills to be developed by students need to be identified and articulated.
- It would also be attractive to students if some elements of the Lab - i.e. building blocks - could be identified in each institution and presented in the course description. The project team could identify these blocks in preparation for the pilot phase.
- The Review Team feels it is essential that students are encouraged to look beyond the existing performance venues in order to reinforce the link with society and to ensure true innovation in the programme. Venues such as city squares, old peoples' homes, supermarkets, etc. could be considered. The Review Team also believes it would be important to encourage students to engage with the general public as well as speaking to educated festival- and concert going audiences.

Special attention shall be given to tutoring as this is the core link in any joint programme:

- See the remark above on the terminology and the need to explicit the roles of tutors, main subject teachers and artistic coordinators, and their responsibility towards students' progress.
- The Review Team suggests that a course/workshop on the art of mentoring is offered to teachers involved in the programme, especially in the pilot phase. This could be done by having all the teachers meet and exchange on their mentoring practices, and could also address the difficulties linked with teaching in English. This aspect is particularly important in the pilot phase and might be financed as part of the institution's own staff development policies.
- Once the applicants have been selected for the programme, it could be helpful to put them in contact, and possibly even to establishing a sort of pre-programme, i.e some sessions with the home tutor before the programme starts in order to already offer them some training in terms of soft skills and entrepreneurship.

Further developing the assessment methods and criteria:

- The Review Team recommends that assessment for reasons of transparency to some extent is harmonised between the four institutions (in terms of form and format).
- The Review Team strongly advises the CoPeCo partners to systematically provide students with a written assessment: written feedback is helpful for the further development of the students and will facilitate communication among teachers about the students' results and development. This will also contribute to the consistency of evaluation throughout the whole programme.
- The Review Team strongly recommends the introduction of peer-assessment in the programme (e.g. in the group activities such as the Lab) in parallel to teachers evaluation.
- It is essential that soft skills are assessed and learning outcomes need to be defined for the group in addition to the outcome of the courses. A general assessment shall then be needed, taking these group assessment criteria ("super learning outcomes") into consideration.
- The partners are encouraged to make a decision about issuing a final grade in view of international practice.

Further developing the communication tools and brainstorming about arguments in favour of the programme:

- External communication: the website needs to be carefully thought of in order to be as attractive as possible and to clearly and truly present to potential students what CoPeCo is.
- Internal communication: the internal webportal/online platform is crucial for the success of the programme as communication in such a setting is challenging and a constant flow of information needs to be in place.

Advocacy for the programme:

1. It is important to show to the four institution's leaders and to grant providers that this programme will bring the international dimension closer to the institutions involved and lead to real internationalisation.
2. The programme's potential to provide a lifelong learning course offer may also be useful to apply for grants
3. In the long run, students could also be advocates for the programme.

Assisting academic staff with the (further) development of innovative teaching methods:

- CoPeCo is an innovative programme, which success will also highly depend on the implementation of innovative teaching practices by the academic staff. It is crucial that teachers communicate to discuss their practice, reflect on it and on possible ways to improve/adjust/develop their delivery methods, and that there is a person responsible for ensuring that this communication takes place.

Resources

- The Review Team suggests that the CoPeCo partners connect with all their professional partners (current and potential) with the aim to build a consortium and apply for a culture grant.
- Initially each partner would have to show their contribution to the consortium, and the subsidy could cover the extra needs. However it is hoped that in the long-term these cooperation schemes could result in the professional partners co-financing CoPeCo (e.g. by covering the expenses of the CoPeCo students who would be part of their programming).
- It is crucial to really create structural partnerships outside the institution. Professional partners could be asked to take part of the admission and/or the examination committee.

Other potential risks identified:

- The programme is very Western European Arts Music centred. If this is the programme team's choice of, the vocabulary used in the text describing the programme and course should be adjusted and terms such as 'diversity of culture' avoided. If the programme is aimed at addressing a global context, more attention needs to be given to non-European cultures.
- The Review Team had the impression that the partners see the CoPeCo project as a solution to escape problems encountered in their home institution. It is certainly positive to be aware of the programme's potential in opening new horizons, but the way this programme may influence back into all the institutions could also be further explored and stressed upon.
- The fact that each institution takes responsibility for its own students seems to be a convenient solution, but could also be counter-productive: the students are part of a group and are entitled to be treated in the same way; transfer complications may also need to involve coordinators in all institutions.