

MUSIQUE QUALITY ENHANCEMENT



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme



Introduction to the MusiQuE Peer-Reviewers Training Session

- Why this workshop?
 - offering elements of training and professional development
 - provide further information about MusiQuE
- For whom is it?
 - potential and confirmed MusiQuE peer-reviewers
 - open to all staff members of higher music education institutions – experienced in QA or not

Workshop programme

9:00 - 9:30	Plenary	Welcome and introduction A general introduction to MusiQuE, its structure and its review procedures.	M1
9:30 - 10:30	Plenary	Preparation, procedures and paperwork The roles and responsibilities of Peer-Reviewers during MusiQuE review procedures.	M1
10.30 - 10.50	Coffee break		

Workshop programme

10:50 - 12:00	Training session in groups	Acting as a Peer-Reviewer (Role-play) Group 1 & 2	Working as part of the team Group 3 & 4	M2, M3 & R4
12:00 - 13:00	Lunch break			
13:00 - 14:10	Training session in groups	Acting as a Peer-Reviewer (Role-play) Group 3 & 4	Working as part of the team Group 1 & 2	M2, M3 & R4

Workshop programme

14:10 - 15:00	Plenary	Plenary discussion and conclusions Presentation of the MusiQuE Board and feedback.	M1
---------------	---------	--	----

MusiQuE – Music Quality Enhancement

- An independent European-level subject-specific external evaluation body
- Its aim:
 - assist institutions in quality enhancement
 - improve quality of higher music education as a whole
- MusiQuE takes over and develops AEC review responsibility (29 reviews since 2008)
- Various services with one philosophy

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

Working groups with representatives of AEC members:

- 2002-2004: 'Music Study, Mobility and Accountability' project with NASM
- 2006-2007: first review criteria and procedures
- 2007-2014 (Polifonia projects): fine-tuning criteria and procedures, formulating standards
- 2 AEC-wide surveys showing broad support
- 2011: AEC Quality Enhancement Committee founded
- **7 October 2014: establishment of MusiQuE as an independent legal entity**

Why MusiQuE – Music Quality Enhancement?

- Don't leave Quality Enhancement to the bureaucrats
- Don't leave Quality Enhancement to the accountants
- Don't leave Quality Enhancement to the politicians

Why MusiQuE – Music Quality Enhancement?

- MusiQuE wants to find subject-specific, self-controlled solutions
- Costs should remain as low as possible, let's challenge the 'quality assurance industry'
- Quality Enhancement in music is different with a specific concept of quality

Concept of Quality

- Tension between ‘academic standards’ and ‘educational quality’
- Music sector has always been strong on musical/artistic standards, but not so on ‘Educational quality’
- MusiQuE brings both together and can suggest tools to support both aspects

MusiQuE services

1. Quality enhancement processes for institutions, programmes and joint programmes
2. Accreditation procedures for institutions, programmes and joint programmes
3. Joint procedures with national quality assurance and accreditation agencies
4. Quality Assurance Desk for institutions and programmes.

Principles of MusiQuE reviews

- Respecting the special characteristics of higher music education
- Bringing a European/international dimension to the procedure
- Encouraging institutions to reflect on their own practice, development and challenges
- Assisting them in the enhancement of their quality by focusing on learning and experience-sharing
- Striving towards a higher level of objectivity (involvement of international review teams)
- Striving for the improvement of higher music education
- Adjusting to very diverse national situations

MusiQuE structure

- MusiQuE Board
- MusiQuE staff
- Reviewers (peers and students)

The notion of 'peer' in peer-review

- Nobody knows better how to evaluate the issues in question as those who are doing the same job themselves somewhere else
- *Peer* means: someone like you

Peer-reviewers roles in different reviews

- QE procedures: advisory
- Accreditation: formal accreditation decision
- Joint procedures with national agencies
 - Agency's own rules often apply
 - Non-musicians in the team (sometimes the chair)
 - Formal impact of the evaluation results possible
 - Peers asked to write part of the report or full report
- All: language often a challenge

What makes a good peer-reviewer?

- Peers should show respect and understanding of
 - What has been achieved
 - Cultural diversity
 - Context
- But they should also be open about their opinions ('Critical friends')
- To be a good expert depends much on your attitude

Preparation, procedures and paperwork

MUSIQUENHANCEMENT
QUALITY

The roles and responsibilities of Peer-Reviewers during MusiQuE review procedures.



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme



Structure of the session

- A - Before the review
 - List of documents
 - Read a self-evaluation report
 - Prepare the first review meeting
- B - During the review
 - Guidelines and code of conduct
- C - After the review
 - Writing report process
 - Final outcome of the review

A. Before the review: documents

- MusiQuE tools and documents
 - Questionnaire for peers invited to review institutions/programmes
 - MusiQuE Framework Document including the review standards
 - European Standards and Guidelines (ESG)
 - Review schedule
 - Meeting sheets
 - Template for the experts' report
- Documents sent by the institution
 - Self-evaluation report and annexes



A. Standards: Areas Reviewed

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

(...) 2.3 Assessment (...)

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

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard

- a) What are the main methods for assessment and how do these methods show the achievement of learning outcomes?
- b) Are the assessment criteria easily accessible to and clearly defined for students and staff?
- c) What kind of grading system is being used in examinations and assessments?
- d) Are students provided with timely and constructive feedback on all forms of assessments?

Supportive material/ evidences

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

A. Before the review: schedule

Time	Session	Participants
13:00-14:00	Lunch	Review Committee
14:00-16:00	Preparatory meeting	Review Committee
16:00-16:30	Break	Review committee
16:30-18:00	Meeting with the management of the institution	Review Committee <u>Management team and senior academic faculty</u> Director Deputy-Director Senior Associate Director Head of Composition Head of Piano Studies Head of Strings
18:00-19:00	Guided tour - Review of the facilities (studios, concert venues, practice facilities, libraries etc.)	Review Committee <u>Management team</u>
19:15-21:00	Dinner	Review committee <u>Representatives of the institution</u>

		Resources Head of Music Library Manager, Academic Studies Associate Director, Admissions & Student Affairs Associate Director, Concerts & Events Lecturer/ Assistant Director, External Relations Assistant Director, Strategic Planning and Research
12:00-12:45	Meeting with members of the relevant boards	Review Committee <u>Members of relevant boards</u> Vice Provost, University Vice Provost, University Chairman, Governing Board
13:00-14:00	Lunch	Review committee
14:00-15:00	Review committee meeting	Review committee
15:00-16:00	Session on research/ teaching and learning	Music Technology Sonic Arts Music History Theory and Composition Cello Studies
16:00-16:40	Visit of classes / or concert Chamber music coaching Senior recital (Flute) Music in the Global Context (General Education Module)	Review Committee
16:40-17:00	Break	
17:00-18:30	Meeting with faculty	Review committee <u>Faculty</u> Head of Violin Studies Music Theory Ear-training, World Music and Professional Development Music Theory Head of Viola Studies Assistant Professor, Piano

A. Before the review: schedule

Time	Session	Participants
09:15-10:30	Meeting with representatives of the profession	Review Committee <u>Representatives of the profession</u> General Manager, Symphony Orchestra Orchestra Manager, Symphony Orchestra Programming Officer, Concert Hall Principal, Music School
10:30-11:00	Break	
11:00-12:00	Extra session if needed by the experts	Review Committee
12:00-13:30	Lunch	
13:30-14:30	Meeting with former students	Review committee 4-5 former students
14:30-16:30	Committee meeting - Preparation of the feedback meeting and of the report	Review Committee
16:30-17:00	Feedback to the institution	Review Committee <u>Leadership of the institution</u> <u>Governing Board members</u>
19:00	Dinner	Review committee

A. Before the review: reading the self-evaluation report

- The Self-evaluation report: a short, analytical and comprehensive statement of the institution's view of quality and strategic management
- Provision of quantitative and qualitative data

A. Before the review: analysing the self-evaluation report

- How to read a self-evaluation report (SER) efficiently?
 - impossible to read every line from the report
 - impossible to check all the criteria

A. Before the review: Questions to consider when reading the SER

○ Questions to consider:

- Does the SER contain the descriptive elements and information needed to come to a valid judgment? Which complementary information do you need?
- Which areas, operations and functions deserve special attention?
- What are its norms and values, the mission and goals?
- What are the organisational characteristics of the institution, i.e. governance structures, and its key activities and to what extent are these in line with the norms and values?
- Does the institution know whether its activities and organisational structures meet the institution's objectives?

A. Before the review: analyzing a self-evaluation report. Exercise

- Each group prepares itself in 10 minutes as a Review Team
- Analyze 1 of the 2 Fictive self-evaluation reports
- Formulate questions using the meeting sheets

A. Prepare for the review visit: analyzing a self-evaluation report

- Questions and answers



B. During the review: guidelines

- Role of the Secretary
- Role of the Review Team Chair
- Role of the Other Reviewers (Peers and Student)

B. During the review: code of conduct

- No conflict of interest
- Data confidentiality
- Fruitful dialogue
- Respect of the local culture of the institution
- Consideration of the objectives and strategies of the institution with the help of the standards – mission driven

C. After the review: template for the peer-reviewers report

- Introduction
- Review Visit Schedule
- 1-8. Report based on the MusiQuE standards
- 9. Summary
- If accreditation => proposal for accreditation

C. Outcomes

- Quality Enhancement Process
- Accreditation procedure
- Joint procedure with national agency

Coming next:

- Coffee break until 10:50
- 2 Workshops 4 groups:
 - How to act as a Peer-Reviewer (Role-play) (groups 1 & 2)
 - How to work as part of a team (groups 3 & 4)
- Lunch break at 12:00
- Groups rotating at 13:00
- Final session together at 14:10

Being a member of a MusiquE peer-review team

MUSIQUENHANCEMENT
QUALITY

Final plenary session



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme



Structure of the session

- Feedback from the group sessions
- Presentation of the MusiQuE Peer-Reviewers Register
- Presentation of the MusiQuE Board
- Concluding remarks

A. Feedback and discussion session

- Which challenges have you encountered?
- What have you learned?
- ...

B. The MusiQuE Peer-reviewers register

- MusiQuE recruits every year new Peer-reviewers
- Criteria:
 - an appropriate qualification (degree or professionally-oriented diploma) and recognised expertise in relevant areas
 - broad knowledge of the teaching and learning models and methods relevant for music education
 - candidates should have taken the Peer-reviewers training

C. MusiQuE Board

- 5 members
- Partner organisations:
 - AEC (3 members)
 - the European Music Schools Union (EMU – 1 member)
 - Pearle*-Live Performance Europe (the Performing Arts Employers Associations League Europe – 1 member).

C. Role of the Board

- Consider requests from institutions or programmes for MusiQuE processes
- Design MusiQuE processes
- Confirm the composition of review teams
- Receive and assess reports from reviews
- Confirm the final outcome and (in accreditation procedures) the accreditation decision
- Monitor the Register of Peer-Reviewers
- Monitor the internal quality assurance process within MusiQuE
- Oversee financial matters
- Promote MusiQuE's external relations

C. Become an AEC mandated Board member

- An open call for a new AEC mandated members will be launched in Spring 2016
- Interested individuals apply to AEC Council by 1st June
- AEC Council studies the applications at its autumn meeting + AEC GA is asked to endorse the Council's recommendation
- MusiQuE Board selects the candidate based on the recommendation from AEC Council

Concluding remarks

MUSIQU
QUALITY ENHANCEMENT



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme



MusiQuE's future development

- MusiQuE as the 'go-to' provider for review and accreditation in music
 - Completion of EQAR (European Register of Quality Assurance Agencies) registration to do formally recognised accreditation procedures in various countries
- Standards for pre-college training and music teacher training being developed and tested
- Supporting procedures in multi-disciplinary institutions with various performing arts disciplines

Finally...

- MusiQuE is all about:
 - Being accountable and also focused on improving ourselves
 - Being mission-driven
 - Confirming the international reality of our profession
 - Strengthening credibility of the sector by showing this is something we can organise ourselves
 - Being in control ourselves of developments in Quality Assurance

MusiQuE – Music Quality Enhancement

Website : www.musique-qe.eu

Request a MusiQuE review? Contact us!

info@musique-qe.eu

THANK YOU!

MUSIC
QUALITY
ENHANCEMENT



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme



AEC