

Doc. 300.3.1/1

Date: 13 February 2020

External Evaluation Report

(Programmatic within the framework of
Departmental Evaluation)

• **Higher Education Institution:**
European University Cyprus

• **Town:** Nicosia

• **School/Faculty:** School of Humanities, Social and Education
Sciences

• **Department:** Arts

• **Programme(s) of study - Name**

Type in **Level Field** the level of each the programme (Bachelor, Master, PhD)

Programme 1 – BMus (8 semesters, 240 ECTS, Cycle 1)

In Greek:

«ΜΟΥΣΙΚΗ (Πτυχίο)»

In English:

MUSIC (B.Mus.)

Language(s) of instruction: English

Programme 2 – MMus (3 semesters, 90 ECTS, Cycle 2)

In Greek:

Μουσική (ΜΕΤΑΠΤΥΧΙΑΚΟ)

Μουσική Παιδαγωγική

Εκτέλεση

Σύνθεση

In English:

Music (Master of Music)

Language(s) of instruction: English

Programme 3 – PhD (6 semesters, 180 ECTS, Cycle 3)

In Greek:

ΜΟΥΣΙΚΗ (Διδακτορικό)

In English:

Music (Ph.D.)

Language(s) of instruction: English

The present document has been prepared within the framework of the authority and competencies of the Cyprus Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education, according to the provisions of the “Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Higher Education and the Establishment and Operation of an Agency on Related Matters Laws of 2015 to 2019” [N. 136 (I)/2015 to N. 35(I)/2019].

A. Introduction

This part includes basic information regarding the onsite visit.

The onsite visit took place on 10 and 11 February 2020. The assessors met with the Head of Department, Programme Co-Ordinators, full-time teaching staff, specialist scientists, collaborators, the Dean, Vice Rector, undergraduate and graduate students. The assessors toured the library, and all parts of the departmental space.

B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Prof. Dr Csaba Kutnyánszky	Vice President of Education	Liszt Ferenc Academy of Music
Univ.-Prof. Michael Posch	Dean, Faculty of Music	MUK Music and Arts University of the City of Vienna
Prof. Mark Everist	Professor of Music	University of Southampton
Stella Lemonari	Student representative	University of Cyprus
Name	Position	University
Name	Position	University

C. Guidelines on content and structure of the report

- *The external evaluation report follows the structure of assessment areas.*
- *At the beginning of each assessment area there is a box presenting:*
 - standards which are relevant to the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG)*
 - some questions that EEC may find useful.*
- *The questions aim at facilitating the understanding of each assessment area and at illustrating the range of topics covered by the standards.*
- *Under each assessment area there are quality indicators (criteria) to be scored by the EEC on a scale from one (1) to five (5), based on the degree of compliance for the above mentioned quality indicators (criteria). The scale used is explained below:*

1 or 2:	Non-compliant
3:	Partially compliant
4 or 5:	Compliant

- *The EEC must justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.*
- *It is pointed out that, in the case of indicators (criteria) that cannot be applied due to the status of the HEI and/or of the programme of study, N/A (= Not Applicable) should be noted and a detailed explanation should be provided on the HEI's corresponding policy regarding the specific quality indicator.*
- *In addition, for each assessment area it is important to provide information regarding the compliance with the requirements. In particular, the following must be included:*

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

Strengths

A list of strengths, e.g. examples of good practices, achievements, innovative solutions etc.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

A list of problem areas to be dealt with, followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.

- **The report may also address other issues which the EEC finds relevant.**

1. Study programme and study programme's design and development (ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.8, 1.9)

Standards

- *Policy for quality assurance of the programme of study:*
 - *has a formal status and is publicly available*
 - *supports the organisation of the quality assurance system through appropriate structures, regulations and processes*
 - *supports teaching, administrative staff and students to take on their responsibilities in quality assurance*
 - *ensures academic integrity and freedom and is vigilant against academic fraud*
 - *guards against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against the students or staff*
 - *supports the involvement of external stakeholders*

- *The programme of study:*
 - *is designed with overall programme objectives that are in line with the institutional strategy and have explicit intended learning outcomes*
 - *is designed by involving students and other stakeholders*
 - *benefits from external expertise*
 - *reflects the four purposes of higher education of the Council of Europe (preparation for sustainable employment, personal development, preparation for life as active citizens in democratic societies, the development and maintenance, through teaching, learning and research, of a broad, advanced knowledge base)*
 - *is designed so that it enables smooth student progression*
 - *defines the expected student workload in ECTS*
 - *includes well-structured placement opportunities where appropriate*
 - *is subject to a formal institutional approval process*
 - *results in a qualification that is clearly specified and communicated, and refers to the correct level of the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area*
 - *is regularly monitored in the light of the latest research in the given discipline, thus ensuring that the programme is up-to-date*
 - *is periodically reviewed so that it takes into account the changing needs of society, the students' workload, progression and completion, the effectiveness of procedures for assessment of students, student expectations, needs and satisfaction in relation to the programme*
 - *is reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders*

- *Public information (clear, accurate, objective, up-to date and readily accessible):*
 - *about the programme of study offered*
 - *the selection criteria*
 - *the intended learning outcomes*
 - *the qualification awarded*
 - *the teaching, learning and assessment procedures*
 - *the pass rates*
 - *the learning opportunities available to the students*
 - *graduate employment information*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *What is the procedure for quality assurance of the programme and who is involved?*
- *What is done to reduce/prevent academic fraud? How does the higher education institution address fraud cases?*
- *Who is involved in the study programme's design and development (launching, changing, internal evaluation) and what is taken into account (strategies, the needs of society, etc.)?*
- *Please evaluate a) whether the study programme remains current and consistent with developments in society (labour market, digital technologies, etc.), and b) whether the content and objectives of the study programme are in accordance with each other?*
- *Do the content and the delivery of the programme correspond to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF)?*
- *How is coherence of the study programme ensured, i.e., logical sequence and coherence of courses? How are substantial overlaps between courses avoided? How is it ensured that the teaching staff is aware of the content and outputs of their colleagues' work within the same study programme?*
- *How does the study programme support development of the learners' general competencies (including digital literacy, foreign language skills, entrepreneurship, communication and teamwork skills)?*
- *What are the scope and objectives of practical training in the study programme (where appropriate)?*
- *What are the scope and objectives of the foundation courses in the study programme (where appropriate)? What are the pass rates?*
- *How long does it take a student on average to graduate?*
- *How has the feedback from students, alumni, employers, teaching staff been taken into account? Provide some concrete examples.*
- *Has the study programme been compared to other similar study programmes when designed, including internationally, and to what purpose? Explain.*
- *Is the graduation rate for the study programme analogous to other European programmes with similar content?*
- *How is it ensured that the actual student workload is in accordance with the workload expressed by ECTS?*
- *What is the pass rate per course/semester?*
- *What are the opportunities for international students to participate in the study programme (courses/modules taught in a foreign language)?*
- *Is information related to the programme of study publicly available?*

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

1 or 2: *Non-compliant*
3: *Partially compliant*
4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		1 - 5		
1.	Study programme and study programme's design and development	[BMus]	[MMus]	[PhD]
1.1	Academic oversight of the programme design is ensured.	5	5	5
1.2	Internal Quality Assurance processes safeguard the quality and the fulfillment of the programme's purpose, objectives and the achievement of the learning outcomes. Particularly, the following are taken into consideration:			
1.2.1	The programme webpage information and material	4	4	4
1.2.2	The procedures for the fulfillment of undergraduate and postgraduate assignments / practical training	5	5	5
1.2.3	The procedures for the conduct and the format of the examinations and for student assessment	5	5	5
1.2.4	Students' participation procedures for the improvement of the programme and of the educational process	5	5	5
1.3	The knowledge (theoretical and/or factual) gained is of the appropriate level to which the programme of study corresponds to, according to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF).	5	5	5
1.4	The skills (cognitive and practical) obtained are of the appropriate level to which the programme of study corresponds to, according to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF).	5	5	5
1.5	Samples of assignments and exams ensure the ability of the learner to apply knowledge and skills autonomously and with responsibility, according to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF).	5	5	5
1.6	The content of the programme's courses reflects the latest achievements / developments in science, arts, research and technology.	3	3	3

1.7	Students' command of the language of instruction is appropriate.	5	5	5
1.8	The learning outcomes and the content of the courses are consistent.	5	5	5
1.9	The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) is applied and there is correspondence between credits, workload and expected learning outcomes per course and per semester.	3	3	5
1.10	The higher education qualification and the programme of study conform to the provisions for registration to their corresponding professional and vocational bodies for the purpose of exercising a particular profession.	n/a	n/a	n/a

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

The assessors recommend the consideration of a senior thesis and corresponding composition portfolio to match the final recital. The assessors recommend review of the academic coherence of the performance concentration in the MMus. The provision of PhD guidance varies greatly according to field: it is fully compliant in musicology and music education. For composition, the PhD is compliant except that the assessors recommend the reconfiguration of two of the three 10-ECTS modules in order to obtain a better training for composers. The same applies to PhD candidates in the performance, but in this area the assessors had serious reservations about the ability of the department to offer suitable supervision without the recruitment of a full-time specialist in research-led performance and the acquisition of suitable library resources.

Provide information on:

1. Employability records

The assessors received no data for employability.

2. Pass rate per course/semester

The assessors received no data for pass rates.

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

Findings for [Bmus]

In the BMus, the assessors found that the courses are not structured according to the modules prescribed in the Bologna agreement.

Findings for [MMus]

In the MMus, the assessors found that the courses are not structured according to the modules prescribed in the Bologna agreement.

Findings for [PhD]

The assessors found that the provision in musicology and music education was compliant, in composition could be developed to ensure compliance but in performance the provision was not compliant.

Strengths

A list of strengths, e.g. examples of good practices, achievements, innovative solutions etc.

Strengths for [BMus]

The assessors found a wide variety and range of courses that gave the students a broad experience of the subject. There is a good alignment between pre-18 education and the provision in the BMus programme. Inclusion of Greek and Cypriot music and performance is an important feature of the degree.

Strengths for [MMus]

The programme is academically coherent in musicology, music education and composition.

Strengths for [PhD]

The programme is academically coherent in musicology, music education and composition.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

A list of problem areas to be dealt with, followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.

Areas of improvement and recommendations for [BMus]

The assessors recommend the consideration of a senior thesis and corresponding composition portfolio to match the final recital.

Areas of improvement and recommendations for [MMus]

The assessors recommend review of the academic coherence of the performance concentration in the MMus.

Areas of improvement and recommendations for [PhD]

The provision of PhD guidance varies greatly according to field: it is fully compliant in musicology and music education. For composition, the PhD is compliant except that the assessors recommend the reconfiguration of two of the three 10-ECTS modules in order to obtain a better training for composers. The same applies to PhD candidates in the performance, but in this area the assessors had serious reservations about the ability of the department to offer suitable supervision without the recruitment of a full-time specialist in research-led performance and the acquisition of suitable library resources.

Please tick one of the following for each programme:

Study programme and study programme's design and development

	<i>Non-Compliant</i>	<i>Partially Compliant</i>	<i>Compliant</i>
[BMus]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
[MMus]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
[PhD]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Teaching, learning and student assessment

(ESG 1.3)

Standards

- *The process of teaching and learning supports students' individual and social development and respects their needs.*
- *The process of teaching and learning is flexible, considers different modes of delivery, where appropriate, uses a variety of pedagogical methods and facilitates the achievement of planned learning outcomes.*
- *Students are encouraged to take an active role in creating the learning process.*
- *The implementation of student-centered learning and teaching encourages a sense of autonomy in the learner, while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teacher.*
- *Teaching methods, tools and material used in teaching are modern, effective, support the use of modern educational technologies and are regularly updated.*
- *Practical and theoretical studies are interconnected.*
- *The organisation and the content of practical training, if applicable, support achievement of planned learning outcomes and meet the needs of the stakeholders.*
- *Mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship is promoted.*
- *Assessment is appropriate, transparent, objective and supports the development of the learner.*
- *The criteria for and method of assessment, as well as criteria for marking, are published in advance.*
- *Assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved. Students are given feedback, which, if necessary, is linked to advice on the learning process.*
- *Assessment, where possible, is carried out by more than one examiner.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *How is it monitored that the teaching staff base their teaching and assessment methods on objectives and intended learning outcomes? Provide samples of examination papers (if available).*
- *How are students' different abilities, learning needs and learning opportunities taken into consideration when conducting educational activities?*
- *How is the development of students' general competencies (including digital skills) supported in educational activities?*
- *How is it ensured that innovative teaching methods, learning environments and learning aids that support learning are diverse and used in educational activities?*
- *Is the teaching staff using new technology in order to make the teaching process more effective?*
- *How is it ensured that theory and practice are interconnected in teaching and learning?*

- *How is practical training organised (finding practical training positions, guidelines for practical training, supervision, reporting, feedback, etc.)? What role does practical training have in achieving the objectives of the study programme? What is student feedback on the content and arrangement of practical training?*
- *Are students actively involved in research? How is student involvement in research set up?*
- *How is supervision of student research papers (seminar papers, projects, theses, etc.) organised?*
- *Do students' assessments correspond to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF)?*
- *What is the proportion and role of independent work by students in the learning process? How is independent work defined within a subject, how is it supervised and assessed, what are the conditions for independent work?*
- *How are the assessment methods chosen and to what extent do students get supportive feedback on their academic progress during their studies?*
- *How is the objectivity and relevance of student assessment ensured (assessment of the degree of achievement of the intended learning outcomes)?*
- *Are people outside of the HEI involved in the assessment of learning outcomes (including during the defense of theses)?*

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

- 1 or 2: *Non-compliant*
3: *Partially compliant*
4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		1 - 5		
2.	Teaching, learning and student assessment	[BMus]	[MMus]	[PhD]
2.1	The teaching and learning process is adequate and effective for the achievement of the expected learning outcomes.	3	5	3
2.2	The actual/expected number of students in each class compares positively to the current international standards and/or practices.	5	5	5
2.3	The methodology implemented in each course leads to the achievement of the course's purpose and objectives and those of the individual modules.	5	5	5
2.4	Constructive formative assessment for learning and feedback are regularly provided to the students.	5	5	5

2.5	The assessment system and criteria regarding student course performance are clear, adequate, and known to the students.	5	5	5
2.6	Educational activities which encourage students' active participation in the learning process are implemented.	5	5	5
2.7	Teaching incorporates the use of modern educational technologies that are consistent with international standards, including a platform for the electronic support of learning.	5	5	5
2.8	Teaching materials (books, manuals, journals, databases, and teaching notes) meet the requirements set by the methodology of the programme's courses and are updated regularly.	4	2	2
2.9	It is ensured that teaching and learning are continuously enriched by research.	4	3	3
2.10	The programme promotes students' research skills and inquiry learning.	3	4	4
2.11	Students are adequately trained in the research process.	2	4	5

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

The assessors recommend the development of a formal senior level composition portfolio and senior thesis to sit alongside the senior level recital. The assessors recommend a review of the nature of the composition portfolio and performance recital with a view to clarifying the size, scope and subject matter of the prose commentary that should accompany it. Acquisition of further online databases is recommended for MMus: RILM, JStor, RISM, Cambridge Core, MGG to accompany Proquest, the Naxos Music Library, Groveonline, and other existing resources. Acquisition of further online databases is obligatory for PhD: RILM, JStor, RISM, Cambridge Core, MGG to accompany Proquest, the Naxos Music Library, Groveonline, and other existing resources.

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

Findings for [BMus]

The assessors found that the number of students in each class was sufficiently small to enable dialogue and interplay between staff and students.

Findings for [MMus]

The assessors found significant shortcomings in the provision of online databases and other resources.

Findings for [PhD]

The assessors found various shortcomings in the core teaching provision in the PhD in composition and performance.

Strengths

A list of strengths, e.g. examples of good practices, achievements, innovative solutions etc.

Strengths for [BMus]

The assessors were impressed by the use of a wide range of up-to-date educational technologies. The assessors recognized and praised the small class sizes and the educational environment thus created.

Strengths for [MMus]

The assessors were impressed by the intellectual and scholarly range of the Masters provision in Music Education.

Strengths for [PhD]

None

Areas of improvement and recommendations

A list of problem areas to be dealt with, followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.

Areas of improvement and recommendations for [BMus]

The assessors recommend the development of a formal senior level composition portfolio and senior thesis to sit alongside the senior level recital.

Areas of improvement and recommendations for [MMus]

The assessors recommend a review of the nature of the composition portfolio and performance recital with a view to clarifying the size, scope and subject matter of the prose commentary that should accompany it. Acquisition of further online databases is recommended: RILM, JStor, RISM, Cambridge Core, MGG to accompany Proquest, the Naxos Music Library, Groveonline, and other existing resources.

Areas of improvement and recommendations for [PhD]

Acquisition of further online databases is obligatory: RILM, JStor, RISM, Cambridge Core, MGG to accompany Proquest, the Naxos Music Library, Groveonline, and other existing resources

Please tick one of the following for each programme:

Teaching, learning and student assessment

	<i>Non-Compliant</i>	<i>Partially Compliant</i>	<i>Compliant</i>
[BMus]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
[MMus]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
[PhD]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Teaching Staff

(ESG 1.5)

Standards

- *Fair, transparent and clear processes for the recruitment and development of the teaching staff are set up.*
- *Teaching staff qualifications are adequate to achieve the objectives and planned learning outcomes of the study programme, and to ensure quality and sustainability of the teaching and learning.*
- *The teaching staff collaborate in the fields of teaching and research within the HEI and with partners outside (practitioners in their fields, employers, and staff members at other HEIs in Cyprus or abroad).*
- *Recognised visiting teaching staff participates in teaching the study programme.*
- *The teaching staff is regularly engaged in professional and teaching-skills training and development.*
- *Assessment of the teaching staff takes into account the quality of their teaching, their research activity, the development of their teaching skills and their mobility.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *How are (novice) members of the teaching staff supported with regard to the development of their teaching skills? How is feedback given to members of the teaching staff regarding their teaching results and teaching skills?*
- *How is the teaching performance assessed? How does their teaching performance affect their remuneration, evaluation and/or selection?*
- *Is teaching connected with research?*
- *Does the HEI involve visiting teaching staff from other HEIs in Cyprus and abroad?*
- *What is the number, workload, qualifications and status of the teaching staff (rank, full/part timers)?*
- *Is student evaluation conducted on the teaching staff? If yes, have the results of student feedback been analysed and taken into account, and how (e.g., when planning in-service training for the teaching staff)?*

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

- 1 or 2: *Non-compliant*
3: *Partially compliant*
4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		1 - 5		
		[BMus]	[MMus]	[PhD]
3.	Teaching Staff			
3.1	The number of full-time teaching staff, occupied exclusively at the institution, and their fields of expertise, adequately support the programme of study.	4	4	4
3.2	The members of teaching staff for each course have the relevant formal and fundamental qualifications for teaching the course, including the following:			
3.2.1	Subject specialisation	5	5	5
3.2.2	Research and Publications within the discipline	5	5	5
3.2.3	Experience / training in teaching in higher education	5	5	5
3.3	The programme attracts visiting professors of recognized academic standing.	3	3	3
3.4	In the programme of study, the ratio of the number of courses taught by full-time staff, occupied exclusively at the institution, to the number of courses taught by part-time staff, ensures the quality of the programme of study.	4	5	5
3.5	The ratio of the number of students to the total number of teaching staff supports and safeguards the programme's quality.	5	5	5
3.6	The teaching load allows for the conduct of research and contribution to society.	5	5	5
3.7	The programme's coordinator has the qualifications and experience to coordinate the programme of study.	5	5	5
3.8	The teaching staff is provided with adequate training opportunities in teaching methods, adult education and new technologies.	5	5	5

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

Although there is evidence of a small number of visiting professors to the department, there is little evidence of their participation in the teaching programme. The assessors recommend a review of the research-led performance staff responsible for the concentration in performance in the MMus. The doctorate in performance is not viable without additional research-led staff in performance to match the high-quality staff in musicology, music education and composition.

Provide information on the following:

In every programme of study the special teaching staff should not exceed 30% of the permanent teaching staff.

The assessors were not provided with the relevant data, nor was it clear whether this relates to individuals or % fractions (FTE) of contracts.

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

Findings for [BMus]

The assessors found high well-qualified staff, teaching appropriate sections of the programme. Judicious use was made of part-time staff to deliver the curriculum. Low student numbers means an advantageous staff-student ratio.

Findings for [MMus]

Again well qualified staff, with most of the provision delivered by full-time members of staff.

Findings for [PhD]

Most of the programme in musicology, music education and composition was delivered by well-qualified staff.

Strengths

A list of strengths, e.g. examples of good practices, achievements, innovative solutions etc.

Strengths for [BMus]

The programme profits from highly-qualified full-time staff supported by equally well-qualified part-time staff. Staff-student ratios are very good. Programme co-ordinators are well-qualified and have excellent oversight of their responsibilities.

Strengths for [MMus]

The programme profits from highly-qualified full-time staff in musicology, music education and composition, but much less in performance, supported by equally well-qualified part-time staff. Staff-student ratios are very good. Programme co-ordinators are well-qualified and have excellent oversight of their responsibilities.

Strengths for [PhD]

Well qualified staff in musicology, music education and composition but not in performance.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

A list of problem areas to be dealt with, followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.

Areas of improvement and recommendations for [BMus]

Although there is evidence of a small number of visiting professors to the department, there is little evidence of their participation in the teaching programme.

Areas of improvement and recommendations for [MMus]

The assessors recommend a review of the research-led performance staff responsible for the concentration in performance. Although there is evidence of a small number of visiting professors to the department, there is little evidence of their participation in the teaching programme.

Areas of improvement and recommendations for [PhD]

The doctorate in performance is not viable without additional research-led staff in performance to match the high-quality staff in musicology, music education and composition. Although there is evidence of a small number of visiting professors to the department, there is little evidence of their participation in the teaching programme.

Please tick one of the following for each programme:

Teaching Staff

	Non-Compliant	Partially Compliant	Compliant
[BMus]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
[MMus]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
[PhD]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Students

(ESG 1.4, 1.6, 1.7)

Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student admission, progression, recognition and certification are in place.*
- *Access policies, admission processes and criteria are implemented consistently and in a transparent manner.*
- *Information on students, like key performance indicators, profile of the student population, student progression, success and drop-out rates, students' satisfaction with their programmes, learning resources and student support available, career paths of graduates, is collected, monitored and analysed.*
- *Fair recognition of higher education qualifications, periods of study and prior learning, including the recognition of non-formal and informal learning, are essential components for ensuring the students' progress in their studies, while promoting mobility.*
- *Students receive certification explaining the qualification gained, including achieved learning outcomes and the context, level, content and status of the studies that were pursued and successfully completed.*
- *Student support is provided covering the needs of a diverse student population (such as mature, part-time, employed and international students, as well as students with disabilities).*
- *A formal procedure for student appeals is in place.*
- *Students are involved in evaluating the teaching staff.*
- *Students' mobility is encouraged and supported.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *What are the admission requirements for the study programme? How is the students' prior preparation/education assessed (including the level of international students, for example)?*
- *What are the objectives for the students' academic progress, counselling, mobility, etc., as set by the HEI? How have these objectives been achieved within the given study programme? What indicators are used to assess the fulfilment or degree of achievement of these objectives?*
- *What are the reasons for dropping out (voluntary withdrawal)? What has been done to reduce the number of such students?*
- *How is student learning within the standard period of study supported (student counselling, flexibility of the study programme, etc.)?*
- *How students' special needs are considered (different capabilities, different levels of academic preparation, special needs due to physical disabilities, etc.)? How/to what extent can students themselves design the content of their studies? What are students' options within the study programme and outside of it?*

- *How is the HEI evaluating the success of its graduates in the labor market? What is the feedback from graduates of the study programme on their employment and/or continuation of studies?*
- *How is student mobility being supported?*
- *Evaluate student feedback on support services. Based on student feedback, which support services (including information flow, counselling) need further development?*
- *How is the procedure of recognition for prior learning and work experience ensured, including recognition of study results acquired at foreign higher education institutions?*

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

- 1 or 2: *Non-compliant*
3: *Partially compliant*
4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		1 - 5		
		[BMus]	[MMus]	[PhD]
4.	Students			
4.1	The student admission requirements for the programme of study are based on specific regulations and suitable criteria that are favourably compared to international practices.	5	5	4
4.2	The programme's evaluation mechanism, by the students, is effective.	5	5	4
4.3	Students' participation in exchange programmes is compared favourably to similar programmes across Europe.	5	5	4
4.4	Statutory mechanisms, for the support of students and the communication with the teaching staff, are effective.	5	5	4
4.5	Students are satisfied with their learning experiences.	5	5	5
4.6	Students' command of the language of instruction is appropriate.	5	5	5

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

Click or tap here to enter text.

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

Findings for [BMus]

In conversation with students, the assessors found a wide range of positive views on the department and supportive comments on the programme.

Findings for [MMus]

In conversation with students, the assessors found a wide range of positive views on the department and supportive comments on the programme.

Findings for [PhD]

In conversation with students, the assessors found a wide range of positive views on the department and supportive comments on the programme.

Strengths

A list of strengths, e.g. examples of good practices, achievements, innovative solutions etc.

Strengths for [BMus]

Students express high levels of satisfaction across all parts of the programme. Evaluation mechanisms are working well and students report positive outcomes to their commentaries.

Strengths for [MMus]

Students express high levels of satisfaction across all parts of the programme. Evaluation mechanisms are working well and students report positive outcomes to their commentaries.

Strengths for [PhD]

Students in music education express high levels of satisfaction across all parts of the programme.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

A list of problem areas to be dealt with, followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.

Areas of improvement and recommendations for [BMus]

None

Areas of improvement and recommendations for [MMus]

None

Areas of improvement and recommendations for [PhD 3]

None

Please circle one of the following for each programme:

Students

	Non-Compliant	Partially Compliant	Compliant
[Level 1]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
[Level 2]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
[Level 3]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

5. Resources

(ESG 1.6)

Standards

- *Adequate and readily accessible resources (teaching and learning environments, teaching materials, teaching aids and equipment, financial, physical and human support resources*) are provided to students and support the achievement of objectives in the study programme.*
- ** Physical resources: premises, libraries, study facilities, IT infrastructure, etc.*
- *Human support resources: tutors/mentors, counsellors, other advisers, qualified*
- *administrative staff*
- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*
- *All resources are fit for purpose and students are informed about the services available to them.*
- *Teaching staff is involved in the management of financial resources regarding the programme of study.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *Evaluate the supply of teaching materials and equipment (including teaching labs, expendable materials, etc.), the condition of classrooms, adequacy of financial resources to conduct the study programme and achieve its objectives. What needs to be supplemented/ improved?*
- *What is the feedback from the teaching staff on the availability of teaching materials, classrooms, etc.?*
- *Are the resources in accordance with actual (changing) needs and contemporary requirements? How is the effectiveness of using resources ensured?*
- *What are the resource-related trends and future risks (risks arising from changing numbers of students, obsolescence of teaching equipment, etc.)? How are these trends taken into account and how are the risks mitigated?*

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

- 1 or 2: *Non-compliant*
3: *Partially compliant*
4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		1 - 5		
5.	Resources	[BMus]	[MMus]	[PhD]
5.1	Adequate and modern learning resources are available to the students.	5	5	5
5.2	The library includes the latest books and material that support the programme.	3	3	2
5.3	The library loan system facilitates students' studies.	4	4	4
5.4	The laboratories adequately support the programme.	3	3	5
5.5	Statutory administrative mechanisms for monitoring and supporting students are sufficient.	4	4	4
5.6	Suitable books and reputable journals support the programme of study.	3	3	2
5.7	An internal communication platform supports the programme of study.	5	5	5
5.8	The equipment used in teaching and learning (laboratory and electronic equipment, consumables etc.) are quantitatively and qualitatively adequate.	3	3	3

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

The provision of musical instruments requires review. In particular, there is no provision for two-piano ensemble work in the concert hall, and the quality of the larger pianos does not conform to international standards for MMus recitals. In general, the library resources focus on works published in the USA and UK and review of the provision should include works published in Europe and created by European researchers. If a PhD in performance is to be considered, a complete review of all aspects of instrumental provision and of library resources should be undertaken.

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

Findings for [BMus]

The assessors found a wide range of resources and equipment as well as specialised spaces for musical performances and composition.

Findings for [MMus]

The assessors found a wide range of resources and equipment as well as specialised spaces for musical performances and composition.

Findings for [PhD]

The assessors found a wide range of resources and equipment as well as specialised spaces for musical performances and composition.

Strengths

A list of strengths, e.g. examples of good practices, achievements, innovative solutions etc.

Strengths for [BMus]

Resources in general are adequate or more than adequate for the programme, especially the electronic studio and the Mac cluster.

Strengths for [MMus]

Resources in general are adequate or more than adequate for the programme, especially the electronic studio and the Mac cluster.

Strengths for [PhD]

None

Areas of improvement and recommendations

A list of problem areas to be dealt with, followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.

Areas of improvement and recommendations for [BMus]

The provision of musical instruments requires review. In particular, there is no provision for two-piano ensemble work in the concert hall. In general, the library resources focus on works published in the USA and UK and review of the provision should include works published in Europe and created by European researchers.

Areas of improvement and recommendations for [MMus]

The provision of musical instruments requires review. In particular, there is no provision for two-piano ensemble work in the concert hall, and the quality of the larger pianos does not conform to international standards for MMus recitals. In general, the library resources focus on works published in the USA and UK and review of the provision should include works published in Europe and created by European researchers.

Areas of improvement and recommendations for [PhD]

If a PhD in performance is to be considered, a complete review of all aspects of instrumental provision and of library resources should be undertaken.

Please circle one of the following for each programme:

Resources

	<i>Non-Compliant</i>	<i>Partially Compliant</i>	<i>Compliant</i>
[Level 1]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
[Level 2]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
[Level 3]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Additional for doctoral programmes

(ALL ESG)

Standards

- *Specific criteria that the potential students need to meet for admission in the programme, as well as how the selection procedures are made, are defined.*
- *The following requirements of the doctoral degree programme are analysed and published:*
 - *the stages of completion*
 - *the minimum and maximum time of completing the programme*
 - *the examinations*
 - *the procedures for supporting and accepting the student's proposal*
 - *the criteria for obtaining the Ph.D. degree*
- *Specific and clear guidelines for the writing of the proposal and the dissertation are set regarding:*
 - *the chapters that are contained*
 - *the system used for the presentation of each chapter, sub-chapters and bibliography*
 - *the minimum word limit*
 - *the binding, the cover page and the prologue pages, including the pages supporting the authenticity, originality and importance of the dissertation, as well as the reference to the committee for the final evaluation*
- *There is a plagiarism check system. Information is provided on the detection of plagiarism and the consequences in case of such misconduct.*
- *The composition, the procedure and the criteria for the formation of the advisory committee (to whom the doctoral student submits the research proposal) are determined.*
- *The composition, the procedure and the criteria for the formation of the examining committee (to whom the doctoral student defends his/her dissertation), are determined.*
- *The duties of the supervisor-chairperson and the other members of the advisory committee towards the student are determined and include:*
 - *regular meetings*
 - *reports per semester and feedback from supervisors*
 - *support for writing research papers*
 - *participation in conferences*
- *The number of doctoral students that each chairperson supervises at the same time are determined.*
- *The process of submitting the dissertation to the university library is set.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *How is the scientific quality of the PhD thesis ensured?*
- *Is there a link between the doctoral programmes of study and the society? What is the value of the obtained degree outside academia and in the labour market?*
- *Can you please provide us with some dissertation samples?*

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

1 or 2: *Non-compliant*
3: *Partially compliant*
4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		1-5
6.1	The structure and the content of a doctoral programme of study ensure the quality provision of doctoral studies.	3
6.2	The doctoral studies' supervisors have the necessary academic qualifications and experience for the supervision of the specific dissertations.	3
6.3	The research interests of academic advisors and supervisors adequately cover the thematic areas of research conducted by the doctoral students of the programme.	3
6.4	Research equipment, laboratories, workshops and existing bibliographic material support the programme of study.	3
6.5	The quality of the doctoral theses of the programme in this field is in line with international standards.	n/a
6.6	Doctoral candidates have publications in scientific journals and/ or participate in international conferences.	n/a
6.7	The candidates demonstrate skills in designing and in conducting productive self-directed research.	4
6.8	Candidates are aware of the ethical implications of their research and of their responsibilities as scientists.	5
6.9	Suitable procedures of monitoring and periodic assessment of students' research progress are set.	5

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

In terms of staff expertise, research, resources, the PhD in performance is not compliant in that all these areas are sub-optimal for delivery of the programme. In both composition and performance, the three 10-ECTS courses need to be reconsidered for the purposes of the specific subjects.

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

The assessors were shown the structure of the PhD programme in all sub-fields and consulted with current students.

Strengths

A list of strengths, e.g. examples of good practices, achievements, innovative solutions etc.

Staff expertise in music education.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

A list of problem areas to be dealt with, followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.

In terms of staff expertise, research, resources, the PhD in performance is not compliant in that all these areas are sub-optimal for delivery of the programme. In both composition and performance, the three 10-ECTS courses need to be reconsidered for the purposes of the specific subjects.

Please tick one of the following for:

Additional for doctoral programmes

	Non-Compliant	Partially Compliant	Compliant
PhD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

D. Conclusions and final remarks

Please provide constructive conclusions and final remarks which may form the basis upon which improvements of the quality of the programme of study under review may be achieved, with emphasis on the correspondence with the EQF.

The assessors found the department of music to be a vibrant environment for the teaching and learning of music in scholarly, creative and re-creative forms. In conversation with staff and students, the assessors found a sense of community and shared purpose that is in line with the best-managed music departments in Europe. Although small in size, the UEC provision in music is ambitious and largely compliant with the EQF.

However, the assessors found four areas of concern which are worthy of attention.

1. Although there is a senior recital in the BMus programme, there is no corresponding provision for composition or music history, and the assessors strongly recommend the development of a senior thesis and parallel composition portfolio.
2. In the thesis/portfolio/recital element of the MMus, the assessors recommend consideration of greater clarity in the prose sections of the submissions in composition and performance. In the view of the assessors, these should be no less than c5000 words and the staff should specify the scope and content of these prose accounts.
3. For the composition element of the PhD, the assessors recommend the reconfiguration of the existing MUS 700 Research Methodology in Music and MUS 710 Contemporary Issues in Music to provide suitable doctoral training for composers.
4. Similarly, the assessors recommend the reconfiguration of the existing MUS 700 Research Methodology in Music and MUS 710 Contemporary Issues in Music to provide suitable doctoral training for performers, but in addition would recommend a comprehensive review of all aspects (staffing, instruments, library provision) of the resourcing of the PhD in performance.

E. Signatures of the EEC

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Univ.-Prof. Michael Posch	
Prof. Dr Csaba Kutnyánszky	
Prof. Mark Everist	
Ms Stella Lemonari	
Click to enter Name	
Click to enter Name	

Date: 13 February 2020

