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## *Preamble to the EQ-Arts Template for Reviewers’ Report Institutional Review*

### *Aim of this template*

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

### *EQ-Arts standards for institutional review*

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

### *How to proceed?*

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

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

*For each standard, the report should include:*

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

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

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

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

## Introduction

*Information to be provided:*

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

## 1. Institutional mission, vision and context

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

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. What is the institution’s mission, vision and aims?
2. What are the institution’s current and future major threats and challenges?
3. What is the institution’s long-term strategy and how does it reflect its mission?
4. How do the aims of its educational programmes address the institutional mission?
5. What are the institutional priorities (in the regional, national and international context) and which areas are emphasised?
6. What is the national legal context/framework in which the institution operates?
7. How are equal opportunities embedded in the institutional mission/vision?
8. What quantitative and qualitative data/information is collected, and how is it used to support the institutional mission/ vision?
9. How are outcomes of internal quality assurance processes used to support the institution’s mission and vision?

*Text to be inserted:*

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

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

## 2. Educational processes

### 2.1 The curriculum and its methods of delivery

**Standard: the goals of the programme are achieved through the content and structure of the curriculum and its methods of delivery**

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. What is the institutional process in place for the design, approval and re-approval of programmes?
2. How are programmes designed in terms of objectives and intended learning outcomes and how are they aligned with the institutional aims?
3. Where appropriate, is there a connection/progression among and between the study programmes/cycles?
4. What are the processes to ensure objectives and learning outcomes remain current and how are stakeholders involved in these processes?
5. Are programme outcomes compatible with the Subject Dublin Descriptors´ learning outcomes (e.g. ELIA Dance, Film, Fine Art and Design subject descriptors) and with the national qualifications framework?
6. How is ‘student centred’ learning supported in the institution and the programmes?
7. What flexibility exists within the institution that enables students to develop individualised study profiles?
8. How is the institution utilising different teaching methodologies in the delivery of the programmes?
9. What role does research[[2]](#footnote-2) play throughout the programmes offered?
10. How does research inform curriculum development and teaching?
11. How does research feed into students’ assignments/activities/tasks?
12. How does the institution encourage critical reflection and self-reflection by the students?
13. How does the institution support students in presenting their creative work?
14. How does the institution provide formal arrangements for students to receive academic, career and personal guidance?

*Text to be inserted:*

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

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

### 2.2 International perspectives

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

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. What is the institutional strategy for offering international perspectives and experiences to students?
2. To what extent do the study programmes and the extra-curricular activities broaden the students’ international perspectives and experiences?
3. How is the international dimension integrated into the curriculum at all levels of study?
4. Are there any intended learning outcomes explicitly formulated linked to internationalisation? What are they?
5. How is the institution participating in international partnerships/exchanges?
6. How does the institution support incoming and outgoing students and staff?
7. Does the institution have international teachers delivering parts of the curriculum?
8. How have teachers developed international expertise?
9. Which activities does the institution organise under the umbrella “internationalisation@home”?
10. How does the institution organise QA on internationalisation?

*Text to be inserted:*

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

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

### 2.3 Assessment

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

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. What are the methods for assessment and how do these methods show the achievement of learning outcomes?
2. How are they being reviewed to consider issues such as consistency and fairness?
3. Are the assessment methods aligned with the teaching and learning methods/formats?
4. Are all assessment criteria and procedures easily accessible to and clearly defined for students and staff?
5. Are students provided with timely and constructive feedback on all forms of assessments?

*Text to be inserted:*

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

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

## 3. Student profiles

### 3.1 Admission/Entrance qualifications

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

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. Does the institution have clear and appropriate criteria for admissions for all types of students (including mature and lifelong learning opportunities?
2. In what ways do the entrance requirements assess the abilities (artistic/technical/academic/ pedagogical) of the applicants to successfully complete the institute’s study programmes?
3. Who is involved in the applicant selection procedure?

*Text to be inserted:*

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

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

### 3.2 Student progression, achievement and employability

**Standard: the institution has mechanisms to formally monitor and review the progression, achievement and subsequent employability of its students**

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. How are student progression and achievement monitored within the programme?
2. What are the recognition mechanisms (prior learning, study abroad)?
3. Is there a policy for data collection on alumni and what information does the programme collect on the professional activities/employment of the students after they complete the programme, and how is this information used?
4. Are graduates successful in finding work/building a career in today’s highly competitive creative industries?
5. What range of creative practice arenas do graduates have jobs in immediately after graduation and later?
6. How do graduates contribute to the enhancement of cultural life locally, nationally and internationally?

*Text to be inserted:*

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

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

## 4. Teaching staff

### 4.1 Staff qualifications and professional activity

**Standards: members of the teaching staff are qualified for their role and are active as artists/pedagogues/researchers**

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

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

*Text to be inserted:*

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

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

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

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

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

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

*Text to be inserted:*

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

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

## 5. Facilities, resources and support

### 5.1 Facilities

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

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. Are the building facilities (teaching and practice studios, lecture and seminar rooms, workshops, exhibition venues, IT and library facilities, etc.) appropriate to the needs of the professional world?
2. Are the equipment/tools/machinery etc. appropriate and up to current standards to meet the demands of the professional world?
3. Are the computing and other technological facilities appropriate and current?

*Text to be inserted:*

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

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

### 5.2 Financial resources

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

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. What are the institution's financial resources and how are these resources guaranteed?
2. How does the institution ensure sustainable funding to run its programmes?
3. How are decisions taken to allocate resources on faculties, departments, study programmes, individual teaching staff members etc.?
4. What are the key features for long-term financial planning?
5. Does the institution have a risk management strategy?

*Text to be inserted:*

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

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

### 5.3 Support staff

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

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

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

*Text to be inserted:*

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

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

## 6. Communication, organisation and decision-making

### 6.1 Internal communication process

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

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. How does the institution communicate with the students and staff?
2. How do students and staff communicate?
3. How is communication arranged between the different programmes within the institution?
4. How does the institution communicate with part time and hourly-paid teaching and non-teaching staff, and with external collaborators (guest teachers, examiners, etc.)?
5. How does the institution ensure the continued effectiveness of its communication systems?
6. How does the institution share best practice across the programmes?

*Text to be inserted:*

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

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

### 6.2 Organisational structure and decision-making processes

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

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. What is the organisational structure of the institution in terms of committees and senior staff? How is the effectiveness of these monitored?
2. How are key strategic decisions made within the institution? Who is involved?
3. Are the responsibilities of senior staff in the institution clearly defined?
4. Is there sufficient and appropriate representation (e.g. students, staff, external representatives, etc.) within the institution’s organisational structure and decision-making processes?
5. What evidence exists to demonstrate that the organisational structure and the decision-making processes are effective?

*Text to be inserted:*

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

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

## 7. Internal Quality Culture

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

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. What quality assurance and enhancement procedures are in place within the institution?
2. How often and by whom are the programmes being reviewed?
3. How and by whom are the quality assurance and enhancement procedures monitored and reviewed at both institutional and programme levels?
4. How do quality assurance and enhancement procedures inform/influence each other?
5. Does the institution set clear benchmarks/metrics for programmes to measure their success?
6. What happens to the programme if they do not achieve these measures?
7. How are staff/students/alumni/representatives of the creative industries profession/quality assurance experts involved in the quality assurance and enhancement procedures and how is their feedback used to enhance the institution/programme?
8. How are these procedures used to inform decision-making?
9. How are staff and students informed of changes made?
10. How are students and staff informed if their feedback has led to change?
11. How would the overall quality culture within the programme be characterised (e.g. individual vs. collective – innovative vs. traditional – self-determined vs. system-controlled – managerial vs. professional)?
12. What external quality assurance activities take place and how does it affect internal quality assurance and enhancement policy?

*Text to be inserted:*

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

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

## 8. Public interaction

### 8.1 Cultural, artistic and educational contexts

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

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. Does the institution engage in the public discourse on cultural/artistic/educational policies and/or other relevant issues and if so, how?
2. Is the institution involved in pre-higher education, either in itself or in partnership with other institution(s)?
3. What are the contributions of the institution to cultural/artistic/educational communities at the local, national and international level?
4. Is the institution involved in the development of cultural and social/enterprise projects on the local, national and/or international levels (outside the institution)?
5. Does the institution prepare its students to advance society through the use of their knowledge and skills, and if so, how?

*Text to be inserted:*

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

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

### 8.2 Interaction with the artistic professions

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

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. How does the institution engage with various sectors of creative industries and other artistic[[3]](#footnote-3) professions?
2. What are the long-term plans for the (continued) development of the links with the artistic professions?
3. How does the institution support its programmes in interacting with the artistic professions?
4. How does the institution assess and monitor the on-going needs of the professions?
5. How does the institution engage in and promote Lifelong Learning opportunities?

*Text to be inserted:*

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

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

### 8.3 Information provided to the public

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

Questions to be considered when addressing this standard:

1. What resources and delivery systems are used to convey information to the public?
2. How does the institution ensure that information given to the public (students, audiences, parents, arts education institutions at other levels, etc.) is consistent with its activities, programmes etc?
3. What mechanisms are in place to review information before it goes public?
4. How does the programme ensure ethical considerations are addressed before going public?
5. How is the accuracy of the information ensured on an on-going basis?
6. Which results of QA review process does the institution publish?

*Text to be inserted:*

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

*The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.*

1. *Comments and suggestions for improvement*

## 9. Summary of the Institutes compliance with EQ-Arts Standards

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

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

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

*List of strong points*

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

*Recommendations for further development*

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

*Conditions for further development (if appropriate)*

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

## 11. Conclusion

Concluding remarks to close the report

## Annex 1 – List of supporting documents

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

Annex 1. *Title*

Annex 2. *Title*

Annex 3. *Title*

Annex 4. *Title*

Annex 5. *Title*

…

1. The Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) have been developed in 2005 and revised in 2015 by the key stakeholders in the field of quality assurance at European level: the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), the European Students’ Union (ESU), the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE) and the European University Association (EUA). A major goal of these Standards and Guidelines is to contribute to the common understanding of quality assurance for learning and teaching across borders and among all stakeholders. See <http://www.enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/ESG_endorsed-with-changed-foreword.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The word ‘research’ is used to cover a wide variety of activities, with the context often related to a field of study; the term is used here to represent a careful study or investigation based on a systematic understanding and critical awareness of knowledge. The word is used in an inclusive way to accommodate the range of activities that support original and innovative work in the whole range of academic, professional and technological fields, including the humanities, and traditional, performing, and other creative arts. It is not used in any limited or restricted sense, or relating solely to a traditional ‘scientific method’. *Source:* [*Glossary of the Shared ‘Dublin’ descriptors for Short Cycle, First Cycle, Second Cycle and Third Cycle Awards*](http://archive.ehea.info/getDocument?id=2117)*.* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Artistic – to represent all fields of art, design and performance. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)