

AEC PUBLICATIONS 2008

HANDBOOK

HOW TO DEVELOP A JOINT PROGRAMME IN MUSIC

HILKE BRESSERS



Association Européenne
des Conservatoires,
Académies de Musique
et Musikhochschulen (AEC)

Prince Claus
Conservatoire



A free copy of this document can be found at www.doremifasocrates.org/coordinators and www.jointmusicmasters.org.



Education and Culture

Socrates

Erasmus

The project 'Musical Celebration of ERASMUS 20 and the LLP Launch' has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views of its authors and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which might be made of the information contained therein.

HANDBOOK

HOW TO DEVELOP A JOINT PROGRAMME IN MUSIC

HILKE BRESSERS

Design: Janine Jansen, Amsterdam

CONTENTS

	Preface	5
	Introduction	7
1.	Preparatory phase	8
2.	A funding application to the European Union	12
3.	Working methods	14
4.	Management and finances	17
5.	Curriculum development	20
6.	Quality assurance	24
7.	Testing and evaluation	30
8.	Dissemination	31
9.	Information sources	33
10.	Appendices	35

PREFACE

This publication has been produced jointly by the Prince Claus Conservatoire in Groningen and the European Association of Conservatoires (AEC). It describes the various steps to be undertaken when designing and implementing a joint (master) programme in the field of music. Its aim is to assist institutions interested in setting up such a joint programme with practical advice and concrete examples from a joint master programme in the field of music entitled 'Music Masters in News Audiences and Innovative Practice'. As a result, it is a combination of a practical handbook and a description of an example of good practice.

The AEC is a European association of more than 250 higher music education institutions all over Europe. One of its aims is to promote European cooperation in the sector by providing information and a platform for international relation professionals to meet on a regular basis. A recent AEC project entitled *A Musical Celebration of the 20th Anniversary of the ERASMUS Programme and the Lifelong Learning Programme Launch* aimed at disseminating results in the ERASMUS Programme in the field of music and at celebrating the 20th anniversary of the ERASMUS Programme with a series of concerts. In the framework of this project, the AEC undertook a survey, in which it tried to assess the current status of the ERASMUS activities in the higher music education sector. Based on this assessment, several documents would then be produced that could improve the current situation.

The feedback received through the survey and subsequent discussions at the AEC Meeting for International Relations Coordinators in the field of music, which was held at the Norwegian Academy in September 2007, clearly showed the current need of the sector in relation to European cooperation:

- Firstly, the continuation of the support given to institutions that are starting with the participation in the ERASMUS Programme. A document was developed for this purpose, entitled '10 Steps on how to develop your ERASMUS Programme'. As the survey showed that in certain countries (e.g. Spain and France) the participation of music conservatoires was lagging behind the participation of institutions in most European countries, it was decided to publish the '10 Steps' document in various languages, including French and Spanish.
- Secondly, a need was also identified by institutions that are already in more advanced stages of European cooperation to receive information on more complex types of cooperation, such as European joint programmes. As a reply to this need, this handbook was developed, as it seems that there is a growing interest in the development of joint programmes in the field of higher music education as vehicles for institutional development.

Joint programmes are a direct result of the Bologna Declaration process developments: without the reforms brought by *Bologna* (e.g. the introduction of the 3-cycle structure in all European countries and the ECTS credit point system), joint programmes would have been very difficult (if not impossible)

to establish. As can be seen in this handbook, joint programmes provide institutions with a unique opportunity to share expertise and resources, and to develop programmes that are of the highest quality and have the capacity to attract the best students and teachers. While insisting on the fact that any reform in the higher education systems should take into account the specificities of the higher music education system, the AEC has been an active advocate of the Bologna Declaration process and sees the joint programmes (one of the first clearly visible results of *Bologna*) as an important opportunity for the further development of higher music education in Europe. It is therefore hoped that this handbook will be of use to the institutions, although there is no doubt that it will be a challenge to keep this handbook up-to-date with the quick development of joint programmes in Europe nowadays.

As it is expected that joint programmes will be mainly developed at the 2nd cycle (Masters) level, this handbook primarily addresses the development of a joint Master programme in music. It is important to mention, however, that another project entitled *DoCuMa*¹ is currently developing a joint PhD programme with several European partners. It will be interesting to see how different or similar this joint programme will be compared to the joint Master programme described in this handbook.

It must be pointed out here that some useful documents on the development of joint programmes already exist, mainly produced by the European University Association (EUA). The EUA already published a document entitled *Developing Joint Masters Programmes for Europe* in 2004, which was followed by the *Guidelines for Quality Enhancement in European Joint Master Programmes* in 2006. This handbook does not seek to duplicate or copy what has been written in the EUA documents, but rather to extend the existing knowledge to the higher music education sector by combining practical information on how to develop joint programmes (some of which refers to the EUA documents) with a very concrete and interesting example in music.

Finally, a word of gratitude and congratulation should be extended to our colleagues at the Prince Claus Conservatoire in Groningen for taking such a pro-active and innovative approach to this matter. There is no doubt they are undertaking ground-breaking work, which will serve as an example of good practice and inspiration for institutions going down the same road.

Martin Prchal, Chief Executive European Association of Conservatoires

¹ See for more information: www.documa.org.

INTRODUCTION

This handbook is written to support conservatoires that are planning to jointly develop a [Masters] study programme with several European partners. During the period October 2006 – October 2009, the *Joint Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice* is being developed with five European conservatoires with support from the ERASMUS Programme of the EU². We would like to share the extensive experience we have gained with developing a brand new joint curriculum, dealing with several seemingly unsolvable quality assurance issues and managing a steering group and two working groups in a fascinating process of collaboration, increasing ownership and the development of the programme in time. By writing down our working process and the challenges we have faced and dealt with, we are hoping that future joint curriculum development projects do not have to reinvent the wheel or start from scratch.

It is possible to start the development of a joint programme with or without applying for an ERASMUS Programme grant for joint curriculum development. For our Joint Music Master we applied for and received such a grant. Our way of working has therefore been based on the corresponding EU demands. As it might be helpful for your process to be informed about these demands (even when you will not be applying for an ERASMUS grant), we have decided to add our experience from this perspective as well.

This handbook does not pretend to be complete. On the contrary: as we are in the middle of the development, information will need to be added to the handbook later, especially about the testing and implementation processes.

We would like to wish you the best of luck with your journey to reach this advanced level of European collaboration in higher music education. We can confirm from our experience that taking part in such a truly joint musical and international adventure is an extraordinary and highly fulfilling undertaking.

Hilke Bressers, project administrator Joint Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice

² See for more information www.jointmusicmaster.org.

1 PREPARATORY PHASE

The preparatory phase is an important phase in the development process that should not be underestimated. Many decisions made beforehand will have a great impact on the future development of the Joint Programme. The following issues should be taken into consideration:

1.1 Why would you like to develop a joint European programme? Have you considered the benefits? Here are some **benefits** you may want to consider:

- For **students**, substantial benefits can be gained from participating in a joint (Masters) programme. The programme can offer within one structure learning opportunities in other institutions and countries, which will give the students the unique opportunity of experiencing other artistic and didactical concepts and approaches. It will also give students the possibility of immersing themselves in another culture. From a professional perspective, students will be able to prepare for an international career by making contacts with musicians and performance venues in other cities and countries. There is no doubt that such learning experiences change lives, broaden intellectual horizons and offer new professional perspectives.
- For **teachers**, joint programmes can provide unique opportunities for continuing professional development through their contacts with their colleagues in other institutions. Teachers will be able to travel and share their expertise with new student audiences and benefit from the exposure to different academic and musical environments and traditions.
- For **institutions**, joint programmes are a unique possibility to develop a highly qualitative programme with the help of other institutions. As the demands of the profession are continuously getting broader, it is increasingly difficult for institutions (especially the smaller ones) to provide education and training in all aspects of musical life. By sharing expertise and costs, it is possible for institutions to establish competitive and specialised programme that will improve the international reputation of the institutions and attract new students.
- For the **profession** joint programmes are important as well, as they will train musicians with a clear international dimension in their experiences and views, which is important in today's increasingly globalising music profession.

1.2 What kind of Master would you like to offer? In which field of specialisation would you like to develop one? What will be the **aims and objectives** of the programme? In the case of the joint 'Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice', many discussions were held beforehand by the partner institutions to ensure there was a shared understanding of the scope and objectives of the programme. It was decided that, in brief, the programme would aim at providing future professional musicians with the skills and knowledge to become artistically flexible practitioners able to adjust to new contexts within a wide range of situations of societal relevance.

- 1.3 If you would like to develop a joint Master's programme, are you sure your partners abroad have the same **understanding of the level of the programme**? Is it clear what is meant with 'Master's level'? It may be helpful to exchange existing documents on this issue, such as the Learning Outcomes and the 'Polifonia/Dublin Descriptors' for the 1st, 2nd and 3rd cycles in music study developed by the AEC³, which provide very broad descriptions of the levels in higher education. These documents could provide a good basis for the comparison of the levels of existing programmes.
- 1.4 With **whom** would you like to cooperate? Which institutions offer a profile that could have an added value to your 'ideal' joint programme? Do you have any preferences for the size, educational structure or artistic character of the institutions? You may want to take into account the already existing international connections of your institution. You can also use existing networks or platforms (such as the AEC) to contact and meet new institutions abroad. In any case, always keep in mind that the development of a joint programme is a highly complex, coordinated activity of partners, which in a way could be seen as the most advanced form of European cooperation. It is therefore advisable to engage institutions in your plans that already have some experience with European cooperation.
- 1.5 Within a joint programme it is important to identify and make use of the **expertise and unique profiles** of the different institutions. What expertise do the institutions have to offer and on which basis should students make a choice that fits best to their profile?
- 1.6 Consider the **number of partner institutions** you would like to work with. You might want to take into account the requested number of partner institutions needed to apply for an ERASMUS grant (which is a minimum of three in three different countries). In the EUA publication *Developing Joint Masters Programmes for Europe*, it is mentioned that already existing networks in higher education have several structural models, which display a number of common features:
- *Larger networks (over 10 institutions):*
 - Students generally spend time at their home institution studying similar "modules" or "core courses", before travelling abroad – usually for a semester;
 - Programmes often feature a short "Intensive Programme" for all students;
 - The level and intensity of involvement of different partner institutions ranges considerably. It is common practice to have several core universities offering basic courses, with partner institutions involved in recruitment and providing specific expertise.
 - *Smaller size networks (less than 6 -7 institutions):*
 - The structures of larger networks – core modules and intensive programmes, may also be found;
 - In other programmes, which involve fewer institutions and a smaller student cohort (e.g. 20 students), the students move together to each of the participating institutions for a period of one semester throughout the programme.

³ See www.bologna-and-music.org/learningoutcomes for more information.

When looking at the development of the various existing programmes, it seems that the majority of these programmes have tended to begin relatively small, and to expand – rather than to begin with a large number of partner institutions, and then to lose some along the way.

In the case of the joint 'Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice', the programme is being developed with 5 partners in 4 countries: the Prince Claus Conservatoire in Groningen (Netherlands, coordinating institution), the Royal Conservatoire in The Hague (Netherlands), the Guildhall School of Music & Drama (UK), the Reykjavik Academy of the Arts, Department of Music (Iceland) and the Jyväskylä University of Applied Sciences, School of Music (Finland).

- 1.7 You may also want to consider involving **external partners** in your programme. In the case of the joint 'Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice', the external partners consist of professional organisations in the field of music that are invited to give advice on the development of the programme. The external partners play an important role during the delivery of the programme: the students' professional integration projects (see §5.5) take place with cooperation of the external partners.
- 1.8 **Trust and commitment** are vital words in finding suitable project partners. Take your time to discuss what your expectations are of the project and what will be asked of the project partners in terms of investment in time and money. Shared ownership is an important issue from the very beginning. It is essential that this will not become a 'hobby' of one or more teachers: ensure that all institutions (and not just academic colleagues) fully support the goals and objectives of the programme.
- 1.9 One of the most vital issues is to ensure that the institutions involved assign **sufficient academic and administrative staff resources** to the development and implementation of the programme. As mentioned before, this should not be left to the responsibility of one individual or a minority of dedicated staff. Involvement of a wider group of staff within an institution will help to maintain institutional commitment. This is important when considering the long-term perspectives of the programme. What if a key teacher leaves the institution: will the institutional commitment remain? If this is not the case, it is clear the institution's commitment is not strong enough.
- 1.10 When it has become clear which partner institutions will participate in the development of the Joint Master, the way **funding and financing** by the institutions will be arranged has to be discussed. A significant part of the budget for the development of the programme might be covered by an ERASMUS grant. In the case of the joint 'Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice', the grant covers the travel and subsistence costs of working group meetings, as well as costs for PR, external evaluation and some general costs. This means that the institutions themselves will have to pay the costs for the staff involved in the project. It is possible to make a different choice in what is covered by the grant and what is by the institutions, but always keep in mind that the EU grant will never cover all costs. In addition, it can happen that the expenses for meetings are sometimes higher than the costs approved for travel and subsistence by the EU. In this case, it might be wise to make an agreement in time on how to deal with extra costs.

- 1.11 It is advisable to sign a **partner agreement**⁴, which governs the relationship between the coordinating institution and the other conservatoires. Such a letter of commitment should be renewed periodically. In order to be able to administer the amount of staff time that all members have to invest in the programme, you could also consider using a so-called 'staff hour declaration', stating the amount of hours that will be spent on the project for the whole period. When applying for an ERASMUS grant, this is obligatory, and the members should in that case moreover be asked to keep their payslips for a fixed period of time in case of an audit by the European Commission.
- 1.12 A **project plan** should be written, including a detailed work plan. In this plan you may want to include the following:
- description of partners and their contribution
 - description of external partners and their contribution
 - budget for the development of the programme
 - objectives of the programme
 - subject areas / specialisations / learning outcomes
 - admission criteria / requirements
 - evaluation and dissemination
 - planning of activities for the development of the master
 - extended work plan
 - summary of the project

⁴ Please find an example of a partner agreement and a staff hour declaration in the appendix.

2 A FUNDING APPLICATION TO THE EUROPEAN UNION

If you are planning to apply for funding from the European Union for the development of your joint programme, it is important to know that there is a specific strand in ERASMUS (the chapter for higher education in the Lifelong Learning Programme of the EU), which provides support to joint curriculum development projects and in particular to the development of joint programmes. This may seem to be the right source of funding, but please be aware of the following points.

- 2.1 ERASMUS project applications are **highly complex** and bureaucratic. Much detailed information is asked for. You will need sufficient time to prepare the application in cooperation with all partners. Also keep in mind that EU deadlines for some reason often take place in the middle of holidays, which can result in problems with receiving relevant information from partner institutions in time.
- 2.2 Try to avoid reinventing the wheel. There will be project or programme coordinators that have been successful in obtaining EU funding. Ask for advice or (ideally) for a copy of their application, so you can see how this was done.
- 2.3 The selection for the ERASMUS project grants is **competitive**. In 2007, 56 project applications were received, of which 22 were approved; the success rate was slightly below 40%. Your application will therefore have to be one of high quality.
- 2.4 ERASMUS project application procedures are shrouded with '**wild stories**'. For example, one story claims that if you include a South-European partner, your application will be automatically successful. It is true that some geographical balance is seen as a positive point, but in the end it will really be the overall quality of your application that will count. It is in this context important to mention that the European Commission works with a highly professional and very strict selection procedure, which is based on the judgement of external experts. This situation disqualifies another 'story', which claims that if you know someone in the European Commission or Parliament personally, doors to large sums of money will be opened easily.
- 2.5 It is encouraging to see that the ERASMUS Programme has gradually opened its doors to the **participation of non-academic partner organisations**. In fact, it is actually seen as a strong point, when a project has external partners (in particular professional partners) in its consortium, as mentioned in §1.8.
- 2.6 It is also important to keep in mind that the **EU funds never cover all project costs**. They are always given as a contribution to a total budget, in which a contribution from the partners must be clearly shown. There is also a limit for the EU contribution, which is usually 75% of the total budget. The contribution of the partners usually is included into the budget by inserting into the project budget general costs (overhead costs) and staff costs of the teaching and administrative staff involved in the project. This way, the grant can be used for travel, subsistence, translation, printing, etc. Finally,

there are also limits for the total grant amount the EU wants to give per year: in 2008, this was 150.000€ per year.

- 2.7 When preparing the application, it is important to inform yourself as much as possible about the **priorities and rationale of the ERASMUS Programme**. On the website of the Education, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency⁵, which is the agency dealing with the technical aspects of the ERASMUS project (selection, contracts, reports, etc), much information can be found. In particular, it is advisable to have a look at the general *Guidelines for Applicants* of the Lifelong Learning Programme and the *Call for Proposals* of the programme, which are usually published annually. These documents can provide useful information about what the EU finds important in relation to the projects. So, for example, two of the priorities mentioned in the Call for Proposals for ERASMUS are a) to improve the quality and to increase the volume of student and teaching staff mobility throughout Europe and b) to improve the quality and to increase the volume of multilateral cooperation between higher education institutions in Europe. With these objectives in mind, it is wise to point to these objectives in your application and work plan by indicating a) an important role for student and staff mobility within your programme and b) your ambition to make this a highly qualitative programme that may attract the best students and teachers from all over the world.
- 2.8 The current **application procedure** is in 2 phases. In the first phase, the (on-line) application form needs to be filled in and sent to the Executive Agency in time (one day too late will make your application end up in a trash can). After a first selection has been made, institutions are then asked to provide additional information in phase 2. This sounds reasonable; in reality it means that the biggest bulk of the work must be done for the first phase anyway.
- 2.9 In the application form, you will be asked to describe the rationale, aims & objectives and results of your project. Space for text is limited, so it is a challenge to write the texts in such a way that they mention the most important points clearly. It is also good to realise that your application may be assessed by an expert in the field of music, but possibly also by an expert in the field of e.g. brain surgery. The text should therefore be written in such a way that it makes sense to non-experts as well as experts in the field, which is another challenge to be met.
- 2.10 In the application form, you will be asked to divide your project plan into **work packages**. This seems to be another inconvenient bureaucratic requirement, but in fact this is also a good way to give a clear structure to your project. Much attention is given by the EU to **dissemination and exploitation**. Although there seems to be very little difference between these 2 concepts, it is essential to make clear how you will distribute information about your project and its results to the various relevant audiences and how you will ensure the programme will not die immediately after the project grant has dried up.
- 2.11 Keep smiling!

5 See <http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/index.htm>.

3 WORKING METHODS

When the outlines of the project become clear, it is time to make decisions about the working methods. Which structure is best for the cooperation that will soon start?

- 3.1 In the case of the joint 'Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice', a **steering group** has been established, which has the task to take care of the management and evaluation of the project, secure time paths and results, and produce a business plan and organisational and managerial model for the joint programme. The steering group, which meets two times per year, consists of one person representing the management of each institution including the coordinator of the project, who acts as chairperson.
- 3.2 In addition to the steering group, several working group have been established. One **working group of teaching staff** (one per institution) is responsible for the development of the curriculum of the Joint Master⁶. Another group consisting of one member per institution deals with quality assurance issues, such as the development of internal and external **quality assurance** systems⁷. The chairs of the working groups are member of the steering group as well, in order to assure short lines of communication between the groups.
- 3.3 Both working groups will meet seven times during the project period of three years. The **working group meetings** are meant for evaluation, discussion, outlining further development and getting to know the schools where the future Joint Master will take place. Therefore, the meetings take place in each institution on a rotating basis. In between the meetings, work is carried out by all members, but also by little groups of experts within the working groups. In general, it must be underlined that developing a joint programme takes time. Sufficient meetings should be foreseen for network partners to develop ideas together and to assess collaboratively the coherence of the study programme.
- 3.4 The **external partners** attend a meeting once per year. In addition to this fixed number of external partners, local site experts are also invited the attend project meetings as well as part of the dissemination strategy of the project.
- 3.5 When choosing the working group members per institution, please take into consideration the profiles of the candidates and the availability of time. Make sure that the steering and working group members are competent for the work that needs to be done, and that a clear part of the total workload of the participants is reserved for the joint programme development. Not all institutions need to have the same level of involvement in programmes, and diversity of contributions can allow the network partners to focus upon particular strengths. In any case, ensure from the beginning that it is clear who takes responsibility for what. The steering group members should feel responsible for the work that is delivered by their working group members, including meeting deadlines.

⁶ More information on the activities for curriculum development can be found in Chapter 5..

⁷ All issues this group is addressing are described in Chapter 6.

In the EUA publication *Guidelines for Quality Enhancement in European Joint Master Programmes* this is clearly explained through the following table:

Level	Challenges and Actions (tasks)
Network	Effective coordination
Subject	Appropriate content
Institution	Sustainable institutional anchoring

While the joint degree programme itself is the result of a joint initiative of more than one institution, the levels of responsibility outlined in the table show where institutions will need to take action in order to accomplish a coherent and valid joint master:

- In terms of coordination and decision making for the programme, it is the **level of the network** that provides the framework for the joint programme as a joint initiative, irrespective of whether it is a formal or a relatively informal networking structure.
- In relation to content and its implementation, the responsibility rests at the **subject level** to be formed by representatives of those disciplines which will implement the joint programme.
- In terms of sustainability and institutional anchoring: the level of the individual university (**institutional level**) contributes primarily to the development and implementation of the joint programme.

- 3.6 At the start of the development process, the steering and working group members are possibly the only persons involved in the Joint Master for each school. It is important that gradually more and more of the conservatoires' management and staff are getting involved in the development process. As the joint programme will be part of the educational offer of each school, it is vital to create **common ownership** within the schools.
- 3.7 In the case of the joint 'Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice', all groups work through a **digital working environment** in between the meetings. On this 'intranet' website, the members are able to up- and download documents, and to add practical information about upcoming meetings. Using an intranet website is a good way for the steering group as well to keep informed about the state of affairs of the work that is carried out.

- 3.8 In the project 'Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice', a work plan and a clear and detailed **time path** was also formulated to ensure goals are reached. Overall, the project will spend two years on the development of the programme, including the implementation of a joint quality assurance system and the formulation of a solid business plan and joint budget for the Joint Master once it is running. A third preparatory year will be spent to test and pilot the curriculum, the quality assurance system and the management of the programme⁸.
- 3.9 At the end of the project and before the programme formally starts, it is advisable to draw up a **contract** stating what (financial) implications the participation in the joint programme actually has. This way you prevent a financial collapse later on, e.g. when one of the partners suddenly withdraws and a portion of the joint income is missing. An exit strategy can form part of the contract. It can also be considered to develop a strategy how to cope with new partners that would like to be included.
- 3.10 Dealing with the practical implementation of the curriculum and administrative issues in various languages can be a true challenge for joint programmes. A joint programme therefore needs to decide on its **language policy**. Will it take a pragmatic approach (e.g. by choosing one common language) or will it be sensitive to the unique European linguistic diversity? In the 'Music Masters' it has been decided to choose English as the main language for the programme itself, including for all courses, the study guide and the website. However, with the aim to provide information about the development of the programme to wider audiences and to prospective students, newsletters and brochures are also being produced in the languages of the countries involved.

⁸ More information about the pilot year can be found in §7.1.

4 MANAGEMENT AND FINANCES

When addressing issues related to management and finances, the following issues should be kept in mind.

- 4.1 In the beginning of the programme development, communication and administration will be fairly informal among the partners, in particular if the number of individuals involved in the programme development is small. However, as issues arise within the programme, it will be necessary to put into place more **formal structures and procedures** to ensure that high standards are maintained, and that programme administration is professionally managed. While informal ways of communication can encourage relationships of trust between the various actors and partners, more formal structures seem unavoidable if networks are to survive in the long term. Formal structures provide a framework for regular meetings on such key issues as network coordination, curriculum planning, evaluation of student progression, and information dissemination.
- 4.2 It is advisable to appoint a small number of staff members that support the development of the programme. The (part-time) **project coordinator** is leading the whole process. For the joint 'Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice', a (part-time) **project administrator** was appointed to take care of the day to day running of the programme, as well as a (part-time) **financial administrator**. Below follows a description of activities and responsibilities of the project coordinator and administrator:

Project coordinator:

- Coordination of Joint Master project
- Chair of the Steering Group
- Preparation and attendance at Joint Master steering group and working group meetings
- Collection of relevant information for the project's research activities through the development, dissemination and analysis of questionnaires or other research tools
- Providing the project with relevant expertise concerning professional music training at national level
- Involvement in the drafting and production of project texts and publications
- Involvement in the production, evaluation and dissemination of interim and final project products, and the project website
- Involvement in the production of the interim and final report to the EU in terms of content and finances
- Presentation and dissemination of project outcomes at congresses and seminars
- Preparation and attendance at Joint Master seminars or congress presentations
- Dissemination of Joint Master outcomes in home institution/organisation

Project administrator:

- Responsibility for overall project management in terms of finances, practical organisation and content
- Preparation, in co-operation with the chairs, of Joint Master working and steering group meetings
- Reporting of working and steering group meetings
- Monitoring of project management and project results
- Supporting role in the production of project publications
- Supporting role in research activities, emerging from the work of the groups
- Production of interim and final reports to the European Commission

4.3 At the start of the project a reliable **financial administration** has to be put into place. When an ERASMUS grant has been awarded, you will have to live up to the strict and complex financial regulations of the EU. In the financial and administrative handbook that is provided by the EU, it is stated exactly what can be covered by the community grant. Moreover, maximum amounts that can be spent on different cost categories (such as travel and subsistence costs) are fixed. It could be helpful to develop a reimbursement form that can be used by all members, in order to ensure that all partners use the same form and live up to the same rules in relation to what can (not) be reimbursed⁹.

4.4 While the joint programme is being developed, you will have to design a **solid business plan** as well, stating how the programme will be run from the start of the programme. The 'Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice' has chosen the following structure:

- A **steering group** is maintained for the ongoing development and commitment in the schools.
- In addition, a **programme manager** has been appointed, who is responsible for the management of the joint part of the programme starting from the pilot year. The programme manager is paid from a joint budget.
- Moreover, in each school a person takes responsibility for the **coordination** of the Joint Master in the school. Instead of making a job profile, it was decided that the tasks of this local coordinator will be described by each institution itself. The coordinator is paid by the institution itself.
- Next to the programme manager and the local coordinator, it can be considered to appoint a **programme leader** per institution with the responsibility for the actual content of the programme.

4.5 In this above-mentioned structure, it will have to be clear what costs of the programme will be covered jointly and what will be paid by the institutions themselves once the programme is running. In the

⁹ An example of a reimbursement form can be found in the appendix.

case of the 'Music Master', the steering group has drawn up a **joint budget** that includes (amongst others) the salary for the project manager, public relations, costs for admission and assessment, and travel and subsistence costs for teacher exchanges. The costs for teachers at the home institution, being normal staff costs, are paid by the institutions themselves. In the appendices, a joint budget with fictional amounts can be found as an example.

4.6 It might well be the case that the **enrolment fees** differ between your institutions. There are two possibilities to deal with this.

- The first option is to charge the student the average of all fees, which would make your programme as expensive for each student. A problem might arise when students of institutions that normally do not ask (or are not allowed to ask due to national legislation) for any enrolment fee might lose interest in the programme.
- A second option is to have a differentiated enrolment fee per institution. This would mean that the student would pay the tuition fee that is normally being charged for a single (Master) programme in that country.

The 'Music Masters' has chosen for the second option, as it is currently based on the principle of a joint programme with single degrees, as explained in §6.1.

4.7 An important part of a joint programme is the **mobility of students and staff**. It is therefore essential to map the actual costs involved in mobility for the different conservatoires. It is important to keep in mind that the individual ERASMUS grants, which the institutions have at their disposal as part of their ERASMUS contracts based on the ERASMUS University Charters, can usually contribute to the travel expenses, language preparation costs, and the higher general costs of living in the host country in joint programmes. The awarded grants for individual student and staff mobility will vary per country. Institutions interested in setting up or further developing their individual mobility activities in the framework of ERASMUS should consult the AEC handbook *10 Steps how to develop your ERASMUS Exchange Programme in Music*¹⁰ and contact the ERASMUS National Agency¹¹ for more information.

¹⁰ This document can be found in English, French, Spanish and German versions at www.doremifasocrates.org/usefulinformation.

¹¹ To find contacts of the ERASMUS National Agencies, please visit the links section of the AEC website www.doremifasocrates.org.

5 CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

In this chapter, the issue of curriculum development is discussed. To address this in a concrete way, the curriculum development activities of the joint 'Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice' will be described in more detail as a case study. It should be pointed out, however, that the curriculum for this particular joint programme is rather innovative, as in some of the participating institutions this curriculum does not yet exist. Joint programmes in other more clearly defined subject areas (e.g. chamber music or jazz) could take a different approach that is more based on existing programmes.

- 5.1 In the first stage of the development you will have to decide what **curriculum you want to develop**. What do you want future students to have reached at graduation? And how do you 'translate' this to a study programme with modules? Which modules do you like to offer compulsory in all conservatoires? Are you planning to use modules that already exist or would you like to develop new courses? What modules will be offered optional per institution? How do you deal with progression within the programme and ensure that the programme is balance and not overloaded? It can be helpful to draw up a programme schedule, containing all semesters specified in courses and credits. The AEC handbook *Curriculum Design and Development in Higher Music Education*¹² could be helpful for the development of your curriculum.

As an example the programme for the 'Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice' is shown here:

When	What		Where are the students?	Where are the teachers?
February	Admission assessments		Home Institution	Admission committee: teachers from the home institution plus members of other institutions
Sept-Febr	Semester 1: 30 EC		Intensive week: rotating at one of the institutions; Rest: home institution	Intensive week: at one of the institutions; Remainder of the period: home institutions; specialised teachers will travel around the institutes
	3EC: mentoring process and personal pathway guidance	Intensive week (1) Action Research (8) Project Management and Entrepreneurship (4) Performance and Communication (7) Leading and Guiding (7)		

¹² This handbook can be found in English, French and German versions at www.bologna-and-music.org/curriculum.

Febr-July	Semester 2: 30 EC		Period abroad	Home institution
	3EC: mentoring process and personal pathway guidance	27 EC: A variety of chosen modules connected to the student's personal pathway		
Sept-July	Semester 3 and 4 : 60 EC		Home institution; Intensive week: rotating at one of the institutions.	Home institution; Examination committee: teachers from the home institution plus one member of another institution; Intensive week: at one of the institutions.
	6EC: mentoring process and personal pathway guidance	30 EC: professional integration project 23 EC: other modules 1 EC: intensive week		

5.2 As can be seen in the table, the 'Music Masters' has decided to start and end the joint programme with an **intensive summer school** week at one of the five institutions, where the students will be able to work together with some of the programme tutors and mentors. A range of workshops and seminar activities will take place, enabling students to explore key strands of the programme and to establish effective channels of communication with their respective home institutions.

5.3 After the summer school the students will spend the first semester at their **home institution**, taking the following four compulsory modules, which will be underpinned by mentoring and personal pathway guidance:

- **Action Research:** a focus on the application of research skills, as well as research methodology and literature.
- **Leading and Guiding:** an introduction to the skills and knowledge necessary to be a competent workshop/laboratory practitioner and creative leader.
- **Performance and Communication:** intensive encounters with best practice of innovative performance practice in a variety of contexts.
- **Project Management and Entrepreneurship:** conceiving, implementing and realising of project/business ideas.

5.4 The second semester will then be spent **away from the home institution** at one of the other five institutions. The choice for one of the institutions is based on the educational offer of the partner institutions based on the specialisations that have been chosen. Students will be able to choose subject areas (through optional modules) that best fit their personal pathway. Examples of modules are: Creating and Communicating Music, Professional Practice, Composition, Improvisation,

Technology in the Arts, Skills of Leadership Training, Cross Cultural Management, International Entertainment and Media Law, Cultural Policy, and Music Sociology.

- 5.5 The third and fourth semester of the programme (i.e. the second year back at the home institution) focuses on the professional integration of the students. They will carry out a **professional integration project**, culminating in a final performance event, by working in collaboration with external professional and educational organisations partnered to each higher education institution. During the whole process of research and development, the student needs to make his/her work and choices transparent to peers and external stakeholders.
- 5.6 **Mentoring** and guidance plays a significant role in this Joint Master as well. Each student has his own key mentor who will oversee continuity for the student throughout the programme, and has a role in guidance of the professional integration project that the student will carry out in the second year of the programme. In addition to the key mentor, other persons will also function as co-mentors. Through the mentoring process students should amongst other things develop co-mentoring skills, skills of critical reflection and the ability to be reflexive in different contexts. Different roles that musicians play will be addressed in the mentoring process as well. Gradually the key mentor will have a more withdrawn and distanced role, while the student himself will function more and more as his own mentor. The digital portfolio developed within the digital working environment (see §3.7) plays an important role as a mentoring tool.
- 5.7 In order to gather the same information for all modules in all institutions, you will need to develop a **course format**. In the format of the 'Music Masters', the following categories have been included:
1. Course title
 2. Course code
 3. Type of course
 4. Level of course
 5. Year of study
 6. Number of credits
 7. Contact hours
 8. Names of tutors
 9. Objectives of the course
 10. Pre-requisites
 11. Course contents
 12. Recommended reading/listening/viewing
 13. Teaching methods/working forms
 14. Assessment methods
 15. Language of instruction and assessment
 16. Corresponding learning outcomes
 17. Breakdown in sessions

- 5.8 What will the **final examination** look like? And how do you want to assess the other compulsory modules? In the case of the 'Music Masters' the final assessment consists of a performance element, a presentation related to the performance event and a discussion of the digital portfolio that the student will continuously update throughout the two years.
- 5.9 When do the students **study abroad** at one of the partner institutions? How will this/these period(s) look like for the students in terms of content? In the 'Music Masters' a personal development plan will be set up by the student and his/her mentor, in which the exchange institution is mentioned, as well as the optional modules that the student would like to take. Also a plan for the professional integration project that is to follow afterwards will be included, as it is considered to be important that the final project relates to the skills and knowledge that the student gained earlier in his/her studies.
- 5.10 In the 'Music Masters' **teacher exchange** is an important component of the mobility part in the programme as well. Throughout the duration of the programme (2 years), teachers travel to teach at one or more of the partner institutions. As mentioned in §4.7, funding can be obtained for both individual teacher and student mobility in the framework of the ERASMUS programme.
- 5.11 As mentioned in §3.7, it could be helpful to develop an **IT environment** that can be used by students and staff in all institutions. In the 'Music Masters', firstly an inventory of the existing IT environments in the participating institutions was made. Based on this inventory, one institution was chosen with the responsibility for the actual development of a Joint Master intranet. It is important to consider what the important parts of the environment are that cannot be missed. For the 'Music Masters', students needed to be able to develop a digital portfolio. Moreover, online contact between students, and between staff and students was regarded as necessary. As staff of five organisations will be involved in the assessment of students, an online database with results of all student assessments could not be missed either.
- 5.12 When the curriculum development progresses, you will have to start thinking about the **involvement of teachers** and other staff in your institutions. In case of (compulsory) modules that are taught in each institution, the profile/skills the teacher needs will have to be made clear. When teacher mobility is part of your programme, you will have to make a schedule of who will be teaching where and when.
- 5.13 In order to support the previous point, it is essential to invest in the **continuing professional development of teachers**. In the 'Music Masters', this issue is addressed by the organisation of an annual seminar in one of the institutions, during which a group of teachers will be invited to reflect on and improve their ways of working in the Joint Master. The first of these seminars is planned for May 2008 with Mentoring as the main theme.

6 QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT

In the joint 'Musical Masters' a specific working group takes care of a wide range of issues related to quality assurance. One of the main questions to address is how to guarantee equal quality and joint procedures in each institution? In addition, the working group deals with external quality assurance and accreditation issues, admission procedures, module assessments and final examinations, degree and qualifications, ECTS, learning outcomes and the development of a guidebook for teachers. The group is also responsible for designing an internal quality assurance system. Many of these items are discussed in close cooperation with the curriculum development working group.

- 6.1 When developing a Joint Master, one should take into account there is a **difference between a joint programme and a joint degree**. You have decided you would like to develop a joint programme: i.e. a programme to be carried out jointly by several institutions in different countries. Whether this will lead to a joint degree is another question. A true joint degree would be a degree awarded by the cooperating institutions as if they were one institution; or by a separate body installed by all participating institutions with the degree-awarding power delegated by all institutions for the specific joint (Master) programme. At this moment¹³, the current national legal frameworks make such a joint degree impossible in many countries.

For the 'Music Masters' this was also the case, as two of the participating countries (the Netherlands and Finland) do not currently recognise joint degrees, although legislation is being prepared that may change this situation in a few years. Another option that might function in your situation but turned out not to be feasible for the 'Music Masters' due to current national legislations, is a double or multiple degree: giving the student a degree of all institutions where (s)he has studied. The option chosen by the 'Music Masters' was to give out a single degree with an attachment: a joint programme is being delivered, but the student studies at the "home institution" and is awarded the degree of this institution. (S)he receives a qualification (a single degree) and in addition a supplement which consists of a certificate. This certificate mentions the partners of the joint programme and especially the institutions where the student has spent his/her second semester. As soon as it will become possible to hand out a true joint degree, the 'Music Masters' will start using this instead.

Within the institution, the joint (Master) programme can function as an independent Master's degree programme within an institution or, an option chosen by some partners in the 'Music Masters', as a part of an already existing (Performance) Master degree programme.

- 6.2 When addressing quality assurance, it is important that all institutions involved in the joint programme have a shared understanding of the terminology related to quality assurance issues. In the AEC, the following terms are being used:

¹³ Spring 2008

- **Quality assurance:** the collective term for the systems by which courses, qualifications and the institutions which run them are monitored to ensure reliability, consistency and the maintaining of fair, rigorous practices and high standards
- **Quality assurance system:** the organisational structure which sets out the responsibilities, processes, procedures and establishes the means to carry out the quality assurance
- **Internal quality assurance:** the systems that are set up and operated by the institution itself, which may include annual monitoring, the use of external examiners, periodic major review of courses, etc
- **External quality assurance:** a system operated by others, such as governmental or quality assurance and accreditation agencies.

- 6.3 When a programme is based on the single degree principle, it is easy to establish who is responsible for the quality assurance of the programme: the primary responsibility for quality rests with the institution awarding the degree. The institution is of course expected to act in compliance with the national regulations and work with relevant quality assurance agencies.
- 6.4 In most cases, institutions involving themselves in the development of a joint programme will already have in place their own **internal quality assurance system**. If this is not so, institutions should be referred to the *AEC Handbook on Internal Quality Assurance in Higher Music Education*¹⁴, which can assist higher music education institutions in setting up an internal quality assurance system. However, a joint programme may ask for an additional system that assures the quality of the programme in each institution, as one has to consider whether the separate existing internal quality assurance systems easily produce enough steering information on quality matters, or whether it is necessary to add an extra layer at the level of the joint programme. The latter costs more development time, but may in the long run be more efficient: it will reduce the amount of time spent in maintaining the quality of the programme, as it is not easy to gather reliable steering information out of many different internal quality assurance systems. A set of helpful criteria and principles for the quality assurance of Joint Master Programmes can be found in the EUA publication *Guidelines for Quality Enhancement of Joint Master Programmes*¹⁵, which provides a very structured and clear framework for this purpose.
- 6.5 In the 'Music Masters', a choice was made to maintain a double level, keeping the several existing internal quality assurance systems in place, but at some points "doubling" these with proper joint master internal quality assurance instruments. On the basis of the EFQM-model¹⁶, the quality assurance working group investigated which steering information would be needed to keep up the quality of the programme and convince outsiders in that respect. It was then studied whether it

¹⁴ This handbook can be found in English, French and German versions at www.bologna-and-music.org/internalqa.

¹⁵ This publication can be found at <http://www.eua.be/index.php?id=110>.

¹⁶ See the *AEC Handbook on Internal Quality Assurance in Higher Music Education* for more information about the EFQM model: www.bologna-and-music.org/internalqa.

was possible to gather this information by using the existing internal quality assurance systems in the different institutions. As this was not the case, it was decided to develop a **specific joint master set of internal quality assurance instruments** on the basis of existing instruments in some of the institutions. The list of instruments to be used became the following:

- a list of data concerning students/teachers/budgets to be delivered on a yearly basis by all institutions on the basis of their own respective administrative systems
- a small student database proper for the joint master programme delivering on demand facts and figures on (e.g.) in-, through- and output
- student questionnaires after entrance examination
- student questionnaires after modules
- student questionnaires immediately after graduation
- dropout questionnaires
- alumni questionnaires
- teacher questionnaires
- list of data to be addressed by external examiners
- press clipping collection procedure.

6.6 In addition to the internal quality assurance systems, in most European countries various **external quality assurance** or accreditation procedures are increasingly being set up that need to be met. Some of the requirements stipulated by national legislation may influence the content of the joint programme. You could therefore consider producing an overview, in which the national requirements of each country are described and compared. In this way it is easier to see the similarities and differences. In any case, your joint programme will probably need to undergo a quality assurance or accreditation procedure in each country in which it will be offered. This seems strange: one would expect that with the development of joint programmes, procedures would exist by now able to deal with joint programme in one procedure. However, to date, no national agency has developed principles and practice which can be applied to quality assurance of joint programmes, taking into account the specific transnational nature of these programmes, and the shared responsibilities for matters such as course development, delivery and student services.

6.7 When addressing external quality assurance, it is also important to point out that the AEC has developed a detailed **subject-specific framework for quality assurance and accreditation in the field of music** with characteristics, criteria, procedures and programme outcomes. As the AEC does not (yet) have any legal power to accredit or evaluate institutions or programmes formally, this framework can be very useful when a joint programme would like to have some 'advice from critical friends', e.g. when it would like to be reviewed by a team of peers from various countries¹⁷.

6.8 As has been previously mentioned, the 'Music Masters' has decided to use **learning outcomes** as the general point of departure of what students should have reached at the end of their Master level

¹⁷ More information about this AEC Institutional and Programme Review Scheme can be found at www.bologna-and-music.org/reviewscheme.

studies. When using learning outcomes, you should be aware in the first place which outcomes you want the students to reach with the programme as a whole. Once you have written down these overall outcomes, it becomes important to consider how these can/will be divided over all modules that will be taught. Are all outcomes being represented in a balanced way? If some of the outcomes are covered by many modules, whilst others are only met once, you might need to reconsider either your learning outcomes or the content of (some of) your modules.

- 6.9 In the 'Music Masters' the **assessment** of the modules is based on the learning outcomes. This means that the learning outcomes had to be translated into practical assessment tools. For the development of the admission criteria, the learning outcomes are being taken into account as well as a point of reference to assess whether the candidate has the potential to reach the final learning outcomes after two years of study.
- 6.10 For both the admission and the assessment procedures you will have to consider how **jointly** you would like to give shape to these. If all schools want to be involved in the auditions and examinations of students in the partner institutions, this is definitely a joint procedure. However, this will result in high costs and effort, as a person representing each institution will have to travel to all other institutions. In the 'Music Masters' it was decided that trust is an important key word. In order to be able to assure that equal procedures are carried out, two persons from different institutions were appointed to take care of the admission and assessment procedures in each country, in addition to a local committee. The joint programme consortium has the confidence that these persons are capable of judging the quality and the extent of comparability of the procedures in each school.
- 6.11 In the EUA publication Developing Joint Masters Programmes for Europe various approaches to **admission procedures** are being identified. Some joint programmes use one set of entry criteria, application forms and admission procedures, often available through a common website. Some consortia also use decentralised admissions systems, but these systems can pose a number of problems, as they can result in considerable variation in entry conditions and different interpretation of admission criteria across institutions. The decentralised procedures can also lead to difficulties in obtaining clear information on the available programmes, particularly when there is no common website available. Decentralised systems can also result in unfairness for students, as it is commonly perceived to be easier or more difficult to gain access in some institutions/countries than in others.

In the case of the 'Music Masters', a digital registration tool has been developed for a centralised admission procedure. The programme manager and one designated person per institution take care of the administration of all student registrations. The students are asked to send a portfolio including a letter of motivation, a (digital) audiovisual presentation, a CV including distinguishing activities (portfolio), a study plan and to answer specifically chosen questions. Moreover, the student should make a first and second choice for the exchange institution abroad. After the registration period,

the first selection takes place. The home institution itself decides which students continue to the second live audition round. For the second audition round the local committee is joined by one/two member(s) of the institutions that is/are visiting all admission procedures. The second admission entails in any case the following items:

- A music performance, including a short ear training exercise
- A presentation of the study plan during an interview
- The DVD and the portfolio that have been sent for the first audition round are used as the basis for the discussions taking place during the second audition
- The applicants are also asked to do a short workshop with approximately 7 students

In the 'Music Masters' it has also been decided that after the auditions the selected students will be divided over the institutions for the semester abroad by two members of the steering group.

6.12 In principle, the admission procedure you carry out should be satisfactory to see which students are suitable for the programme. When a student turns out to be not as good as expected, and (s)he does not want to leave the programme (but is not improving either), legally this student cannot be forced in many countries to leave the programme. It might therefore be wise to have **prerequisites** in place. In the 'Music Masters' it was decided that at least 3 out of 4 of the compulsory modules of the first semester as well as the mentoring process should be finished adequately before the student can continue to the second semester. Moreover, it was decided that at the end of the first year all compulsory modules and the mentoring module should be completed adequately for a student to be able to move on to the second year.

6.13 In the 'Music Masters' the **ECTS system** was taken as point of departure, in which the average yearly workload per student is given 60 ECTS credits. It is a well-known fact that the average yearly workload can vary from country to country (and even per institute or per programme; this depends also on national legislation). In addition, in the case of the 'Music Masters' the minimum workload for a Master programme differs per country:

<i>Place</i>	<i>Yearly workload (60 ECTS)</i>	<i>Minimum master</i>
Holland	1680 hours	60 ECTS = 1680 hours
UK	12001 hours	90 CATS = 1800 hours
Iceland	1200 hours	90 ECTS = 1800 hours
Finland	1600 hours	60 ECTS = 1600 hours

The differences in yearly workload lead to almost insurmountable problems (and advanced mathematics) when a formal stance is taken. Comparability and recognition based on ECTS-credits connected to the formal national determined workloads becomes nearly impossible. This is why the 'Music Masters' has chosen for the following solution:

- It is acknowledged that there is sufficient trust among partners concerning level and intensity of studies;
- The existing national systems are being respected, but no attempt is being made to translate these directly to each other, as this is impossible;
- A more nominal view of the ECTS-system is being taken: 60 ECTS stands for a workload of a year and is subdivided over the different modules;
- If necessary, for internal use within each institute the respective official national workload is being used. When it comes to student exchange, only ECTS-credits are being used as the main “currency”, and it is accepted that behind this currency different formal systems may be hidden, but that the reality in all countries will be more or less the same.

For issues related to the use of credit points in higher music education, institutions should be referred to the AEC handbook *Implementation and use of Credit Points in Higher Music Education*¹⁸.

¹⁸ This handbook can be found in English, French and German versions at www.bologna-and-music.org/creditpoints.

7 TESTING AND EVALUATION

Before the first students start their education in your joint (Masters) programme, it might be wise to include a period of testing and evaluation.

- 7.1 In the 'Music Masters' it was decided that after two years of developing a curriculum, a quality assurance system and a thorough managerial plan, a **pilot year** would be conducted to test all these components of the programme before the first students would enrol in the programme. This pilot will test a two year programme in one year, which means that not everything can be tested. It has therefore been decided that the institutions will offer different modules during the pilot year and will assist each other in terms of experience. In any case, the four compulsory modules that are newly developed will be tested, as well as the IT-environment for students and teachers, the quality assurance system, the teacher exchanges and the joint management and financing of the programme. Moreover, some of the institutions will pilot the optional modules they are developing or adapting to a Master's level.
- 7.2 The 'Music Masters' has also invited an expert in the field of music to serve as an external evaluator during the project period in which the programme is being developed. The **external evaluator** oversees and monitors the development of the project and gives advice upon request as well as on her own initiative. She attends a number of the meetings and reads all reports. Through the 'helicopter view' of the external evaluator an extra layer of reflection is created, which enhances the ultimate quality of the work. Once the programme will be developed and implemented, a system with external examiners will be used as part of the internal quality assurance system of the programme (see §6.4).
- 7.3 The steering group 'Music Masters' has furthermore continuously evaluated the development of the programme through discussions on matters of importance during the meetings and by staying in touch through e-mail and telephone in between meetings.

8 DISSEMINATION

To attract the attention of potential future students and other interested parties, it is important to disseminate information about the joint programme and its development process. The target groups of the 'Music Masters' consist of students and staff in the partner institutions and in other institutions for professional music training, professional musicians and their organisations, international and national organisations interested in the development of a Joint Master Programme (e.g. European and national bodies, governmental organisations and international networks) and the general public interested in issues related to music training and the music profession. Therefore, the 'Music Masters' has chosen to use the following tools for dissemination:

- 8.1 A **website** has been produced for the description of the development process of the Joint Master Programme (www.jointmusicmasters.org). This website was specifically designed to inform interested parties about the way our Master is developed. In addition to a general description of the Master and the participating institutions, updated results of the work executed by the steering and working groups are being put online. Before the start of the pilot year, a second website will be launched that is meant to inform students about the Joint Master. This website will link to the local websites of the different schools, as well as to an internal part that is being accessed by students, teachers and supporting staff only. It is advisable to construct a website with a content management system that is easily accessible for the joint programme management: this way it is easy to update the information about the (development of) the programme.
- 8.2 A **course brochure** for the Joint Master Programme has been developed that is handed out to the students in addition to other local brochures. It was decided to include the following categories in the brochure:
 - Why this programme
 - Description of programme: specialisations, subject areas and qualification awarded
 - A programme schedule that gives an overview of the structure
 - Profiles of the institutions
 - Examples of external partners that are involved
 - Mentoring & personal pathway guidance
 - Examples of pathways of the student
 - Contact person per institution
 - Links to website addresses of the Joint Master and the separate institutions

In the course brochure reference is being made to websites, where more information can be found about the administration and admission procedures of the different institutions. Moreover, an extensive description of the compulsory and optional modules is also given.

- 8.3 In addition to the course brochure, a short online **study guide** is being produced, containing a general description of the Master (qualification awarded, admission procedures, final examination, etc) and a description of individual course units. The study guide will be linked to the general website, on which more detailed information on the programme can be found. It will also be linked to the websites of the various institutions, where the general educational and examination regulations are to be found. As students will study formally at their home institutions and will receive single degrees from these institutions, the JM study guide actually is to be seen as the programme-specific addendum to each of the existing more general documents per institution.
- 8.4 Two times per year a **digital newsletter** is being produced and distributed to inform a large audience in- and outside the partnership about the development of the joint 'Music Masters'. A professional designer has made a format for this newsletter.
- 8.5 An **information flyer** has also been produced as a information tool for congresses, seminars and other public events. This flyer refers to more extended information on the website.
- 8.6 **Presentations** about the development process at national and international congresses and seminars are being given, e.g. at the meetings and congresses of the AEC. A template has been developed in a clear 'house style' that is used for the showing of PowerPoint presentations.

9 INFORMATION SOURCES

EUA publications (www.eua.be)

- *Developing Joint Masters Programmes for Europe*, Results of the EUA Joint Masters Project (2004)
- *Guidelines for Quality Enhancement in European Joint Master Programme*, EMNEM - European Masters New Evaluation Methodology (2006)

AEC publications (www.bologna-and-music.org)

- *Handbook 10 Steps how to develop your ERASMUS exchange programme in music* (2008 – EN, DE, FR)
- *Higher music education: Characteristics, learning outcomes and competences* with learning outcomes and Polifonia/Dublin Descriptors for 1st, 2nd and 3rd cycles studies in music (2007 – EN)
- *Handbook for the Implementation and Use of Credit Points in Higher Music Education* (2007 – EN, DE, FR)
- *Handbook on Curriculum Design and Development in Higher Music Education* (2007 – EN, DE, FR)
- *Handbook for Internal Quality Assurance in Higher Music Education* (2007 – EN, DE, FR)
- *Guide to Third-Cycle Studies in Higher Music Education* (2007 – EN, DE, FR)
- *Today's student; tomorrow's alumnus – Cultivating good alumni relationships in conservatoires* (2007 – EN, DE, FR)
- AEC Framework document *Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Music Education: Characteristics, Criteria and Procedures* (2007 – EN, DE, FR)
- *Handbook How to Prepare for an Institutional or Programme Review in Higher Music Education* (2007 – EN, DE, FR)

The Bologna Declaration process

- The AEC Bologna & Music website: www.bologna-and-music.org
- The AEC DoReMiFaSOCRATES website: www.doremifasocrates.org
- The Official Bologna website: <http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/>

Links to joint programmes in music

- The Joint Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice website: <http://www.jointmusicmasters.org/>
- The Doctoral Curriculum in Musical Arts (DoCuMa) website: www.documa.org

APPENDICES

As appendices, the following administrative forms and information can be found, which are being used in the joint 'Music Masters for New Audiences and Innovative Practice':

1. A model partner agreement
2. A model staff hour declaration
3. A model reimbursement form
4. A joint budget with fictional amounts

APPENDIX 1:

MODEL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CONTRACTOR AND THE PARTNER

This Agreement, drawn up under the Community Programme SOCRATES (based on Decision 253/2000/EC of the European Parliament and the European Council of 24 January 2000 establishing the second phase of the Community Programme in the field of education 'Socrates'), shall govern the relationships between:

Hanzehogeschool Groningen

whose registered office is situated at:

**Postbus 30030
NL – 9700 RM Groningen**

represented by:

Ms Catharina Smilde, Coordinator of the project

hereinafter known as "the Contractor"

and

Whose registered office is situated at:

represented by:

hereinafter known as "the Partner"

have agreed as follows:

Article 1 / Scope of the Agreement

Having regard to the provisions of the Decision 253/2000/EC of the European Parliament and the European Council of 24 January 2000 describing the SOCRATES Programme, the Contractor and the Partner shall undertake to carry out the work programme set out in this agreement.

This work programme shall be as set out in **Project No. 29019 – IC – 1 – 2005 – 1 – NL – ERASMUS – PROGUC – 3** concluded between the Contractor and the European Commission, relating to the project entitled **Music Masters in New Audiences and Innovative Practice**.

The total cost of the project for the contract period under **Project No. 29019 – IC – 1 – 2005 – 1 – NL – ERASMUS – PROGUC – 3**, all financing combined, is estimated at Euros ... (including all taxes and duties).

The maximum SOCRATES contribution to cover expenditure incurred by the members of the Partnership participating officially in the programme shall be Euros ... or **44,51%** of the total cost of the project borne by the members, amounting to Euros ... Where actual eligible expenditure is less than this, the Community contribution will be restricted to **44,51%** of total eligible expenditure. No profit may be derived under any circumstances from this financial assistance.

This Agreement shall regulate the relationships between the parties and their respective rights and obligations arising from their participation in the project.

The subject matter of this Agreement and the work programme relating thereto are specified in the annexes which form an integral part of this Agreement and which each party states that it has read and approved.

Article 2 / Duration

This Agreement shall enter into force on 01/10/2006 and shall terminate on 15/01/2010. However, the contractual period in which actual expenditure can be made will terminate on 30/09/2009.

Article 3 / Obligations of the Contractor

The Contractor shall undertake:

- to take all the steps needed to prepare for, perform and correctly manage the work programme of the project, in accordance with the project objectives as set out in the Contract concluded between the European Commission and the Contractor;
- to forward to the Partner a copy of official documents in connection with the project, such as various documents, reports produced by the project, and relevant texts from the European Commission;
- to notify the Partner of any change to the Contract concluded with the European Commission;
- to decide, together with the Partner, on the role, rights and obligations of both parties, including those concerning the allocation of intellectual property rights;
- to respect all the provisions of the general Contract binding the Contractor to the European Commission.

Article 4 / Obligations of the Partner

The Partner shall undertake:

- to take all the steps needed to prepare for, perform and correctly manage the work programme of the project, in accordance with the project objectives as set out in the Contract concluded between the European Commission and the Contractor;
- to respect all the provisions of the general Contract binding the Contractor to the European Commission;
- to forward to the Contractor any information or document that the latter requests and that is needed for the management of the project;
- to decide, together with the Contractor, on the role, rights and obligations of both parties, including those concerning the allocation of intellectual property rights.

Article 5 / Financing - Description of tasks

The total expenditure to be committed by the Partner for the period covered by this Agreement corresponds to the tasks and costs set out in the Annexes (staff hour declarations) and the project work plan/timetable.

The partner will be reimbursed for the following costs:

- Travel and subsistence costs made by the steering group and working group members from the partner institution for steering/working group meetings that have been included into the official working plan/timetable and/or application. For reimbursement of all other meetings, permission will have to be asked from the Contractor.

For reimbursement of any other costs (e.g. printing, translation, etc.), permission will have to be asked from the Contractor. In any case, no costs can be reimbursed that have been not been included into the official working plan /timetable and/or application.

The Contractor will provide the partner institution with reimbursement forms in order to execute the necessary reimbursements as soon as possible. The partner will include (where possible) original copies of invoices with the reimbursement forms and will keep copies of these original invoices related to these expenditures on file for a period of 5 years.

Please note that, in principle, VAT cannot be covered by the EU grant, unless the VAT costs cannot be recovered by the partner institution or in the case the partner institution does not have a clear VAT accounting system to administer VAT costs.

Article 6 / Co-financing

The Partner's contribution shall be mainly in the form of staff hours worked for the project and general costs. This contribution shall be described and quantified in a staff hour declaration, which takes the form set out in the annex and form an integral part of this Agreement.

(A staff hour declaration describing the Partner's contribution in relation to staff costs should be attached as an annex).

Article 7 / Payments

The Contractor shall undertake to make payments in connection with the subject matter of this Agreement to the Partner by international bank transfer

Article 8 / Bank account

The partner will provide the Contractor with all relevant information concerning Bank accounts, etc.

Article 9 / Reports

The Partner shall supply the documents needed for completing the interim report to the Contractor by 15/11/2007 at the latest.

The Partner shall supply the documents needed for completing the final report to the Contractor by 15/11/2009 at the latest.

Article 10 / Follow-up and monitoring

The Partner shall, without delay, supply the Contractor with any information that the latter may request from him/her in connection with the implementation of the work programme forming the subject matter of this Agreement.

The Partner shall make available to the Contractor any document making it possible to check that this work programme is being or has been completed.

In the event of financial and/or operational audit by the competent authorities, the Partner shall cooperate with the Contractor such that the latter has all the necessary information.

In all publications in connection with this project (including publication on the Internet), any reference to the financial support awarded by the Commission shall be accompanied by a clearly worded statement that the content of such publication is the sole responsibility of its authors and in no way represents the opinions of the Commission or its departments.

Article 11 / Property rights

The Partner shall undertake to abide by the provisions of Article II.3 – “Ownership/use of results” of the Contract concluded between the Contractor and the European Commission.

The Contractor shall provide the Partner with all information on this subject, including such information as appears in the Contract and its amendments and in official documents and correspondence.

Article 12 / Liability

Each contracting party shall release the other from any civil liability in respect of damages resulting from the performance of this Agreement, suffered by itself or by its personnel, to the extent that these damages are not due to the serious or intentional negligence of the European Commission, the Contractor or their personnel.

The Partner shall guarantee the European Commission, the Contractor and their personnel against any action for damages suffered by third parties, including project personnel, as a result of the

performance of this Agreement, to the extent that these damages are not due to the serious or intentional negligence of the European Commission, the Contractor or their personnel.

Article 13 / Termination of the Agreement

The Agreement may be terminated if the Partner fails to perform one of the obligations arising from this Agreement, irrespective of the consequences set out in law that are applicable to him/her; this Agreement may then automatically be terminated by the Contractor without the need for any other legal formality, after notification of the Partner by registered letter has remained without effect for one month.

The Partner shall immediately notify the Contractor, supplying all useful information, of any event likely to prejudice the performance of this Agreement.

Article 14 / Jurisdiction clause

Failing amicable settlement, the Courts of Groningen (Contractor’s registered office) shall have sole jurisdiction to rule on any dispute between the contracting parties in respect of this Agreement.

The law applicable to this Agreement shall be the law of The Netherlands (country of the Contractor).

Article 15 / Modifications or additions to the Agreement

Modifications to this Agreement shall be made by an amendment signed on behalf of each of the parties by the signatories to this Agreement.

Article 16 / Annexes

The following documents are annexed and are an integral part of this Agreement:

- Staff hour declarations, including description of work

Done at in two copies.

For the Contractor

For the Partner

APPENDIX 2:

MODEL STAFF HOUR DECLARATION

To be filled out by each working group, steering group and other staff member working in the framework of the 'Joint Music Masters in New Audiences and Innovative Practice' co-ordinated by the Hanze Hogeschool Groningen.

Name:	Hilke Bressers
Partner organisation and partner number:	Hanzehogeschool Groningen (Partner no. 1)
Address of partner organisation:	Veemarktstraat 76 NL – 9724 GA Groningen
Position in partner organisation (please mention ISCO-code):	Project Administrator (ISCO 4)
Contribution in time to 'Joint Masters' (in full-time days):	360 days

Description of activities:

- Responsibility as a project administrator for overall project management in terms of finances, practical organisation and content
- Preparation, in co-operation with the chairs, of 'Joint Masters' working and steering group meetings
- Reporting of working and steering group meetings
- Monitoring of project management and project results
- Supporting role in the production of project publications
- Supporting role in research activities, emerging from the work of the groups
- Production of interim and final reports to the European Commission

Dates of these activities: **1 October 2006 until 30 September 2009**

Gross wages (including insurance, taxes, etc.) corresponding to working time / costs for the employer for making employee available for 'Joint Masters'

(please specify total amount and amount paid per hour or day):

'Joint Masters' staff member:

Name:

Signature and stamp of the institution:

Please keep in mind that, in case of an audit by the European Commission, copies of salary slips may have to be provided as well as proof of other financial contributions (e.g. administration costs – communication, photocopies, hire of conference and training rooms, etc.). All invoices related to 'Joint Masters', also for those costs that have been or will be reimbursed by ERASMUS, will have to be kept for a period of 5 years.

APPENDIX 3:

MODEL REIMBURSEMENT FORM

To be sent to:
 Prince Claus Conservatoire
 Attn. Vasilis Ntoulos
 Veemarktstraat 76
 9724 GA Groningen
THE NETHERLANDS

Please specify to whom the reimbursement should be paid to by crossing the appropriate box:

Name of the declarant..... ☐

Date of birth (dd/mm/yyyy).....

Institution/organisation..... ☐

Address.....

VAT Number (if applicable).....

Bank name.....

Bank address.....

Account Holder

BIC / Swift Bank code

IBAN Account n°

Activity / dates

Specification of costs*	EURO	If other currency, state here
Travel costs
Hotel costs
Other living expenses
Publication & printing
Other expenses namely:

Total expenses in EURO

Hereby I declare to keep the copies of invoices related to this declaration for a period of 5 years **(please join original invoices to this form)**.

Signature: Date:

Reimbursement forms must be in EURO. Forms in national currencies only **will not be accepted and returned.*

APPENDIX 4:

A JOINT BUDGET WITH FICTIONAL AMOUNTS

JOINT MASTER - BUSINESS PLAN - BUDGET JOINT AREAS					
		2008-09	2009-10	2010-2011	
		once only	pilot year	one class	two classes
-		-	-	-	-
-		-	-	-	-
curriculum independent costs		-	-	-	-
Programme manager			10,000	20,000	
SG Meetings programme manager			1,000	1,000	
PR		1,000	10,000	10,000	
SG Meetings			10,000	10,000	
ICT		5,000	1,000	5,000	
Staff development			10,000	5,000	
		6,000	42,000	51,000	
curriculum dependent costs		-	-	-	-
<u>first year students</u>		-	-	-	-
Admission + final assessment			10,000	10,000	
Guest teachers			5,000	5,000	
Employed professors			10,000	10,000	
Student Mobility			10,000	10,000	
		0	0	35,000	35,000
<u>second year students</u>		-	-	-	-
Employed professors				10,000	
Students projects				1,000	
		0		11,000	
<u>summerschool</u>		-	-	-	-
			40,000	80,000	
unforeseen		-	-	-	-
6%			7,020	9,960	
total costs		-	-	-	-
		6,000	124,020	186,960	
Per student:		-	-	-	-
		0	3,543	2,671	
Commitment:		-	-	-	-
capacity		-	-	-	-
Prince Claus Conservatoire		7	1,200	24,804	37,392
RC Den Haag		7	1,200	24,804	37,392
Jyväskylä University of Applied Sciences		7	1,200	24,804	37,392
Guildhall School of Music & Drama		7	1,200	24,804	37,392
Iceland Academy of the Arts		7	1,200	24,804	37,392
		35	6.000	124.020	186.960

All amounts are fictional

DETAILED CALCULATION BUDGET JOINT AREAS

Once-only costs		
	Website design	1,000
	Course brochure development	1,000
	total	2,000
Curriculum independent costs per year		
<u>Programme manager in Groningen:</u>		
	Salary 0,3 fte x schaal 10	10,000
	Bureau	1,000
	Yearly institution visits travel + subsistence:	
	1x travel + 1x subsistence to The Hague (60+200)	1,000
	1x travel + 2x subsistence to London (150+400)	1,000
	1x travel + 4x subsistence to Reykjavik (750+1000)	1,000
	1x travel + 4x subsistence to Jyväskylä (600+1000)	1,000
<u>2x SG meeting travel + subsistence:</u>		
	1x meeting in The Netherlands, 2x subsistence (400)	1,000
	1x meeting abroad: train 60+ ticket 600+ 2x 210 subsistence	1,000
<u>PR:</u>		
	Website support (hosting = 50/month)	1,000
	Course brochures editing + print	10,000
	PR employer 0,1 fte x schaal 9	10,000
<u>SG meeting (of 2 days) 2 times a year:</u>		
	2 x 6 SG members travel + subs (650+2x210)	10,000
<u>Internal ICT-infrastructure</u>		
	Blackboard enrollment per student/teacher and general support	
	50 per user x (35 students + 70 teachers)	1,000
<u>Joint staff development (4 days)</u>		
	5 persons from abroad, 1 The Hague, 1 Groningen	
	5 x tickets	1,000
	6 x train Schiphol - Groningen (6 x 2 x € 27,90)	1,000
	hotel x 8 (4 nights x €75)	1,000
	lunch (25) dinner (50) x 4 x 9 persons	1,000
	total	53,000
Curriculum dependent costs year 1		
<u>Admission procedure + final assessment</u>		
<i>per school 1x home inst, 1x partner inst (travel +subs)</i>		
	The Hague to Groningen traintickets + 1x subsistence (60+100)	1000
	Groningen to Reykjavik ticket+4x subsistence (750+1000)	1,000
	Reykjavik to Jyväskylä ticket + 4x subsistence (850+880)	1,000
	Jyväskylä to London ticket + 4x subsistence (550+800)	1,000
	London to The Hague ticket + 4x subsistence (550+800)	1,000
	7x daily wages for local experts, incl travel (400)	1,000
<u>Costs for student meals (lunch)</u>		
	35 students x 15	1,000
	10 staff x 15	1,000
<u>Guest teachers (working on hourly paid basis)</u>		
		10,000
<u>Extra costs students' mobility for 35 students</u>		
	-	10,000
<u>Travel + subsistence of employed professors (4 days per visit)</u>		
	8 compulsory module teachers per year	
	8x (travel + subsistence= 650+4x210)	10,000
	total	38,000

Curriculum dependent costs year 2		
<u>Travel + subsistence of employed professors (4 days per visit)</u>		
	8 compulsory module teachers per year	
	8x (travel + subsistence= 650+4x210)	10,000
<u>Students' projects</u>		
	Amount of principle 150 x 35 students	1,000
	total	11,000
	TOTAL	104,000

All amounts are fictional



Association Européenne des Conservatoires,
Académies de Musique et Musikhochschulen (AEC)
PO Box 805 NL-3500AV Utrecht The Netherlands
Tel +31.302361242 Fax +31.302361290
Email aecinfo@aecinfo.org Website www.aecinfo.org



Education and Culture

Socrates
Erasmus