Reaction of the European Association of Conservatoires (AEC) on the dimensions and indicators developed in the framework of the Classification Project

In this document, the AEC, a European association representing almost 300 institutions for higher music education in all European countries that has assumed a role on the U-Map advisory board, seeks to suggest changes to the dimensions and indicators in order to increase the relevance of the classification to the higher music education sector in Europe.

The AEC has carefully considered the dimensions and indicators as presented in the CEIHE II Final Report "Mapping Diversity" by discussing these in the following working group meetings:

- In the 'Bologna' Working Group during its meeting on 3 February 2009 in Ljubljana
- In the 'Accreditation' Working during its meeting on 24 February 2009 in Genoa
- In a consultative group with conservatoire leaders on 25 June 2008 in Antwerp
- In the meetings of the AEC Council on 20 September 2008 and 28 March 2009 in Utrecht

In addition, a telephone conversation was conducted with Mr Sam Hope, executive director of the National Association of School of Music (NASM) in the US, to collect information about experiences with the Carnegie Classification and its consequences for the higher music education sector.

Contact will also be made with the European League of Institutes of the Arts (ELIA), which represents app. 350 art colleges around Europe, inviting ELIA experts to provide feedback to the CEIHE II proposal. It is expected that ELIA will return with feedback on the proposal soon.

In general, the AEC is supportive of any measure that would increase the transparency of higher education in Europe, including a classification of higher education institutions. It is clear that it is in the interest of the sector to find a visible and clear place within the European higher education arena. Nevertheless, before giving a more detailed overview of the comments to the dimension and indicators, the AEC would like to express the following:

1) As was learned from the experiences with the Carnegie Classification in the US, the subject-specific dimension of such a classification will be limited: some higher music education institutions that are units in bigger comprehensive higher education institutions will appear in the classification under a category reflecting the characteristics of the large ensemble, whereas the stand-alone institutions (app. 60% of the AEC membership) will appear in another category. A subject-specific classification will therefore not be necessary. However, dimensions and indicators will have to be created that will not only accommodate the stand-alone subject-specific institutions, but also enable music units within larger higher education conglomerates to contribute to the dimensions and indicators of the classification of the comprehensive higher education institution they are part of as well.

2) The relevance of the current classification system for the various beneficiaries mentioned in the CEIHE final report has been discussed at length. If we consider students, the current dimensions and

indicators do not seem informative enough for this target group in order to allow them to choose a higher education institution. Essential criteria informing students' choice are for example student friendliness, career opportunities, cost of studies, opinion of current students and alumni on the institution. For music students, such criteria need to be even more specific in order to be really helpful for students: the latter would be interested in information such as the number of practice room and the number of teachers in their area of musical study.

3) An important point of concern for the music sector is the strong scientific orientation of this classification at the expense of the professional orientation. Some dimensions are only approached in a scientific way, such as the research intensiveness and the innovation intensiveness. With the indicators currently chosen, the higher arts education institutions will not appear in this category. However, numerous and various research activities are taking place in higher arts education institutions and innovation is at the core of music education. The sector therefore suggests broadening the scope of the indicators for these two dimensions.

4) The above-mentioned issue has already been expressed during the second phase of the CEIHE project. However, the comments of the music sector have not been followed regarding the research dimension, as they would "reduce the legitimacy of the dimension for other institutions (especially the traditional research universities)[1]". Our sector would rather prefer to broaden the scope of the "Research intensiveness" dimension than to exclude a complete sector from this dimension.

5) Some national authorities have developed a set of criteria and indicators in order to determine the allocation of funding to universities; these are most of the time not relevant for the higher music education sector. Working towards a European classification integrating the music sector in a better way would be of great help to the institutions and the sector is therefore committed to assist the CEIHE project team in making concrete suggestions to improve the relevance of the classification system for this type of institutions. However, the dimensions and indicators will need to be broad enough to avoid the situation in which narrowly defined indicators will make some dimensions irrelevant for some sectors, leading to possible adjustments of the levels of funding.

---

[1] CEIHE II Final Report, page 23.

U-Map – Comments and suggestions of the higher music education sector	
* These comments are based on a thorough knowledge of the higher music education sector in Europe, but could very well be relevant for other sectors (e.g. drama, visual art & design, humanities) as well. The advice of ELIA (see above) will be important in this respect.	
* The sector agrees with dimensions 1, 2, 8, 9, 11 and 12 as they are and would like to make the following suggestions/comments on the other dimensions and indicators.	

Indicators	**Comments of the music sector**
3: orientation of degrees	Taking into consideration the fact that many artists create their own labour market and work as freelancers it is suggested to add a fourth indicator that mentions "self employed professions" OR indicator 3b will also include self-employment (to be clarified by the U-Map project team)
3a: the number of programmes leading to certified/ regulated professions as a % of the total number of programmes	The term "regulated profession" needs to be clarified.
3b: the number of programmes offered that answer to a particular demand from the labour market or professions (as % of the total number of programmes)	The term "particular demand" needs to be clarified.
3c: the number of student placements in firms, hospitals etc. as a % of total enrolment	More examples of placements could be mentioned, such as schools and cultural organisations.
4: involvement in lifelong learning	This indicator should be more focused on the number of programmes that have (or include) adult learners as specific target groups. In addition, no indicator is mentioned in relation to pre-college education which is fundamental for lifelong learning in some artistic disciplines.
4a1: number of adult learners as a % of total number of students (all degree levels combined)	The term "adult learner" needs to be clarified. There is however a risk of age discrimination if specific ages are mentioned.
4b: number of part-time adult learners as a % of total number of part-time students	The term "part-time" needs to be clarified as in some countries this concept does not exist.
4c: number of students enrolled in specific LLL programmes	
4d: number of extracurricular courses offered for regional labour market (see 14b)	

5: research intensiveness	This dimension is relevant, but as currently described only to a very small number of institutions. The indicators should be broadened so that the music sector could be represented, as numerous research activities are taking place in higher music education institutions.
5a: number of peer reviewed publications per fte academic staff	The term "publications" should be replaced by products, outcomes or results to take the different kinds of artistic outcomes into account.
5b: the ISI based citation indicator, also known as the 'crown indicator'	The ISI based citation indicator cannot be applied to Higher Music Education institutions. Need for an alternative to this indicator?
5c: total research income as a percentage of total income	
6: innovation intensiveness	New indicators suggested: • Offer of 3rd cycle studies in the institution (YES/NO). • Total research spending as a percentage of total spending The arts are important agents of creativity and innovation. A way of identifying innovativeness in the arts can be to look at awarded prizes, scholarships, grants, commissions for compositions, choreographies or theatre projects
6a: the number of start-up firms	The term "start-up firms" should be broadened to "professional organizations/ enterprises".
6b: the number of patent applications filed	The term "copyrighted products" should be added in order to include products such as compositions.
6c: annual licensing income	Need for an alternative indicator
6d: the revenues from privately funded research contracts as a % of total research revenues	Need for an alternative indicator or "revenues from privately funded contracts as a % of total revenues"
6e: use of full academic costing (yes/no)	This indicator needs to be clarified.
7: international orientation: teaching and staff	
7a1: the number of degree seeking students with a foreign qualifying diploma as % of total enrolment	The term "diploma" could create confusion in certain countries and should be replaced by "degree" or "qualification".

7b1: the number of incoming students in international exchange programmes, as % of total enrolment	
7c1: the number of students sent out in international exchange programmes	
7d: international staff members as % of total number of staff members	
7e: number of programmes offered abroad	
7f: the number of students in joint degree programmes as a % of total enrolment	
	<u>New indicator</u>: number of international partnerships
10: mode of delivery	The term "programme" needs to be clarified in this dimension (does it mean a degree-granting programme or can it be a course or a module)?
13: cultural engagement	This indicator should be taken out as it does neither contribute in a helpful way to classify higher education institutions without artistic subjects that usually score very low, nor to e.g. higher music education institutions that score much higher in this indicator than average.

However, indicators 13a and 13b could be merged in one indicator and used to provide information on the regional engagement of the higher education institution (appearing in dimension 14). |
13a: number of official concerts and performances (co)-organised by the institution	
13b: number of official exhibitions (co)-organised by the institution	
14: regional engagement	The formulation of this indicator as it is at the moment does not represent the Higher Music Education sector.
14a: annual turnover in EU structural funds as % of total turnover	
14b: (will be dropped out) number of graduates remaining in the region as % of total number of graduates	This indicator should remain in the classification. There are many examples of institutions in far away regions for reaching out to such regions.
14c: number of extracurricular courses offered for regional labour market	
14d: importance of local/regional income sources	The term "importance" should be clarified
14e: the number of start-up firms (see 6a)	
14f: the number of partnerships with business and industry	The term "businesses and industry" should be enlarged to "community, public bodies, etc."

	New indicators:
	<u>New indicators:</u> • Number of contacts/collaborations with local, regional and national organisations outside education (such as concert halls, festivals, research centres). • Number of concerts, performances and exhibitions (co)-organised by the institution in the regions as a % of total number of these activities (co)-organised by the institution