

polifonia

HANDBOOK

HANDBOOK ON MOBILITY AND RECOGNITION ISSUES IN JOINT PROGRAMMES



Lifelong
Learning
Programme



'POLIFONIA'
WORKING GROUP
ON MOBILITY:
RECOGNITION,
MONITORING
AND JOINT DEGREES

**Disclaimer**

This project is funded with support from the European Commission. This report reflects only the views of the authors and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which might be made of the information contained herein.

CONTENTS

Contents	2
Abbreviations used in this handbook.....	3
Foreword	4
1. Purpose of this handbook	4
2. Context of the project	4
3. Authors of this handbook.....	5
4. Thanks	6
Introduction.....	7
A. What are joint programmes?	8
1. Explaining the terms.....	8
2. Indicating the benefits.....	9
B. How to develop a joint programme?	13
1. Preparatory/preliminary phase	13
2. Development phase: administration and curriculum development	16
3. Implementation phase	32
4. Stabilisation and sustainability phase	37
C. Case studies	39
1. The joint postgraduate programme European Jazz Masters	39
2. The joint master programme in contemporary performance and composition	40
3. The joint master programme 'New Audiences and Innovative Practice'	41

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS HANDBOOK

AEC	Association Européenne des Conservatoires, Académies de Musique et Musikhochschulen
ECTS	European Credit Transfer and accumulation System
ECC	Education and Examination Codes
EUJAM	European Jazz Master
HME	Higher Music Education
JP	Joint Programme
QA	Quality Assurance
QE	Quality Enhancement
WG	Working Group

1. PURPOSE OF THIS HANDBOOK

Within the ERASMUS Network for Music ‘Polifonia’, Working Group (WG) 5, “Mobility: Recognition, Monitoring and Joint Degrees”, was responsible for promoting mobility in higher music education (HME). In order to identify the specific mobility and recognition issues that apply in European joint degrees, the WG carried out several case-studies and site-visits. Drawing from the experience of these case-studies, the WG has compiled this handbook, which aims to describe the various steps to be undertaken when designing and implementing such a programme. It provides information on what exactly is meant by the term joint programme, lists the benefits to institutions from the use of joint programmes and presents some recent experiences. It also outlines practical details that institutions have to consider when developing a joint programme.

2. CONTEXT OF THE PROJECT

Since its launch in 2004, the ERASMUS Network for Music ‘Polifonia’ has proactively addressed European higher education policy issues (such as mobility, research, quality assurance and accreditation, admission and assessment, links with the profession, etc.) from the perspective of HME.¹ Through the consistent output of high quality products, it has been able to raise the awareness of these issues throughout the sector, which has subsequently supported the implementation of these outputs at both institutional and national levels. From a general higher education point of view, ‘Polifonia’ has often been cited as a good example of what can be achieved through a subject-specific and European-level approach to the modernisation agenda that was initiated by the Bologna Declaration and is now embedded in the Europe 2020 strategy.

The ‘Polifonia’ project, supported by the ERASMUS Networks programme of the European Union, is the biggest European project on professional music training to date. The first project cycle ran from 2004-2007, the second from 2007-2010 and the third, jointly

¹ For more information about the ‘Polifonia’ project, visit its website at <http://www.polifonia.eu>.

coordinated by the Royal Conservatoire The Hague and the Association Européenne des Conservatoires, Académies de Musique et Musikhochschulen (AEC), from 2011-2014.² In this last cycle, experts from 55 different institutions in the field of higher music education and the music profession were involved, coming from 26 European countries and 4 countries outside Europe.

The overall aim of 'ERASMUS Network for Music 'Polifonia' is to promote innovation in, and enhance the quality, attractiveness and accessibility of, European higher music education through cooperation at the European level.

3. AUTHORS OF THIS HANDBOOK

The Working Group (WG) 5 has promoted mobility in the HME sector through a variety of activities. During the course of the project, the WG has focused on the following aims:

- achieve a European-level agreement on how to deal with recognition issues in higher music education institutions;
- develop a methodology to facilitate reciprocal external examining arrangements in higher music education;
- carry out case-studies to identify mobility and recognition issues in European joint degrees.

'Polifonia' WG 5 members:

- **Keld Hosbond** (Co-chair - Det Jyske Musikkonservatorium, Aarhus)
- **Rineke Smilde** (Co-chair - Prins Claus Conservatorium, Groningen)
- **Chris Caine** (Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance, London)
- **John Galea** (Università të Malta, Malta)
- **Aygül Günaltay** (State Conservatory of Istanbul, Istanbul)
- **Hannah Hebert** (Koninklijk Conservatorium Den Haag/AEC), The Hague/Brussels)

² The Erasmus academic networks were supported by the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Commission, the European Funding programme in the field of education and training, in place between 2007 and 2014. The Erasmus academic networks were designed to promote European co-operation and innovation in specific subject areas. For more information on this funding programme, visit the website http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/erasmus/erasmus_networks_en.php.

- **Shane Levesque** (Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts, Hong Kong)
- **Hanneleen Pihlak** (Eesti Muusika - ja Teatriakadeemia, Tallinn)
- **Martin Prchal** (Koninklijk Conservatorium Den Haag, The Hague)
- **Eleonoor Tchernoff** (Koninklijk Conservatorium Den Haag, The Hague)
- **Ioannis Toulis** (Music Department - Ionian University Corfu, Corfu)
- **Maarten Weyler** (Conservatorium Hogeschool Gent, Ghent)

4. THANKS

The WG members would like to express their deep gratitude to representatives of the various visited institutes for sharing their experience on designing and implementing joint programmes. The WG is also very grateful to the 'Polifonia' management team for all their support in the realization of this handbook.

In 2008, the Association Européenne des Conservatoires, Académies de Musique et Musikhochschulen (AEC) and the Prince Claus Conservatoire, Groningen, The Netherlands published a handbook on *How to develop a joint programme in Music*, written by Hilke Bressers. The text of this publication was mainly based on the experience of the development of the joint 'Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice'. In his introduction, former AEC chief executive Martin Prchal, writes:

*"...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."*³

Members of the 'Polifonia' WG 5 took this challenge seriously and have jointly produced this publication to reflect the changes to the landscape of joint degree programmes since the 2008 publication. It attempts to describe the latest 'state of the art' as it exists in 2014 in terms of the various steps to be undertaken when designing and implementing a joint programme. During the years 2011-14, members of the WG undertook site visits at existing joint programmes in different European countries and in institutions of HME. Furthermore, they reviewed a methodology developed within a 'virtual joint programme'. Benefiting from these insights, the handbook offers practical advice and concrete examples, including some from the original publication, on running joint Masters programmes in the field of music, whether with physical mobility, harmonised curricula or in the form of a 'virtual joint programme'. As a result, it is a combination of a practical handbook and a description of examples of good practice.

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, and still is, an active advocate of the Bologna process and the modernisation agenda for European higher education. It sees joint programmes - one of the first clearly visible results of the process - as an important opportunity for the further development of HME in Europe.

³ H. BRESSERS, *How to develop a Joint Programme in music*, 5.

A. WHAT ARE JOINT PROGRAMMES?

1. EXPLAINING THE TERMS

Joint Programmes take many forms, and the terminology used to describe them is not always clear or consistent. For this reason, it is the first task of this handbook to try and map out the territory with some definitions.

The first problem to be encountered is that the phrase ‘joint programme’ can be used both to describe such programmes generically and to describe one particular form that such a programme can take. Throughout most of the handbook, when the phrase is used, it is its generic meaning that is intended. However, in this first section, we will begin by defining the term as it is used when distinguishing a joint programme from a joint degree, a double degree or a joint study programme.

1.1 Joint Programme:

A Joint Programme, when used in this more precise sense, involves the completion of coursework that will earn a student two (rather than simply one) degrees. Joint programmes are established by international partner universities. Students can make use of the expertise and facilities of the partner universities. The programme is completed within a system of organized mobility, meaning that students are able to travel back and forth between institutions to attain the joint degree. The student’s international diploma is recognized by each of the degree-awarding partner institutions.

1.2 Joint Degree:

A joint degree refers to a collaboration between two or more institutions on a joint study programme leading to a joint degree. This means that all partner institutions are responsible for the entire programme and not just their own separate parts of it. A joint degree can be documented by issuing a joint diploma, a joint diploma plus two or more institutional diplomas, or simply the two or more institutional diplomas. This is in line with the definition in the Lisbon Convention. A joint degree may be issued as:

- a joint diploma in addition to one or more national diplomas;

- a joint diploma issued by the institutions offering the study programme in question without being accompanied by any national diploma;
- one or more national diplomas issued officially as the only attestation of the joint qualification in question.

1.3 Double Degree:

Double degrees comprise two degrees awarded by higher education institutions offering the joint programme attesting the successful completion of this programme.⁴

1.4 Joint Study Programme:

There are several alternative models of joint study programmes. These are the two main ones:

- a joint study programme where two or more institutions collaborate on the programme, but where each institution is responsible for admission and awarding of degrees to its own students. The programme is developed and managed jointly, but each institution 'owns' its own students;
- a joint study programme where two or more institutions cooperate on a joint study programme that leads to a degree being awarded at one of the partner institutions.

In the latter case, two or more institutions collaborate on a study programme leading up to a degree at one of the institutions. One institution is responsible for the degree and issues the degree diploma. The awarded degree diploma is linked to an integrated curriculum coordinated and offered jointly by different higher education institutions.⁵

2. INDICATING THE BENEFITS

Establishing a Joint Programme (JP) consists of far more than just entering into a contract. The benefits that joint programmes bestow on all higher education actors merit greater recognition. The development of a joint programme is a long and difficult path requiring

⁴ *Joint programme terminology*, 2014

(http://ecahe.eu/w/index.php/Joint_programme_terminology#Programme).

⁵ *Joint programme terminology*, 2014

(http://ecahe.eu/w/index.php/Joint_programme_terminology#Programme).

extra efforts, costs and most of all, institutional commitment. One of the main objectives could be to enrich the quality of the education and research the degree encompasses. By joining forces, the institutions can develop a programme of a higher academic standard than the institutions might achieve separately. Therefore, the construction of a JP involves developing a new study programme and a new arena for knowledge. In the following paragraphs, possible benefits and advantages a JP will be indicated.

2.1 Benefits for students:

- new long-term cultural opportunities, including the possibility to develop and extend language-learning skills;
- the opportunity of experiencing other artistic and didactical concepts and approaches;
- study in multi-cultural environments, enhancing experiences of European culture and extending pan-European social and technological knowledge;
- development of permanent network links across Europe;
- training that gives musicians a clear international dimension in their experiences and views;
- widening of future employment prospects and preparation for an international career;
- added value in the *curricula vitae* of graduates;
- increased employability and motivation for mobility in a global labour market;
- increased interest from non-European students in the newly developed programmes;
- an expanded and innovative arena for learning;
- innovative learning methodologies and study programmes of a different and more advanced academic quality.

2.2 Benefits for teaching staff:

- fostering the professional growth of the staff involved, influenced by the involvement of different actors at institutional level;
- exposure to different academic environments and traditions;
- professional development opportunities outside the national context;

- the development of tried and tested ties within a network, building solid bases for international cooperation;
- interaction between teaching and research in specialized areas.

2.3 Benefits for Institutions

- learning about policy and practice in other European institutions and countries concerning the set-up of JP;
- placing the institution at the forefront of European inter-university cooperation;
- becoming stronger by combining the diverse strengths of individual institutions;
- building a greater potential for specialized programmes with high qualitative programme with the help of high quality teachers and infrastructures;
- by sharing expertise and costs, establishing a competitive and specialized programme that will improve the international reputation of the institution and attract new students;
- increasing the institution's ability to change in step with emerging needs;
- increasing the knowledge of transparency and comparability of HMEI systems;
- embedding the use of ECTS and the Diploma Supplement
- introducing a European dimension of quality assurance (QA);
- providing opportunities for continuing professional development through contacts between colleagues and institutions;
- forming a strategic target within the overall internationalization strategy.

2.4 Benefits of an international dimension for European higher education:

- fostering geographical cooperation;
- increasing the international reputation of European HE;
- expanding horizons not only for students, but also for academics and institutions, which stand to gain in today's competitive global landscape through European collaboration and mutual learning;
- meeting a wide range of European needs, and also placing European higher education as a reference for quality on the global map;

- avoiding shortcomings in the existing arrangements of co-operation between European HE systems;
- encouraging structural cooperation with partner institutions abroad. Joint programmes can be preferred options in this strategy and thus fit within the Erasmus Mundus (now ERASMUS+ Credit Mobility and Joint Degrees) concepts of consortia and integration;
- increasing transparency between educational systems;
- facilitating multi-national research contacts;
- developing study and research programmes targeted to new global and emerging needs;
- strengthening the international profile by increasing the number of excellent joint programmes;
- increasing the competence of partner institutions through cooperation and implementation of a best practice system;
- enhancing both national and international recruitment, since JPs increase the attractiveness of European HE to both groups.

B. HOW TO DEVELOP A JOINT PROGRAMME?

1. PREPARATORY/PRELIMINARY PHASE

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

1.1 Choose your partners - mission, vision, curriculum

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 Association Européenne des Conservatoires, Académies de Musique et Musikhochschulen (AEC), which provide very broad descriptions of the levels in higher education and expectations of the competences to be achieved at these levels by a typical student in higher music education (HME). These documents could provide a good basis for the comparison of the levels of existing programmes.

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.

And what kind of a Joint Programme would you like to offer? In which field of specialization 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' whose development was coordinated by the Prince Claus Conservatoire, Groningen, The

Netherlands, 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.

1.2 Academic and administrative staff resources

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. 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 that the institution's commitment is not strong enough.

The partners should exchange the Education and Examination Codes (EEC) or a similar document containing regulations concerning inscription, exam facilities, language policy etc. If not already available, this should be translated to English. These documents are (mostly) in concordance with national law, and a lot of information that one needs for setting up a joint programme is stated in them. It is necessary for every member of the development team of both the institutions to read their own EEC and that of the other member. It is also a good idea to annotate significant differences between the different documents; this will anticipate certain problems ahead.

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 the academic colleagues within them) fully support the goals and objectives of the programme.

1.3 Division of tasks among academic and administrative staff

Within a joint programme it is important to identify and make use of the expertise and unique profiles of the different institutions and of the academic and administrative staff working in them. What expertise do the institutions have to offer, and on which basis should tasks be divided?

1.4 Financial issues

When it has become clear which partner institutions will participate in the development of the Joint Programme, the way that 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 – for example, if the development forms part of a Strategic Partnership. In the case of the joint ‘Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice’, funding was obtained through a curriculum development project grant under the previous ERASMUS scheme. The grant covered 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 still had to pay the costs for the staff involved in the project.

It is possible to make a different choice in terms of 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, and the new unit-cost method of calculation sets up certain constraints within which budgets have to be drawn up. 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 among the partners ahead of time on how to deal with extra costs.

It is advisable to sign a partner agreement, which governs the relationship between the coordinating institution and the other conservatoires. Such a document 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 pay slips for a fixed period of time in case of an audit by the European Commission.

1.5 Development of programme contents

A project plan should be written, including a detailed work plan. In this plan you may want to include the following:

- description of main partners and their contribution;
- description of external/associate partners and their contribution;
- budget for the development of the programme;
- objectives of the programme;
- subject areas/specializations/learning outcomes;
- admissions criteria/requirements;
- mobility scheme;
- evaluation and dissemination;
- planning of activities for the development of the programme;
- extended work plan;
- promotion plan;
- summary of the project.

Make sure the partners agree on the programme and project plan.

2. DEVELOPMENT PHASE: ADMINISTRATION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

2.1 Methodology

The methodology proposed here for preparing a joint programme will divide the collection of the information needed into different working phases. The realization of these phases depends on high-quality management, which needs direct communication between the right persons at each institute. Therefore it is advisable to set up a steering group and working group at the outset.

2.1.1 Steering Group

In the case of the joint 'Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice', a steering group was established, which had the task of taking care of the management and evaluation of the project, securing time paths and results, and producing a business plan and organisational and managerial model for the joint programme. The steering group, which met two times per year, consisted of one person representing the management of each institution, including a representative of the coordinating institution for the project, who acted as chairman.

The steering group members should feel responsible for the work that is delivered by their working group members (see below) including meeting deadlines.

2.1.2 Working Group

In addition to the steering group, working groups will need to be established to drive forward the development of the JP. In the case of the joint 'Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice', several working groups were established. One working group of teaching staff (one per institution) was responsible for the development of the curriculum of the Joint Master. Another group, consisting of one member per institution, dealt with QA issues, such as the development of internal and external QA systems. The chairs of the working groups were members of the steering group as well, in order to assure short lines of communication between the groups.

2.1.3 Meetings

Working groups will meet more frequently than the steering group. For the joint 'Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice', both working groups met seven times during the project period of three years. The working group meetings were meant for evaluation, discussion, outlining further development and getting to know the schools where the future Joint Master would take place. Therefore, the meetings took place in each institution on a rotating basis. In between the meetings, work was carried out by all members, but also by little groups of experts within the working groups. Optional external partners attended a meeting once per year. In addition to this fixed number of external partners, local site experts were also invited

the attend project meetings as well as part of the dissemination strategy of the project.

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 a 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.

In general, it is worth re-emphasising here 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.

2.2 Working phases

For each phase, one person should be responsible for gathering all information. Each phase could be preceded by the sending, roughly seven days in advance, of a questionnaire concerning topics of the next phase at hand to the different participating institutes. Using set deadlines, those responsible should meet (for example in a videoconference monitored by the person responsible for the phase) to discuss the topics and to finalize the agreement concerning the relevant phase.

2.2.1 Checklist of the working phases (an indicative example)

Phase 1 - Student Administration will be dealing with:

- application & admission;
- database.

Phase 2 - Quality Assurance & Accreditation:

- legal framework for accreditation process;
- QA plan & bodies.

Phase 3 - Evaluation, Recognition & Grading:

- examination criteria;
- process of master thesis & joint defence;
- (final) grading (ECTS & conversion table);
- evaluation / monitoring of the programme (both internal and external);

Phase 4 - Graduation:

- Joint diploma.

Phase 5 - Finances:

- budget plan;
- income

2.3 Examples of implementation of the different working phases

Phase 1 - Student administration

Due: April 15th at 3 PM

1.1 Decisions

Decisions have to be made concerning:

- application form;
- selection criteria and process;
- installation of a Committee of Admission;
- definitive Selection of the students;
- registration & enrolment.

1.2 Questionnaire

[In this questionnaire and those in the following sections, some 'real life' examples that were made anonymous are added to give an idea of answers received during this process]

1.2.1 Admission criteria for an accredited international Master's programme

- Diploma requirements starting a Master's programme

What are national/institutional requirements to applicants starting a Master's programme?

Students normally require a Bachelor's degree or equivalent qualification. Examples of equivalent qualifications might be a diploma or diplomas that give satisfactory preparation for the Master's programme.

- Language requirements

Are there any language requirements for entering to programme or for running the programme?

The programme is delivered in English and there are minimum standards of English that must be achieved before commencing the programme.

1.2.2 Application procedure

What are the national/institutional requirements to applicants starting the procedure for entering a Master's programme?

Translated certificate and transcript of previous degrees; certificate of language ability; online statement of motivation; online application form including details of previous study; audition.

1.2.3 Selection procedure

What are national/institutional requirements to selection procedures applying for a Master's programme?

The institution governs selection procedures but these follow national guidelines issued by the Quality Assurance Agency. At postgraduate level there is no minimum or maximum number set for eligible students (undergraduate numbers are regulated by the Government). Selection is by individual audition in front of a panel (jury) and students are graded according to a set of entrance criteria. Once graded a Selection Panel will give the final verdict on which candidates are accepted. International students can send attested DVD/CDs but must play "live" on arrival before being enrolled. A jury grades DVDs/CDs and the Selection Panel will give the final verdict on which candidates are accepted.

1.2.4 Enrolment or registration

How do you manage students' applications in your university (database, portal, etc.)? Do you have a specific procedure for joint degrees? If yes, how is it connected to your local information management system?

Applications are managed online through the Conservatoire UK CUKAS system. Once registered, all details are transferred to the institution's database and many records are maintained electronically (assessment, registration and financial timetable). All records are governed by the freedom and protection of information laws.

2.1 Decisions

Decisions have to be made concerning:

- putting up a list of the minimal national requirements for general QA;
- ensuring academic level (student evaluations);
- ensuring administration (external control);
- QA in line with (national) accreditation;
- make up QA plan and bodies:
 - internal: students, administration;
 - external: research units, enterprises or other external stakeholders;
- student book with all do information (i.e. ensuring transparency);
- setting up an ex-post evaluation (i.e. looking at employability) – stay in touch with the alumni.

2.2 Questionnaire - Legal requirements

What requirements does national legislation set regarding to quality assurance on the institutional level? Is there a requirement for the institution to have a certified quality assurance system or what requirements on the institutional level related to quality assurance must educational establishment comply with? In other words: what are the requirements for internal quality assurance system?

Requirements for quality assurance on institutional level are set by the 'State' Higher Education Quality Agency that carries out institutional accreditation of institutions providing higher education in our country. Institutions must undergo institutional accreditation at least once in seven years. *Quality indicators and evaluation criteria (the internal quality assurance system of our institution) are set in the annex of the document "The Conditions and Procedures for Institutional Accreditation".* The Agency shall assess the compliance of the management, administration, academic and research activity, and academic and research environment of higher education institutions with the requirements by the following areas and sub-areas: Organizational management and performance; teaching and learning, Research, development and/or other creative activity, service to society. *The full document with the requirements is found on our website.*

What are the requirements exist on national level for accreditation of new and existing study programmes? What obligations institutions must fulfil? What reports have to be developed in order to accredit a new study programme and prolong the accreditation period of an existing one?

The Flemish Interuniversity Council (Vlaamse Inter-universitaire Raad/VLIR) was established in 1976 to improve mutual understanding and cooperation amongst our universities. VLIR operates as a think-tank and advises the Flemish government on all policy aspects higher education is involved in. University leaders and specialized staff members collaborate with VLIR to create consensus on a wide range of topics including degree structure, research management, QA, student services, academic governance and so on.

For the accreditation of a new program, VLIR collaborates with NVAO (Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatieorganisatie – Accreditation Organization for the Netherlands and Flanders). A new program is recognized if it meets the generic quality standards. The assessment of these generic quality standards is linked to three questions:

- *what is the aim of the program?*
- *how does the program intend to achieve this?*
- *how will the program evaluate whether the intended learning outcomes have been achieved?*

The framework makes a distinction between programs provided by “statutory registered institutions”¹, programs provided by “registered institutions” and programs provided by “institutions not yet registered”. The registered and not yet registered institutions are not subject to an institutional review. This is why a fourth question is asked for the assessment of the programs that they wish to offer concerning the set-up and the organization of the internal QA. NVAO bases its assessment of the new program on an assessment conducted by an assessment panel. This assessment results in an initial accreditation report.

The work method and procedure for initial accreditations are set down by NVAO. A differentiated approach has been chosen for this. Although the generic quality standards for all new programs are the same, the character of the assessment procedure for the proposed program varies depending on how new the program is at the institution in question and in Flemish higher education.

3.1 Decisions

Decisions have to be made concerning:

- the harmonization of examination criteria and examination cultures:
 - for instance Slovenia 6 x and then expel of university – Czech 4 x in one year – France 2 x in one year
 - national legislation or institutional rules?
 - oral and written possible?
 - paying for extra exams?
- all partner institutes ask thesis – deciding on minimal requirements for each country;
- organization of jury? for simple exams? for final exams? and organization joint defence? external jury members?;
- thesis or do we also accept internship or a combination of both;
- grading ECTS and marks conversion table/scale for each institute:
 - A-B-C-D-E-F in Czech Republic;
 - 1 - 10 (5 is pass) in Lithuania versus 1 - 10 (6 is pass) in Slovenia;
 - 1 - 20 (10 passes) in France and Belgium;
- evaluation / monitoring the program.

3.2 Questionnaire

3.2.1 Exams

State the different assessment methods used at your institute.

We have different assessment methods: written or oral exams, seminar work/presentation, portfolios, project work etc. Different types are not set by any regulation.

OR:

The second year of Master in Country X is either professional (internship + report) or research (master's thesis). The student chooses at the beginning of the second year of master whether he will do an internship or a thesis. Both master's theses and internships result in a report.

Repetitions of exams: how many times can a student redo his exam?

In total six times, four times in the same academic year. After the sixth attempt, the student is expelled from the university. No national rules, just institutional.

Students don't pay for extra exams.

3.2.2 Master's thesis

How do you monitor the decision process of the master's thesis?

The Law on Education does not define the number of pages or credits for master's thesis - the number of pages of final thesis and amount of credits is defined per university. Usually it ranges from 70 to 90 pages. Amount of ECTS credits, related to final thesis also is not defined by Law, however, the usual case is that it equal to one semester load of work and amounts to 30 ECTS credits.

Does the master's thesis imply a 'defense' of this work?

The defense is optional and depends from the department or from the professor in charge of the master's thesis.

What are minimal requirements for the master's thesis with regard to the amount of pages, the amount of ECTS credits, the link with an internship and the minimum duration of the internship?

- *Pages: not specified by law but in practical terms, at least 60 pages.*
- *Amount of ECTS: not specified by law but in practical terms, at least 15 ECTS.*
- *Internship with internship report – defense is optional.*
- *Minimum time of internship is three months.*

3.2.3 ECTS

Does your institute use an ECTS conversion table? Please send the table attached.

ECTS scale	Level	Comment	UCG scale
A	Excellent	Outstanding performance with no or only minor errors	16 – 20
B	Very good	Above the average standard, but with some errors	14 – 15
C	Good	Generally sound work with a number of notable errors	12 – 13
D	Satisfactory	Pass. Performance meets the requirements	11
E	Sufficient	Pass. Performance meets the minimal requirements	10
FX	Not sufficient	Some more work required before the credit can be awarded	7 – 10
F	Poor	Considerable further work is required	0 – 7

4.1 Decisions

Decisions have to be made concerning:

- distributing, printing, signing the diploma – *In country X around 1 month after graduation the diploma is already delivered, in country Z every university has to sign joint master diploma. The diploma is printed by the state;*
- signatures? *In country Z the rector, dean and student have to sign – in country C the rector and the dean;*
- what has to be included on the diploma?;
- is a diploma supplement obligatory, necessary?;
- the design of the diploma;
- the supplement: issuing of the double/multiple diploma. Normally, the diploma supplement is provided by the coordinating institute;
- this needs internal communication and information about all courses, the institution where course was followed, results, the so-called mobility track record. This information has to come from the own administration of the institute.

4.2 Questionnaire

4.2.1 Joint diploma

The main question is whether your national legislation allows you to deliver a joint diploma?

Do you agree on this definition of joint diploma of our programme, stating that “a joint diploma is the single diploma signed by the rectors/ chancellors of all partner universities or at least most of them and recognized as a substitute of national diplomas”?

Bearing in mind that all partner universities are involved in the Programme but not effectively in every track, does your legislation let you award a joint diploma also to a student who never studied at your university? Is there any legal limitation? Clarify any national restriction related to the issuing of the joint diploma.

Please specify references of your national legislation and institutional regulations as to the award and issue of the diploma.

Please specify all the joint diploma necessary elements and data required by your national legislation and institutional regulations.

Please specify the joint diploma layout or format required by your national legislation and institutional regulations. Identify what must be written on the diploma and its language. Do you accept English as the European language for the joint diploma, or do we need a multilingual issuing?

Accordingly to your national legislation and institutional regulations, which university can issue the joint diploma on behalf of the consortium? Do you agree on stating that the university at which the thesis is defended is also the one issuing the joint diploma?

4.2.2 Design and content of joint diploma

Please specify your regulations as per the logo, giving a sample.

Please specify what must be written on the joint degree (data and awarding formula).

At the bottom we need to collect info about the following elements: seals, signatures, dates and reference number.

Phase 5 - Finances

Due: August 15th at 3 PM

5.1 Decisions

Decisions have to be made concerning:

- Financial administration done by the coordinating institute or by an external enterprise?;
- definition of a joint diploma budget:
 - human resources;
 - cost of a coordinator;
 - mobility budget;
 - marketing, budgets and responsibilities;
 - creating an e-learning environment;
- definition of (common) tuition fees;
- management and distribution of tuition fees or of the joint diploma budget
 - redistribution is defined by the consortium;
 - more money for the organizing university?

- finding financial support for the programs in terms of scholarships or human resources:
 - scholarships;
 - mobility: Erasmus mobility agreements for the students?;
 - audits & visits;
 - promotion;
 - administrative support;
 - Erasmus for All possibilities;
- calculation of costs and in the reserves for sustainability;
- reporting and accounting phase when requested by donor.

5.2 Questionnaire

Who sets the tuition fees?

Is it determined for each academic year or for a longer period?

When do the tuitions fees have to be publicized at the latest?

Do you have a unique tuition fee for master programmes?

Is there a maximum tuition fee?

Are there mechanisms of exemption of payments of tuition waivers? A number of tuition fees waivers will be decided each year by the Academic Board, on the basis of applicants' academic records.

Can you set extra registration fees?

Do you have special regulations for joint diplomas?

5.3 Example of cost overview of an agreement

5.3.1 Table containing the cost of an agreement calculated on a two years basis for 30 students.

Type of cost	Calculation formula	Total
Staff (employment of an administrative officer for the Joint Degree Programme management) by the 'leading' university	€1,500/month X 12 months X 2 years	€ 36,000
Travel and subsistence cost for the Joint Degree Programme teachers (oral defence)	7 universities to visit X 2 external teachers per oral defence date X 2 years = 28 mobilities 28 mobilities X €1,000/mobility	€ 28,000
The Joint Degree Programme Promotion - website - flyers, posters	€ 5,000 € 1,000	€ 6,000
External audit	€ 6,000	€ 6,000
Office stationary	7 universities X €500	€ 3,500
Computer Equipment of the Joint Degree Programme administrative officer at 'leading' University - Computer: hardware + software - Printer	€1,000 € 300	€ 1,300
Phone costs (communication)	6 universities X €150 + 1 university (leading) X €250	€ 1,150
Scholarships	€ 8,000/year x 15 students X 2 years	€ 240,000
Bank commission for currency conversion from € to £	3% of the amount to be converted for each financial transaction	€ 10,000
Tuition fees to be distributed among universities on a 2-year basis	€ 8,663.37 X 30 students (average amount)	€ 259, 901
OVERALL COSTS ON 2 YEARS		€ 591,851

5.3.2 Table allowing the calculation of the average tuition fees, as well as the most expensive and the cheapest paths chosen by students on a two year basis.

Tuition fees per university		
University	Tuition fees per year	Tuition fees/semester
University (Great Britain)	Non EU student: £ 13,900 EU student: £ 4,700	Non EU student: £ 4,633.33 (€ 5,763.90) EU student: £ 1,566.66 (€ 1,948.93)
University (Germany 2)	EU/Non EU students : € 0	EU/Non EU students : €0
Leading University (Germany 1)	EU/Non EU students : € 0	EU/Non EU students : €0
University (France 1)	EU/Non EU students : € 250	EU/Non EU students : € 125
University (France 2)	EU/Non EU students : € 250	EU/Non EU students : € 125
University (Poland)	EU/Non EU students : € 4,700	EU/Non EU students : € 2,350
University (Portugal)	EU/Non EU : € 3,000	EU/Non EU : € 1,500

5.3.3 Example of the most expensive path chosen by a student on a two year basis

Semester 1 at a university in Great Britain (non EU student = £ 13,900/3 = £ 4,633.33 or € 5,763.90), semester 2 in Poland (€ 4,700/2 = € 2,350), semester 3 at a Portuguese institution (€ 3,000/2= € 1,500) and semester 4 again in Great Britain (non EU student = £ 13,900/3 = £ 4,633.33 or € 5,763.90) costs € 15, 377.80 in total. If 30 students opt for this path: 30 X € 15,377.80 = € 461,334. The tuition fees are to be distributed according to national rules among the institutes from Great Britain, Poland and Portugal.

5.3.4 Example of the cheapest path chosen by the student on a two year basis

Semester 1 at a university in Great Britain (EU student = £ 4,700/3 = £ 1,566.66 or € 1,948.93), semester 2, 3 and 4 at German universities (€ 0) = € 1,948.93 in total. If 30 students choose this path: 30 X € 1,948.93 = € 58,467.90. The tuition fees are to be distributed among the institutes from Great Britain and Germany.

5.3.5 Average cost on a two year basis

Average cost of tuition fees between the most expensive academic career choice and the cheapest path: € 15,377.80 + € 1,948.93 = € 8,663.37 per student.

5.3.6 Table showing funds calculated on a two year basis

Type of fund	Calculation formula	Total
Tuition fees	€5,000 X 30 students X 2 years	€300,000
Private fund raising		
- ACCOR group/ Club Med	€ 100,000	€ 330,000
- British Airways	€80,000	
- Deutschbank	€ 70,000	
- Air Portugal	€ 80,000	
Public fund raising		
- European Union	€ 75,000	€ 140,000
- DAAD	€ 15,000	
- Polish Ministry for HE	€15,000	
- Portuguese Ministry for HE	€15,000	
- French Ministry for Higher Education (MESR)	€20,000	
OVERALL FUNDS ON 2 YEARS		€ 770,000

5.3.7 Difference between costs and funds

Difference between costs and funds: € 770,000 - € 591,851 = € 178,149. This profit would allow the institutions to distribute the tuition fees among the Joint Degree Programme Universities according to their national regulation if all the joint degree programme students came to choose the most expensive academic career.

2.4 Curriculum development

In the initial stages, the rationale and broad outlines of the curriculum will have been agreed upon. You will now have to decide the details of the curriculum you wish to develop. How do you 'translate' this to a study programme with modules? Which modules would you like to make 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 as options in each

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* could be helpful for the development of your curriculum.⁶

In order to gather the same information for all modules in all institutions, you will need to develop a course format. The following categories may include:

- course title;
- course code;
- type of course;
- level of course;
- year of study;
- number of credits;
- contact hours;
- names of tutors;
- objectives of the course;
- pre-requisites;
- course contents;
- recommended reading;
- teaching methods;
- assessment methods;
- use of the e-learning environment;
- language of instruction and assessment;
- corresponding learning outcomes;
- breakdown in sessions.

⁶ J. COX, *AEC Handbook - Curriculum Design and Development in Higher Music Education*, 2007. This handbook can be found in English, French and German versions at the AEC website (<http://www.aec-music.eu/>).

As the curriculum development progresses, the institution will have to start to think about the involvement of teachers and other staff. In case of (compulsory) modules that are taught in each institution, the profile and the 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. In order to support the previous point, it is essential to invest in the continuing professional development of teachers.

In the case of the joint 'Music Master for New Audiences and Innovative Practice', 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 was planned during the pilot year in 2008 with Mentoring as the main theme, and has since been continued annually. This could be considered as an example of good practice.

3. IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

3.1 Testing and evaluation

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

Often, it is decided that a pilot year will be conducted to test all the components of the programme before the first students will enrol specifically on the full programme. A possibility is to offer to existing internal students different modules during the pilot year and for the participating institutes to assist each other in terms of experience. Besides the testing of the newly developed modules, the IT-environment for students and teachers, the quality assurance system, the teacher exchanges and the joint management and financing of the programme must be tested.

During the test period, an expert in the field of music and pedagogy may serve as an external evaluator to oversee and monitor the development of the project and to give advice upon. This advisor may attend a number of the meetings and read 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.

The steering group can continuously evaluate the development of the programme through discussions on matters of importance during the meetings and by staying in touch through in between meetings. You may wish to consider investing time in finding efficient means of communication, such as online platforms.

3.2 Dissemination

A broad agreement will have been reached at an early stage as to marketing responsibilities and the budget. In order 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. A target group can be created, consisting 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 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.

The added value of this type of joint programmes should be clarified for possible applicants: information about learning outcomes and employability should be emphasised and can be increased by demonstrating possibilities of collaboration the business communities.

The following tools for dissemination can be set in place:

3.2.1 Website and social media

A website and various forms of social media can be developed to inform interested parties with a general description of the Master Joint Programme and the participating institutions. These matters of communication 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.

3.2.2 Course brochure

A course brochure for the joint programme should be developed that is handed out to possible students in addition to other local brochures. In the course brochure reference may be 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 should also be given.

The following categories may be included in the brochure:

- why this programme;
- description of programme: specialisations, subject areas and the qualification to be awarded;
- a programme schedule that gives an overview of the structure;
- profiles of the partner 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 programme and the separate institutions.

3.2.3 Study guide

In addition to the course brochure, a short online study guide is being produced, containing a general description of the programme (qualification awarded, admission procedures, final examination, etc.) and a description of individual course units. The study guide will be linked to the general website and to social media, 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. This study guide is to be seen as the programme-specific addendum to each of the existing more general documents per institution.

3.2.4 Social media campaign

A social media campaign, possibly accompanied by a digital newsletter, can be produced to inform a large audience about the development of the joint programme.

3.2.5 Leaflet

An information leaflet can be produced as an information tool for congresses, seminars and other public events. This flyer refers to more extended information on the website.

3.2.6 Presentations

Presentations about the development process at national and international congresses and seminars may be organized at the meetings and congresses of the AEC.

3.3 Implementation

3.3.1 Enrolment and admission

The practical organisation of the programme must have been discussed and agreed on in the development stage. Each institute will have to implement what has been agreed upon. Language and administrative skills of staff and faculty should be enhanced. The regular application procedure should be adapted both to an international dimension and to the needs of the consortium. A decision should be made whether a specially designated application procedure is needed for this programme, or whether the normal application procedures can be followed.

The management of an integrated programme between different institutes involves many actors: consortium secretariat, the coordinating institute, the single institutions, the faculties and many more. This also means that system differences such as examination periods, procedures etc. but also the alignment of academic calendar should be ready for implementation. The partners should establish a system of evaluation and improvement of student administration systems of the joint programme. Additionally, the programme may be evaluated as part of the evaluation procedure of each institution. Regular meetings between those responsible will create a sense of security and strengthen the bonds between colleagues from the

participating institutions. Common criteria for enrolment and admission but also for appeal procedures will create a sense of joint responsibility for the institutions. Often, the coordinating institution is responsible for practical aspects of admissions, which means sending out a common letter of admission on behalf of the partner institutions and a letter of refusal and information about waiting lists.

3.3.2 Certificates and documents

Also here, start thinking about the practicalities as early as possible. State therefore in the cooperation agreement how the degree will be awarded and be aware of each partner's requirements and limitations. Regardless of the type of diploma, it must be stated on the Diploma and Diploma Supplement that the degree is a joint degree. The parties must agree on the minimum contents of the diploma. When will the joint diploma be issued? The contents and format should be clarified at least one semester before the first intake of students.

3.3.3 Student's arrival and accommodation

Frequent contact with enrolled students from the time of admission until the start of the programme will facilitate the process of student arrival and accommodation. Send to all enrolled students information on practical matters (e.g. length of procedures for the issues of visa, recognition of degrees) and programme specific information. Plan induction events regarding accommodation, insurance, residence permits, next to tutoring and integration services and other activities for the incoming students. Since students will stay for a longer period at another institute, housing opportunities and services needs to be clearly communicated. The availability and portability of scholarships and student aid programs should be looked upon and must be made visible to possible students. Partner institutions should agree on who is responsible for answering questions from potential applicants.

4. STABILISATION AND SUSTAINABILITY PHASE

Sustainability, which is usually underestimated or even ignored when developing a joint programme, should be one of the priorities. In addition to a set-up plan, a strategy with a long-term plan to support the programme, not only academically but financially as well, is essential to ensure sustainability. Sustainability is not only about money as it is often thought to be: it is also about the quality and excellence of the programme. In this context, it should be borne in mind that joint programmes, although they may begin through innovative and exciting initiatives, have just as much need as more conventional programmes to be periodically reviewed and updated so that their relevance and vitality is maintained.

4.1 Academic sustainability

A feasibility study will have been carried out at the early stages of planning and should be kept and monitored regularly throughout the running of the programme. Likewise, the curriculum should meet the demands of the day as well as the future. Even after the programme is started, the curriculum review and revision by internal and external evaluations would support sustainability. It is important that all the parties involved plan and have seminars and meetings to discuss issues concerning sustainability of the programme both in the means of professional development and mutual exchange.

4.2 Financial sustainability

Although the financial support by European Commission is beneficial, care should be taken to ensure that there is provision for sustainability when the funding from the EU expires. Applications for financial support by the Commission should be very carefully planned, since "... sustainability is about the challenge of securing the necessary resources to operate a programme beyond the period of core funding by the European Commission."⁷ The strategic financial plans will have been improved and should be kept continuous review with planning for a worst case scenario. Within the network, there should be negotiation on the financial aspects and economic scope. There should always be consideration of the opportunities for

⁷ *Clustering Erasmus Mundus joint programmes and attractiveness projects survey report*, 2012, 15.

other external funding. It must be clearly defined what minimum contributions will be made by each institution.

For a sustainable financial plan, the partner institutions should think about:

- the target group of the programme;
- total student numbers;
- scholarship funding;
- increasing the number of paying students;
- commercial and cultural funding;
- adapting the programme to changing contexts;
- marketing;
- links with the profession;
- a focus on the quality;
- employment after graduation.

Last but not least, to sustain a joint programme, the partner institutions should cooperate fully with each other and share responsibilities for all aspects.

C. CASE STUDIES

As has been seen throughout this handbook, joint programmes can take different shapes and forms. This can vary from joint programmes that comprise a number of modules or form part of programmes of a consortium of institutions that are offered jointly, mainly through intensive Erasmus exchange, to completely new developed programmes where all institutions start to develop a programme 'from scratch'. Examples of three cases are briefly described below.

1. THE JOINT POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMME EUROPEAN JAZZ MASTERS

The European Jazz Master (EUJAM) is a postgraduate programme for young elite jazz performers and composers. Five European jazz schools are cooperating: the Conservatorium van Amsterdam, Hochschule für Musik 'Hans Eisler' Berlin, Rytmisk Musikkonservatorium Copenhagen, Conservatoire national supérieur de musique et de danse de Paris and the Jazz Performance Programme from the Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim. This programme was up and running during the time of the case study.

The joint postgraduate programme EUJAM offers is a joint postgraduate programme, not a joint degree. Students are admitted to a home institution and get their degree from that institution. Two of the four semesters are spent there, the first and the last. The two remaining middle semesters are spent at two of the other four institutions. The aims of the EUJAM are:

- educating a new generation of strong contemporary jazz performers by supporting a student driven curriculum;
- providing the possibility to investigate European jazz in its broad artistic, cultural and entrepreneurial scope;
- helping students to design and perform artistic projects in collaboration with professional performers, organisational and business enterprises;
- giving students the opportunity to develop a strong international professional network;
- providing students with a broad range of professional qualifications.

2. THE JOINT MASTER PROGRAMME IN CONTEMPORARY PERFORMANCE AND COMPOSITION

The Joint Master Programme in Contemporary Performance and Composition (CoPeCo) is a two-year joint master programme that offers the students an open platform for experimental artistic practice within a European setting. The programme is operated by four European Music institutions: Eesti Muusika-ja Teatriakadeemia (Estonia), Kungliga Musikhögskolan i Stockholm (Sweden), Conservatoire National Supérieur Musique et Danse de Lyon (France) and Hochschule für Musik und Theater Hamburg (Germany). CoPeCo was developed as a three-year LLP Erasmus Curriculum Development project. The programme was in the second year and at the end of the first phase of the programme development process during the site visit.

The programme offers a joint master programme with a single degree from the home institution and all graduates receive a certificate signed by the heads of the four institutions stating that the student has completed a joint master programme. The students spend each of the four semesters in a different institution, moving from one to the other as a group with the other CoPeCo students.

The programme aims to integrate the traditionally separate disciplines of contemporary composition and performance and encourage an interdisciplinary approach with the inclusion of other art forms into the curriculum. The programme also aims 'to create a common collaborative platform for composition and performance students (...) and will offer up-to-date specialised education in contemporary music with a focus on live electronics, improvisation, cross disciplinary interaction and cooperation'. The programme features include:

- a trans-disciplinary approach (composition and performance; music and other arts);
- new technology and new media integrated into the programme on the levels of pedagogy and artistic expression;
- mobility built into the core of the programme;
- an emphasis on group work and synergy (between students; between students and teachers).

3. THE JOINT MASTER PROGRAMME 'NEW AUDIENCES AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICE'

The joint master programme 'New Audiences and Innovative Practice' (NAIP) of Prince Claus Conservatoire in Groningen, the Royal Conservatoire in the Hague, the Royal College of Music in Stockholm and the Iceland Academy of the Arts in Reykjavik. This programme was already up and running during the time of the case study and frequent reference has been made to its development phase during the handbook.

This programme was developed between 2006 and 2009 by Prince Claus Conservatoire in Groningen, the Royal Conservatoire in The Hague, the Iceland Academy of the Arts in Reykjavik, Guildhall School of Music & Drama in London and the University of Applied Sciences in Jyväskylä in Finland. The development was funded by the European Lifelong Learning programme. The joint master NAIP is an innovative two-year master programme, helping students to develop and lead creative projects in diverse artistic, community and cross-sectorial settings, thereby creating new audiences and developing their leadership skills in varied artistic and social contexts. The programme aims to provide 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.