

# MUSIQUENHANCEMENT QUALITY

## Report

**Quality Enhancement Review of the Bachelor and Master of  
Arts in Music programmes delivered by the**

**Koninklijk Conservatorium Brussel  
Erasmushogeschool Brussel**

**(Brussels, Belgium)**



**Site-visit: 16-17 May 2018**

## Content

Introduction.....	3
Key data on KCB.....	5
A note on the scope and context of the review.....	6
1. Programme's goals and context.....	7
2. Educational processes.....	9
2.1 The curriculum and its methods of delivery.....	9
2.2 International perspectives.....	12
2.3 Assessment.....	13
3. Student profiles.....	16
3.1 Admission/Entrance qualifications.....	16
3.2 Student progression, achievement and employability.....	17
4. Teaching staff.....	19
4.1 Staff qualifications and professional activity.....	19
4.2 Size and composition of the teaching staff body.....	19
5. Facilities, resources and support.....	21
5.1 Facilities.....	21
5.2 Financial resources.....	21
5.3 Support staff.....	21
6. Communication, organisation and decision-making.....	22
6.1 Internal communication process.....	22
6.2 Organisational structure and decision-making processes.....	22
7. Internal quality culture.....	24
8. Public interaction.....	25
8.1 Cultural, artistic and educational contexts.....	25
8.2 Interaction with the artistic professions.....	26
8.3 Information provided to the public.....	27
Summary of the compliance with the Standards and recommendations.....	28
Conclusion.....	32
Annex 1. Site-visit schedule.....	33
Annex 2. List of documents provided to the review team.....	38

## Introduction

The conservatoire was founded in 1832. In 1967 the unitarian Belgian conservatoire was split into an independent Dutch and French speaking institution. Following a merger in 1995 of several art and non-art related Brussels based higher education institutions, Koninklijk Conservatorium Brussel (from now on: KCB) became a part of the Erasmushogeschool Brussel. In 2004 the two-cycle programmes, including the basic music training, were changed into an academic programme fully integrating research and study of the arts. In 2012 a decree was passed turning KCB into a School of Arts within the Erasmushogeschool Brussel, with its own responsibilities in the field of organisation of music education and research (Source: *SER*, p. 3-6).

Since 2003, Flanders has developed an external quality assurance system of programme evaluations for its University Colleges. An external independent panel monitored each programme. Since 2005, an accreditation was added to the external quality assurance system. Until 2015, all study programmes of Flemish higher education institutions were evaluated each eight years.

Due to the decree of June 10, 2015, institutions underwent an extensive institutional review which is an institutional review extended with an additional assessment that focuses on the conduct exerted on programme evaluation by the institution rather than assessing the actual quality of the programmes.

Since the changes to the quality assurance and accreditation scheme within the Flemish higher education system in 2015, Erasmushogeschool Brussel has been responsible for ensuring the quality of its own study programmes. KCB took the decision to commission MusiQuE – Music Quality Enhancement (MusiQuE) to organise a procedure for a quality enhancement review of its Bachelor and Master of Arts in Music. In Flemish higher education it is customary for students with an academic Bachelor's degree (BA) to follow a subsequent Master's programme (MA). MusiQuE coordinated the organisation of the quality enhancement review and carried out the review of the music programmes.

The procedure for the review of the music programmes followed a three-stage process:

- KCB prepared a *Self-evaluation Report (SER)* and supporting documents, based on the *MusiQuE Standards for Programme Review*;
- An international review team composed by MusiQuE studied the *SER* and conducted a site-visit at KCB on 16-17 May 2018. The site-visit comprised meetings with representatives of the KCB management team, teaching and support staff, students, alumni, employers and external stakeholders, and visits to classes and performances. The review team used the *MusiQuE Standards for Programme Review* as the basis of its investigations;
- The review team produced the review report that follows, structured along the *Standards* mentioned above.

The review team consisted of:

- Georg Schulz (Chair), Associate professor at, and former rector of, the University of Music and Performing Arts Graz, Austria
- Jacques Moreau, Director of the Cefedem Auvergne Rhône-Alpes, Centre de formation des enseignants de la musique, Lyon, France
- Hannie Van Veldhoven, Head of jazz and pop at HKU University of the Arts Utrecht, The Netherlands
- Ankna Arockiam (Student member), Royal Conservatoire of Scotland, Glasgow, Scotland, United Kingdom
- Patrick Van den Bosch (Secretary), Advisor quality assurance at VLUHR KZ, Brussels, Belgium

The review team would like to express its sincere gratitude to the staff of KCB for the excellent organisation of the site-visit and for welcoming the review team as peers in such a hospitable way. The review team hopes that the present report will be beneficial for the continued high-quality performance. The review team would like to encourage KCB to make the report available to all stakeholders by circulating it among its staff members and students and also by publishing it on the KCB website.

## Key data on KCB

<b>Name of the institution</b>	Koninklijk Conservatorium Brussel / Royal Conservatory of Brussels (KCB)
<b>Legal status</b>	Public institution
<b>Date of creation</b>	1832  In 1967 the unitarian Belgian conservatoire was split into an independent Dutch and French speaking institution (Source: <i>SER</i> , p. 4).
<b>Website</b>	<a href="https://www.kcb.be">https://www.kcb.be</a>
<b>Number of students</b>	In 2017-2018 the music programmes consist of 536 students, divided in four categories: Bachelor, Master, preparatory programme and postgraduate. Part of these 536 students is simultaneously enrolled in the BA and The MA programme. In the BA, 295 students are enrolled; in the MA 250 students are enrolled. At the end of 2016-2017, 67 Bachelor and 71 Master degrees were conferred (Source: <i>SER</i> , p. 4).

## List of reviewed programmes

1. Bachelor of Arts in Music, including: Conducting, Music Writing, Instrumental/Vocal Studies, Jazz/Popular Music and Composition.
2. Master of Arts in Music, including: Jazz/Popular Music, Instrumental/Vocal Studies, Music Writing, Composition and Conducting.

## **A note on the scope and context of the review**

KCB and the Royal Conservatoire of Antwerp have jointly commissioned MusiQuE to organise a programme quality enhancement review, and both institutions requested to be reviewed in the same week by the same review team. The objectives of the quality enhancement review was to provide both institutions and their programmes with an opportunity to engage in a process of internal reflection on the quality of their educational services and, where relevant, to offer the institutions suggestions for improvement. Moreover, the review aimed to bring fresh ideas and wider perspectives to KCB and the Royal Conservatoire of Antwerp, encouraging the principle of 'many correct answers' to questions concerning the pursuit of quality in higher music education.

Given the broad scope of the institutional reviews in 2016-2017, MusiQuE agreed that this programme review would focus on the artistic education and not so much on the underlying policy processes of KCB and the Royal Conservatoire of Antwerp. Therefore, not all standards in the *SER* had the same emphasis. Consequently, on explicit request by KCB, for standards 4, 5, 6 and 7 which were given only a little emphasis in the *SER*, there will not be any compliance statements made in the present review report.

This report of the review team is articulated based on the information provided in the *SER*, the online appendixes, and the meetings conducted during the site-visit. The review team wishes to express its gratefulness to KCB for providing the requested materials to the review team.

## 1. Programme's goals and context

### Standard 1. The programme goals are clearly stated and reflect the institutional mission.

KCB adopted a new mission statement in 2017 – 2018 (Source: *SER*, p. 7). The review team learned that the core elements behind KCB's vision on music education remain (1) the continuation of an artistic tradition of excellence in music; (2) the presence of a qualitative artistic national and international environment; (3) the interweaving of artistic practice, education and research. The programme leaders called together two large 'resonance groups' with alumni and representatives of the artistic field to discuss the new learning outcomes as designed by the programme committee. Finally, 28 new learning outcomes (14 for the BA and 14 for the MA) were approved. The programme leaders told the review team that formulating this set of learning outcomes was an inspiring task that forced them to think about the concept of the BA and MA programmes at KCB (Sources: *SER*, p. 8; *meeting with institution management and programme leaders*).

As stated in the *SER*, the current learning outcomes of the music programmes can be clustered within three main goals, whose content corresponds to the new KCB mission statement: (1) musical insight and knowledge, (2) the creative application of both in an artistic realisation or performance and (3) the musician's artistic-societal positioning. The review team learned that a graduated musician must have integrated these three artistic pillars – knowledge, practice and vision – in his/her own expertise, within the current cultural context and from an artistic, societal and historical perspective. The stated goals for the BA and MA programmes are relevant and reflect the institutional mission. These learning outcomes are tested against the domain-specific learning outcomes of music programmes in Flanders, validated by the Dutch Flemish Accreditation Organisation (NVAO) (Sources: *SER*, p. 8; *meeting with institution management and programme leaders*; *Annex 1. Comparison of the Domain-specific learning outcomes of Music programmes in Flanders with the KCB Learning outcomes*).

The programmes' approach to equal opportunities is not part of the institutional vision. The institution management and programme leaders met by the review team mention that there is an increasing awareness about gender. But they indicate that it is still a question of a generation. As an example, they point out that the alumni that obtain international prizes are now both male and female graduates and that the current KCB director is the first female director of the conservatoire (Sources: *meeting with institution management and programme leaders*).

The review team was in favour of the comprehensive vision on a musician in the 21<sup>st</sup> century with changes to a traditional approach. Therefore, the review team commends the extremely high artistic level that is intended involving high quality of teachers and based on a long tradition. The review team wants to emphasise the pursuit of excellence of the BA and MA programme build up on 3 pillars: music practice, education and research. Even so, the review team commends the cultural / international environment for students. The latter will be elaborated under the following standards.

Based on the meeting with all stakeholders, the review team has a strong impression that the teachers of the BA and MA programmes are the driving forces behind the programmes. The teachers take almost all initiatives organically. The review team perceived leadership on distance. On the one hand, this bottom up approach can be very stimulating and innovative. On the other hand, the review team strongly recommends a more proactive managerial approach. This is considered necessary to achieve the goals faster with a long-term strategical plan.

The meetings with different stakeholders, especially the institutional management and programme leaders, convinced the review team that they are very eager to achieve the goals and reach their ambitions. It is nevertheless important that they choose and prioritise targets they want to develop on a structural way.

The review team was surprised that there was no mention of the several other Belgian Conservatoires in the *SER* as this is important for benchmarking purposes. It can further strengthen the profile of the BA and MA programme and eventually it can even lead to collaborations with the other conservatoires. The latter is rarely the case today.

When it comes to dealing with diversity, including gender and disabilities, additional steps should be taken to raise awareness and embed these themes in the conservatory culture. In the institutional mission and the programme goals, diversity is not mentioned explicitly. As a result, the review team did not discover awareness of staff in dealing with diversity. The review team recommends raising awareness in the conservatory culture about equal opportunities by describing smart goals as institutional ambitions.

### **Compliance with Standard 1**

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 1 as follows:

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Compliance level</b>
Bachelor	Fully compliant
Master	Fully compliant

## 2. Educational processes

### 2.1 The curriculum and its methods of delivery

**Standard 2.1. The goals of the programme are achieved through the content and structure of the curriculum and its methods of delivery.**

As indicated under the previous standard, the BA and MA programme have a set of learning outcomes. These learning outcomes are now integrated in the ECTS files of every course. The ECTS files are not on the KCB website but are made available to all students. The review team learned from its meeting with the institution management and programme leaders that they took rigorously into account the Polifonia Dublin Descriptors and AEC learning outcomes when drafting the BA and MA learning outcomes.

In Flemish higher education, a BA consists of 180 credits (ECTS), a MA consists of at least 60 study points (ECTS) or one year of study. KCB MA consists of 120 study points.

The review team received detailed descriptions of the curricula of the programmes. Examples of curriculum overviews were provided to the review team in the annexes of the *SER* and are publicly available on the website (Sources: *SER*, p. 32; <https://www.kcb.be/en/Programmes>).

A large part of the BA and MA students (supported and guided by a 0,3 FTE study track counsellor) are following an individualised track. The students met by the review team observe that even within the compulsory courses, there is often room for personal choices. In the MA, the programme offers also more elective courses. Nevertheless, students from different disciplines are not encouraged to meet and work/collaborate with each other. Sometimes, students themselves come up with interesting interdisciplinary initiatives (Sources: *SER*, p. 12; *meeting with students*).

The teaching methods in the BA and MA vary according to the requirements of each course. The main course is always taught through one-to-one tuition. All stakeholders met by the review team confirm that the approach is very personal. During the visit of classes, the review team witnessed this personal approach. It was explicitly mentioned by the programme management that they do not want students to copy their teachers, but they want their students to become reflective thinkers that reflect on their selves and on society (Source: *meeting with institution management and programme leaders*).

Several teachers also use more innovative teaching methods, e.g. internal masterclasses. As an additional example, the review team was informed that there is a budget for a 'blended learning' project. This will enable students to record themselves and receive feedback. It can be considered as one-to-one tuition by distance (Source: *Meeting with institution management and programme leaders*).

Students met by the review team indicated that they have several performance opportunities to show their artistic progress throughout the year.<sup>1</sup> (Source: *Meeting with students*). Due to these performances, students are able to showcase and perform to future employers. When it comes to preparing students for their role and their contribution in society, and addressing sectors and target groups such as the amateur sector, migrants, children and elderly in the scope of the BA and MA programme<sup>2</sup>, some stakeholders indicated that the nature of the conservatoire, being in the heart of Belgium and Europe, offers a lot of opportunities without these being explicitly provided by the programmes.

Research is an essential aspect in an academic BA and MA programme, the review team found students developing a research attitude. At KCB, all teachers are involved in a research group. Every year, the programmes organise ten research days. As there are six research groups, every responsible for a group has to organise one or two research days. The programme leaders informed the review team that they see an increase of awareness for research amongst students and teachers (Sources: *meeting with institution management and programme leaders, annex 8: recent research days*).

As mentioned under the previous standard, the teaching staff of the BA and MA programme can be considered as the driving forces of the programmes. Students can easily approach teachers and feel safe to ask questions. Students met by the review team explicitly mentioned the personalised student guidance by their main teacher. The review team finds this strong cooperation between students and staff, and among students commendable.

A prerequisite for programmes where there is a strong connection between students and their teachers is that in case of conflicts, students are aware of the designated services of the programme or the conservatoire to go to. The review team found evidence that students are aware of the existing students' services. In case of a problem, students can either go to the student counsellor or the head of the department. There is also an ombudsman both at KCB as well as at the central administration of the Erasmushogeschool. The conservatoire tries to solve the problems without involving the Erasmushogeschool Brussel (EHB) (Sources: *meeting with institution leaders and programme management, meeting with students, annex 6: global results of student surveys*).

Students met by the review team explained that the students of the music programmes are formally organised in an active student council. They have a few meetings a year, where they discuss what they hear from other students. In case of any problems, they contact the director, who is - according to these students - very approachable. The review team was also pleased to hear that international students are involved in the student council too. The student representatives confirmed to the review team that their voice is heard in the Music Board

---

<sup>1</sup> Some examples mentioned in the SER show a kaleidoscope concerts, chamber music concerts (within and outside KCB), masterclasses, free internship vacancies, audition training, internal and external contests, orchestra projects, collaborations for internships in important institutions such as De Munt/La Monnaie (instrument and voice), the Belgian National Orchestra, the Royal Symphonic Band of the Belgian Guides, Operastudio Vlaanderen, Brussels Philharmonic and collaborations with ensembles-in-residence such as Oxalys and Odysseia (Source: *SER*, p. 14)

<sup>2</sup> The review team goes into this in more detail in standard 3.2.

and in the Board of KCB. However, not all students feel connected with the student body council (Source: *Meeting with students*).

The programme leaders met by the review team witnessed that they use the learning outcomes. This was not convincingly confirmed by the teachers and students met by the review team. Therefore, the review team recommends that the programme leaders be very proactive, with the support of the teachers, for having the learning outcomes for each course be used as a clear guideline to teach and assess the course.

The review team recommends all teaching staff of the BA and MA programme to share good practices in teaching methods among the teaching faculty. The programme management is responsible to further develop the learning methods in the BA and MA programme and to keep on educating teaching staff.

The main subject is always taught through one-to-one tuition. The traditional 'master-apprentice' model is widely adopted by many teaching staff. Whilst the benefits of this approach are widely understood, it might benefit the staff and students to consider other student-centred approaches to learning and teaching the main subject, e.g. peer-learning in group situations. To support innovative teaching methods, the review team recommends raising awareness on multimedia production skills. KCB can support more initiatives regarding giving multimedia production skills a proper place in the curricula of BA and MA.

The review team commends the flexibility of the curriculum. Giving ownership to the students for developing a strong artistic personality was especially observed in the jazz department. The review team believes that KCB could improve and foster its work when it comes to preparing students for their role and their contribution in society. The review team recommends the programme to stimulate students in observing and researching such opportunities and to embed entrepreneurial attitude in as many courses as possible.

The review team recommends to further embed the research attitude in the whole educational process, especially in the main subject instead of having only additional courses. The meeting with teachers revealed that the latter are not very much informed about what is supposed to be taught in the courses when it comes to research. The review team recommends offering teachers pedagogical courses and courses on how to deal with research.<sup>3</sup>

Although the review team is convinced that the student representatives already put a lot of effort to be the voice of all students, student representation has to be strongly encouraged and supported by KCB. Therefore, the review team recommends KCB to support the student body council professionally.<sup>4</sup> The student body council can

---

<sup>3</sup> See also standard 4.1.

<sup>4</sup> In its response to the draft report, KCB asked the review team to clarify their statement. The review team refers to specific examples in the publication. "Increasing student voice in Higher Music Education institutions - tips and guidelines from the AEC Student WG" which one can find on <https://www.aec-music.eu/publications/increasing-student-voice-in-higher-music-education-institutions-tips-and-guidelines-from-the-aec-student-wg>

be more connected to the students. This will reinforce the quality culture of the programme. The review team recommends considering a proper independent counselling system that is easily accessible to students.<sup>5</sup>

Overall, the goals of the BA and MA are achieved through the contact and structure of the curriculum and its methods of delivery. The structural working point for both programmes is to share innovative and creative ideas about content, learning methods and opportunities to collaborate between teachers. This must be facilitated by the programme management that sets out operational policies whereat a more widely developed student-centred approach is considered.

### Compliance with Standard 2.1

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 2.1 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Substantially compliant
Master	Substantially compliant

## 2.2 International perspectives

**Standard 2.2. The programme offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international perspective.**

KCB has an obvious strong international orientation. This is translated in the mission of the institution<sup>6</sup> and is emphasized by the institutional management and programme leaders in their meeting with the review team.

The *SER* states that ‘given a context of a large multinational composition of our student population, the presence of several international teachers and teachers working in the international music scene, KCB almost naturally presents a very international and multicultural biotope’ (Source, *SER*, p. 17). The review team’s meetings proved the latter statement with all stakeholders. The review team received some documents to illustrate the international identity of KCB including a list of recent masterclasses that were performed by international talented musicians and a list of incoming international teachers (Sources: *annex 9 Recent masterclasses*; *annex 11 Erasmus exchange – teachers*). A lot, if not all, of the teachers have international experience.

KCB participates at festivals such as Encuentro de Música y Academia de Santander or the Harnos Festival in Porto. Voice students can participate at international song masterclasses. An exchange programme exists

<sup>5</sup> In its response to the draft report, KCB asked the review team to clarify their statement. The review team states that independent means that the students do not have the impression that they are speaking to a colleague of the teacher/administrator they want to complain about. So the management team might consider that the counselling persons should not be member of administrative or academic staff, but an external person.

<sup>6</sup> The mission of the institution is discussed under standard 1.1.

between KCB and the conservatoires of Tours and Poitiers for percussion teachers and students (Source: *SER*, p. 18).

KCB offers students the possibility to go on an Erasmus exchange. KCB has more than hundred international partners (Source: *Annex 10: List of Erasmus Partners*). The desire to do part of their study abroad is rather low amongst the Flemish students. There are a lot of possibilities, which are not always taken by the students (Source: *annex 10 Erasmus Exchange – students*). The international environment of Brussels is a new experience that can stimulate the students from Flanders to find their (musical) identity (Source: *Meeting with students*).

In this academic year, twenty-five Erasmus students enrolled to the BA and MA programme at KCB. In addition, a lot of international students applied for the BA or MA programme. To assist the international students, the programme management provides all relevant documentation in English. Most of the collective courses are 'doubled' which means they are separately taught in Dutch and in English. Assignments can be written in Dutch, German, French or English. International students met by the review team confirmed that there are no linguistic problems and that they are well supported (Sources: *meeting with institution management and programme leaders, SER*, p. 19).

The review team commends the efforts taken by KCB in the field of internationalisation. During the visit of classes, the review team was impressed by the commendable knowledge of different languages spoken by the teaching staff.

## **Compliance with Standard 2.2**

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 2.2 as follows:

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Compliance level</b>
Bachelor	Fully compliant
Master	Fully compliant

## **2.3 Assessment**

**Standard 2.3. Assessment methods are clearly defined and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes.**

The review team has seen evidence of appropriate and clearly expressed assessment methods for courses in the programmes' ECTS files which are provided to the students. The students declared in their meeting with the review team that these files are easily accessible to them. There is a grading system in place, which expresses results on a scale on twenty points (Source: *meeting with students*). The review team received a document with the names of all courses, their assessment form and the learning outcomes that are assessed (Source: *annex 13*:

assessment). The BA and MA programme make use of a broad diversity of assessment methods, depending on the nature of the courses.<sup>7</sup>

The students met by the review team acknowledge that their main (instrument) teacher gives them good feedback, although the review team heard testimonies of individual cases where a teacher does not give proper feedback. It seems that the feedback given by teachers is not consistent across all departments. In the past, it was a complaint that the grades do not always reflect the work efforts done and the level reached by the students and that they are subjected to subjectivity. The BA and MA programme use the digital tool SEQUENS. SEQUENS was demonstrated to the review team.

The *SER* states that SEQUENS 'maps the evolution of each student in a way that it is visible to all teachers (facilitating the contact between the teachers themselves)'. SEQUENS is not a static instrument, but rather used as a 'trigger'. Communication to the student and remediation in case of negative development are an inherent part of the tool (Source: *SER*, p. 15).

In their meetings with teachers, it was evident to the review team that learning outcomes are not consistently used as the basis for assessment. The review team recommends that teachers (and assessors) should refer to the intended learning outcomes when teaching and assessing students. Regular discussion and staff development on this subject would be beneficial, in terms of extending understanding of the use of learning outcomes, and in facilitating greater communication between teachers.

Given the fact that the BA and MA programme make use of exam juries with representatives of the profession, the review team believes that students are examined on the fact that they are 'a good musician'. Although this is essential, it does not automatically guarantee that the student has achieved all intended learning outcomes, for example in the field of musicians' artistic-societal positioning.

In general, the review team noticed a lack of awareness on how students perceive subjectivity of (individual) assessments and a lack of structural feedback. The review team detected an unconscious bias: programme leaders and teachers seem not to be really aware of the problems felt by the students. The latter say that a lot of things depend on the teachers, but are not part of a uniform policy of the school. Students are looking for funded intersubjectivity: e.g. by including peer assessments, but also by more diverse and well described assessment methods. The review team recommends making use of good examples on feedback to establish a conservatory

---

<sup>7</sup> These assessment methods are 'concerts', 'observation reports', 'annotated bibliographies', 'book/website/article reviews', 'oral presentations', 'doing it exams', 'reflective reports', 'observations', 'exercise sheets', 'portfolio', 'case study'...

The master thesis consists of two recitals and an interview, prepared by a written research report. The research report contains all the experiences, findings and conclusions of the research process, and describes the evolution in the preparations for the recital/work of art step by step. The written report and oral assessment count for 20% of the total marks, the other 80% go to the recital/work of art. The recital is recorded, the interview is not. The jury always consists of an external member from the professional field, and quite often of teachers who are either from abroad, either frequently active in the international scene. The assessment of the master proof is documented in a jury report that can be consulted by the students (Source: *SER*, p. 21).

wide mechanism approach. Even so, the review team recommends making students as partners in the assessment. As an example, the review team suggests that the programmes can focus more on peer assessments by students (Sources: *Meeting with institution management and programme leaders, meeting with teachers, meeting with students*).

### **Compliance with Standard 2.3**

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 2.3 as follows:

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Compliance level</b>
Bachelor	Partially compliant
Master	Partially compliant

### 3. Student profiles

#### 3.1 Admission/Entrance qualifications

**Standard 3.1. There are clear criteria for student admission, based on an assessment of their artistic/academic suitability for the programme.**

The institution uses formal registration, selection and admissions procedures. All potential students who want to study at KCB have to pass an artistic entrance exam. The latter can subscribe for one of the two sessions via an online application tool.<sup>8</sup> The review team noticed that the programmes have developed a clear and relevant admission procedure, which takes into account governmental regulations and verifies the students' suitability for the programmes in an appropriate manner. This is confirmed by the students and teachers met by the review team.

The entrance exam consists of a generic and a specific part. The general music test involves a main demonstration of the artistic level and a short interview on motivation and background. The second part of the entrance exam deals specifically with the chosen discipline or instrument. The jury consists of at least three teachers, including the KCB director or the head of music programme, as well as the responsible teacher of the section (Sources: *meeting with institution management, meeting with teachers, meeting with students; SER, p. 24*).

After the admission test, all accepted students have a personal interview with the study track counsellor. Declined candidates can receive feedback from the specialists in each discipline. Students met by the review mentioned they felt welcome at KCB after passing the admission test (Sources: *meeting with students; SER, p. 24*).

The review team was provided an overview of the amount of students that enrolled for the admission test and the pass rates. The last decade saw a general decline of Flemish students. To keep a good balance, KCB has intensified collaboration with the Kunsthumaniora Brussel (secondary art school) amongst other initiatives.

The review team was informed that in the 2016-2017 67% of candidates taking the entrance exams were successful. In 2017-2018, this was 60%. The review team was provided evidence that there is a larger number of foreign students in the BA and MA programmes: in 2017-2018 61% of the students that past the admission test are foreign (Source: *Annex 14: Admission test applications*).

The review team commends that the KCB website has ample and accessible information for candidates. The review team also commends that KCB takes into account the potential of students and not only the level of artistry already shown in the admission process. The review team recommends using more the admission interviews to check the potential of the students regarding the vision of the conservatoire on role of the musician in the society. The review team finds it commendable that students, met by the review team, had received all information needed for their admission efficiently.

<sup>8</sup> Source: <http://tp.kcb.be/begin.php>

Next to that, language proficiency in one of the four languages spoken at the conservatoire should be a prerequisite for international students. Currently, this is not that case which can cause, though rather exceptional, difficulties.

### Compliance with Standard 3.1

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 3.1 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Fully compliant
Master	Fully compliant

### 3.2 Student progression, achievement and employability

**Standard 3.2. The programme has mechanisms to formally monitor and review the progression, achievement and subsequent employability of its students.**

The study achievement is monitored and discussed by the programme management: about 80% of the credits that are taken per year in the BA are passed and, in the MA, the results are even better. In general, students often take less than 60 credits, according to their capacities and personal situation. In case of general low pass rates in a course, the programme management investigates the reason behind it and takes improvement measures (Sources: *SER*, p. 26; *Meeting with institution management and programme leaders*; *annex 15: study duration*).

Students who have already obtained results in a prior higher education programme can ask for an 'Accreditation of Prior Learning'. This procedure is available on the website and is explained after the admission test. For students coming from another conservatoire, who do not have the required entrance level the possibility of a 'premaster' is offered. The review team learned that it takes the students on average between 3 and 3.5 years to obtain a BA degree. It takes on average 2,5 years to obtain a MA degree (Sources: *SER*, p. 28; *annex 16: Study duration*).

The review team was able to verify that the programmes have proper mechanisms in place to monitor the progression of students throughout their studies and also after graduation. The review team is satisfied with the degree to which the programme analyses its results. The programme leaders have a good overview on the progression and achievements of all their students thanks to the SEQUENS system, mentioned in the previous standard. To make sure that students function well, the review team recommends raising awareness on mental and physical wellbeing of students.

As it was in the past, a complaint that the grades did not always reflect the work efforts done and the level reached by the students and that they are subjected to subjectivity, the review team welcomes the fact that the BA and MA programme use the digital tool SEQUENS. The review team commends the system and witnessed that most of the teachers use the system to follow the students' progress and give them feedback during the year.

Currently, KCB has not an explicit career guidance policy for its alumni. The review team recommends establishing a more explicit career guidance policy. Alumni indicated that the programme could prepare them more strongly for the job market (Sources: *meeting with students, meeting with representatives of the profession and alumni*). This can be done with, for example, information sessions on self-employed status.

Added to that, it is the review team's opinion that the programme leaders, together with the representatives of the professional field, have to think about wider job possibilities for the graduates. In its meeting with the review team, representatives of the professional field emphasised that programme leaders have to make students aware of the new and other and creative job possibilities. The review team suggests projects as making music for and with children or the elderly. This requires teachers to create awareness during the BA and MA programme for these other creative job opportunities.

### **Compliance with Standard 3.2**

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 3.2. as follows:

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Compliance level</b>
Bachelor	Fully compliant
Master	Fully compliant

## 4. Teaching staff

### 4.1 Staff qualifications and professional activity

**Standard 4.1. Members of the teaching staff are qualified for their role and are active as artists/pedagogues/ researchers.**

This standard was not in the main scope of the review. There was however basic information concerning this standard provided in the *SER*.<sup>9</sup> In addition, certain aspects of this standard were also touched upon in the discussions during the site-visit. This enabled the review team to make some observations, which are presented below.

It was obvious to the review team that teachers are committed to their educational tasks. The teachers met by the review team appeared to be motivated and showed enthusiasm to provide students with the skills and competences required for developing themselves as young professionals. The review team witnessed the extremely high artistic level that is intended involving high quality of teachers and based on a long tradition. However, the visits to the classes made the team feel that there is room for improvement towards the most advanced teaching methods regarding a student-centred learning attitude. In addition, the review team also saw examples of challenging and enriching learning methods that enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Therefore, the review team is convinced that the institution has to pay more attention to continuing pedagogical development of the teachers. Support of Erasmushogeschool Brussel for continuous professional development should be tailor fit for the School of Arts and its Music programmes. The review team recommends sharing the good practices of learning methods among the staff to embed and foster pedagogical education, entrepreneurial skills and education for research within all subjects. The different methods of teaching could also be shared in research groups. In these groups, it can be questioned if current teaching methods nurture the students in their research attitude. The review team recommends that KCB improves the way it communicates its goals to its teachers and the way it shares its expectations towards them, and that KCB raises awareness about research amongst the teaching staff.

Since there is such a strong student-teacher relationship in this institute, the importance of well-trained teachers cannot be underestimated: investing in teachers training, keeping teachers up-to-date concerning innovative teaching methods.

During the visit of classes, the review team detected that no hearing protection is provided. The review team strongly recommends the programme management to develop a policy on hearing protection, to raise the awareness and to provide hearing protection for students and staff where needed. This should be a part of raising awareness on mental and physical wellbeing of whole staff.

---

<sup>9</sup> The institutional review of Erasmushogeschool Brussel has already dealt with various formal aspects of recruitment, personal development and evaluation of the teaching staff. Therefore the *SER* was restricted to some specific features.

## 4.2 Size and composition of the teaching staff body

### **Standard 4.2. There are sufficient qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the programme.**

This standard was not in the main scope of the review. There was however basic information concerning this standard provided in the *SER*.<sup>10</sup> In addition, certain aspects of this standard were also touched upon in the discussions during the site-visit. This enabled the review team to make some observations, which are presented below.

133 staff members are employed in the Music programme, equalling 80,30 FTE, of which 47,60 FTE (59%) are appointed and 32,70 FTE (41%) working on a 'temporary' basis. Teaching staff, met by the review team, indicated that they have the possibility to discuss the creation of new courses and teaching positions. This can be done in the section meetings for each discipline or section (Source: *Meeting with teachers*).

The arts education in Flanders is determined by the so-called special salary scale, which confers particular (read: lower) salary scales to artistic teaching staff to offer them the opportunity to continue a high level artistic career. These restrictions are meant to foster teachers to be active in the field. Apart from the fact that this reduction is not the case in many European countries, too many activities in the artistic field could also jeopardise continuity in the education.

The review team detected some imbalances in the staff: balance between active artist and regular teaching. The review recommends that the programme leaders guard this balance with a sense of perspective.

Overall, the review team is confident that there is enough high qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the BA and MA programme. Teaching staff is involved in discussions on new professional requirements and changes to the curriculum.

---

<sup>10</sup> The institutional review of Erasmushogeschool Brussel has already dealt with various formal aspects of recruitment, personal development and evaluation of the teaching staff. Therefore the *SER* was restricted to some specific features.

## 5. Facilities, resources and support

### 5.1 Facilities

**Standard 5.1. The institution has appropriate resources to support student learning and delivery of the programme.**

This standard was not in the main scope of the review. There was however basic information concerning this standard provided in the *SER*. In addition, certain aspects of this standard were also touched upon in the discussions during the site-visit. This enabled the review team to make some observations, which are presented below.

The BA and MA programme are delivered in the main building in the Regentschapsstraat and the annex building on the Kleine Zavel. KCB is aware that the current buildings urgently need renovation. However, this is not in the hands of KCB itself. The students met by the review team informed the review team that practicing rooms are accessible from 8 am to 9.30 pm.

During the visit of classes, the review team concluded that some classrooms are not properly soundproof. This can be disturbing for teachers and students. Another aspect that can be improved by KCB, is the organisation of the rooms. Teachers do not always use the classrooms that are booked for them. A better room booking system is recommended.

The availability of sufficient study rooms during peak times remains a major point of attention. The review team recommends considering any improvements e.g. extending the opening hours.

### 5.2 Financial resources

**Standard 5.2. The institution's financial resources enable successful delivery of the programme.**

This standard was not in the main scope of the review. There was no information provided in the *SER*. Consequently, this standard has not been touched upon during the discussions.

### 5.3 Support staff

**Standard 5.3. The programme has sufficient qualified support staff.**

This standard was not in the main scope of the review. There was no information provided in the *SER*. Consequently, this standard has not been touched upon during the discussions.

## 6. Communication, organisation and decision-making

### 6.1 Internal communication process

#### **Standard 6.1. Effective mechanisms are in place for internal communication within the programme.**

This standard was not in the main scope of the review. There was however basic information concerning this standard provided in the *SER*. In addition, certain aspects of this standard were also touched upon in the discussions during the site-visit. This enabled the review team to make some observations, which are presented below.

As mentioned in previous standards, the teachers are recommended to communicate more with each other in order to share good practices, both in terms of teaching and assessment. Students find most of the teachers are approachable. The director is approachable and appears to be a binding factor in KCB.<sup>11</sup>

SEQUENS is a good and useful tool for communication. The programme leaders are recommended to ensure that all teachers use this tool. After all, formal structured feedback has to be available for every course.<sup>12</sup>

### 6.2 Organisational structure and decision-making processes

#### **Standard 6.2 The programme is supported by an appropriate organisational structure and decision-making processes.**

This standard was not in the main scope of the review. There was however basic information concerning this standard provided in the *SER*. In addition, certain aspects of this standard were also touched upon in the discussions during the site-visit. This enabled the review team to make some observations, which are presented below.

The review team studied an organigram of KCB's institutional structure in the *SER*, and saw evidence of clear organisational and decision-making structures. KCB as an institution, as well as the Music programme have a decision-making structure in which all relevant stakeholders including teachers, students and the professional field are involved.

Students have to find out by themselves how the student body council works. Student representation has to be strongly encouraged and supported. Therefore, the review team recommends KCB to support the student body

---

<sup>11</sup> See standard 4.1.

<sup>12</sup> See standard 2.3.

council professionally.<sup>13</sup> The student body council could be more connected to the students, which will enhance the quality culture of the programme.

---

<sup>13</sup> In its response to the draft report, KCB asked the review team to clarify their statement. The review team refers to specific examples in the publication. "Increasing student voice in Higher Music Education institutions - tips and guidelines from the AEC Student WG" which one can find on <https://www.aec-music.eu/publications/increasing-student-voice-in-higher-music-education-institutions-tips-and-guidelines-from-the-aec-student-wg>

## 7. Internal quality culture

### **Standard 7. The programme has in place effective quality assurance and enhancement procedures.**

This standard was not in the main scope of the review. There was however, basic information concerning this standard provided in the *SER*. In addition, certain aspects of this standard were also touched upon in the discussions during the site-visit. This enabled the review team to make some observations, which are presented below.

The review team learned that students are represented in all relevant KCB bodies. Students can take part in a survey dealing with the teaching quality and student facilities at the conservatoire. Students and programme leaders, met by the review team, mentioned that focus groups on various topics are organised and that this provides more qualitative information than standardised surveys. Masterclasses and productions with student participation are evaluated through (anonymous) written surveys. The results are, when deemed necessary, discussed in the Artistic Board (Sources: *SER*, p. 36, *meeting with institution management and programme leaders; meeting with students*). KCB uses TRIS survey (Transnational Institutional Cooperation, a derivative of EFQM<sup>14</sup>, adapted to higher education) as a tool for polling the teaching staff. In 2017, alumni were asked to participate in a survey (Source: *SER*, p. 38).

Representatives of the music profession have been active members of the Artistic Board for many years. On particular occasions, this Artistic Board has been expanded to a broader – ad hoc – resonance board, for instance in 2015 when the new learning outcomes were formulated (Sources: *SER*, p. 38, *meeting with institution management and programme leaders; meeting with students*).

To structure and monitor all possible areas of improvement, the head of the music programme draws up 'action plans'. On a regular basis, the quality assurance coordinator monitors the progress (and possible bottlenecks) in achieving the targets. The coordinator approaches the responsible people and reports about developments (Sources: *SER*, p. 38, *meeting with institution management and programme leaders*).

---

<sup>14</sup> EFQM: European Foundation for Quality Management

## 8. Public interaction

### 8.1 Cultural, artistic and educational contexts

#### **Standard 8.1. The programme engages within wider cultural, artistic and educational contexts.**

Multiple learning outcomes of the BA<sup>15</sup> and MA<sup>16</sup> programme focus on the societal role of the musician. It is clear from the meeting with institution management and programme leaders that the latter have a clear expectation from their students after graduation: flexible musicians able to reflect and to carry on different tasks in society, supported by their achieved entrepreneurial skills.

The students and alumni met by the review team did not feel prepared by the BA and MA programme to advance society through the use of their knowledge and skills. They feel prepared to become very good musicians, but not to actively engage in society (Sources: *Meeting with students, meeting with representatives of the profession and alumni*).

It is clear to the review team that the KCB BA and MA programme intends to engage within wider cultural, artistic and educational contexts. It was said by the programme leaders that students are stimulated to organise concerts. Nevertheless, the review team felt that there is still some room for improvement. Currently, this engagement with the public discourse happens incidentally. The review team recommends establishing a policy to engage within the wider cultural, artistic and educational context.

In line with this, KCB should better communicate the various strengths of the institution to the public.

When it comes to preparing students for their role and their contribution in society, KCB could improve its programmes and work on their scope, in order to explicitly address sectors and target groups such as the amateur sector, migrants, children and elderly<sup>17</sup> (see also standard 3.2). The review team recommends KCB should appeal to its inventiveness to educate its students regarding the requirements of the current and future society, including for example a stronger use of the diversity of Brussels in all its aspects.

#### **Compliance with Standard 8.1**

<sup>15</sup> LO 12 The bachelor in music reflects and communicates about his/her place in society and musical world, starting from an artistic and critical-reflective position. He/she positions his/her practical and theoretical knowledge within a cultural context.

LO 13 The bachelor in music is aware of the necessity to continuously develop him/herself as an artist.

LO 14 The bachelor in music develops (under supervision) his/her own idea to an artistic product and knows the possibilities to share this with a public. He/she starts to develop a personal vision on the process of his/his artistic career.

<sup>16</sup> LO 12 The master in music reflects and communicates in an independent and critical way about his/her own place in society and musical world, integrating philosophical reflection as well as cultural and historical music knowledge.

LO 13 The master in music has developed the attitude to continuously develop him/herself as an artist.

LO 14 The master in music autonomously develops his/her own idea to an artistic product and shares this with a public. He/she shows, beside quality awareness and professional artistry, artistic entrepreneurship and responsibility. He/she shows a personal vision on the possible process of his/his artistic career.

<sup>17</sup> In its response to the draft report, the KCB indicated that at the time of the site visit for instance, KCB was preparing a community opera project called 'Leedberg', that involved amateur singers, migrants and children, and was staged in December 2018. This was not mentioned during the site visit.

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 8.1 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor	Partially compliant
Master	Partially compliant

## 8.2 Interaction with the artistic professions

### Standard 8.2. The programme actively promotes links with various sectors of the music and other artistic professions.

As already mentioned under previous standards, the BA and MA programme of KCB have contacts with the profession e.g. via the Artistic Board. The review team was informed by the programme leaders that based on their feedback, adjustments are made to the programme. They help the programme to monitor the ongoing needs of the profession.

Students can make use of the music programmes' close contacts with various professional orchestras, opera houses, chamber music ensembles or the Brussels Jazz Orchestra. These connections facilitate the students obtaining internships and temporary assignments in professional orchestras and choirs. It also allows KCB to invite people to workshops, auditions or to short-term assignments (Sources: *SER*, p. 42; *meeting with students*).

The BA and MA programme do not have an active policy in stimulating lifelong learning opportunities for its students and alumni, although masterclasses and research days are open to public too. This was confirmed by students and alumni met by the review team. Alumni are sometimes invited to KCB's public performances; nevertheless there is no active structured policy in place (Sources: *meeting with students*; *meeting with alumni and the representatives of the profession*).

The programme promotes links with various actors of the music and other professions. The review team is convinced that this should be done in a more widely active and structured way. The review team believes, that there are still opportunities to increase synergies with the profession, by further diversifying the nature of the links with the artistic scene as already mentioned under standard 8.1. On top of that, the interaction with the other Belgian conservatories must be increased as mention under standard 1.

The review team wants to recommend taking active responsibility for graduates after the achievement of the diploma. This will lead among others to a better contact and more lifelong learning opportunities. The review team therefore suggests developing a strategy how fruitful relations to the graduates could be build up under the given profile of KCB.

### Compliance with Standard 8.2

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 8.2 as follows:

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Compliance level</b>
Bachelor	Substantially compliant
Master	Substantially compliant

### **8.3 Information provided to the public**

**Standard 8.3 Information provided to the public about the programme is clear, consistent and accurate.**

The review team noted that the KCB website contains a lot of information about the programme in Dutch and in English. The public can find detailed information about every study track on the website. Potential students, students, alumni and the wider public find clear, consistent accurate and detailed information on the KCB website.

The review team commends that on the website a lot of information is available online in Dutch and English.

### **Compliance with Standard 8.3**

The review team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 8.3 as follows:

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Compliance level</b>
Bachelor	Fully compliant
Master	Fully compliant

## Summary of the compliance with the Standards and recommendations

The review team concludes that the KCB programmes comply with the *Standards for Programme Review* as follows:

<b>1. Programme's goals and context</b>	
<b>Standard 1.</b> The programme goals are clearly stated and reflect the institutional mission.	<b>Fully compliant</b>
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Establish a more proactive managerial approach to achieve the goals faster with a long term strategical planning.</li> <li>· Choose and prioritise targets you want to develop in a structural way.</li> <li>· Benchmark your profile with other conservatoires in Belgium, in regards to future collaborations.</li> <li>· Raise awareness in the conservatory's culture about equal opportunities by taking concrete steps.</li> </ul>	
<b>2. Educational processes</b>	
<b>Standard 2.1.</b> The goals of the programme are achieved through the content and structure of the curriculum and its methods of delivery.	<b>Substantially compliant</b>
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Guarantee that in all courses the learning outcomes are used as a clear guideline to teach and assess the courses.</li> <li>· Share good practices of teaching methods among the teaching faculty.</li> <li>· Embed entrepreneurial attitude in as many courses as possible.</li> <li>· Embed the research attitude in the whole educational process, especially in the main subject instead of having additional courses.</li> <li>· Raise awareness about multimedia production skills.</li> <li>· Consider a more widely developed student-centred approach.</li> <li>· Consider a proper and independent counselling system that is easily accessible to students.</li> </ul>	
<b>Standard 2.2.</b> The programme offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international perspective.	<b>Fully compliant</b>
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· /</li> </ul>	

<b>Standard 2.3.</b> Assessment methods are clearly defined and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes.	<b>Partially compliant</b>
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Make more use of the learning outcomes in all assessments.</li> <li>· Use the good examples on feedback for a conservatory wide mechanism approach.</li> </ul>	
<b>3. Student profiles</b>	
<b>Standard 3.1.</b> There are clear criteria for student admission, based on an assessment of their artistic/academic suitability for the programme.	<b>Fully compliant</b>
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Utilise the admission interviews to check the potential of the candidate based on the vision of the conservatoire and the role of a musician in the society.</li> <li>· Make language proficiency in one of the 4 languages spoken at the conservatoire a prerequisite for international students.</li> </ul>	
<b>Standard 3.2.</b> The programme has mechanisms to formally monitor and review the progression, achievement and subsequent employability of its students.	<b>Fully compliant</b>
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Establish a more explicit career guidance policy for alumni.</li> <li>· Raise awareness on mental and physical wellbeing of students.</li> </ul>	
<b>4. Teaching staff</b>	
<b>Standard 4.1.</b> Members of the teaching staff are qualified for their role and are active as artists/pedagogues/ researchers.	
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Offer continuous professional development for teachers e.g. research skills, knowledge on new teaching methods, entrepreneurial education.</li> <li>· Develop a policy on hearing protection as part of raising awareness on mental and physical wellbeing of whole staff.</li> </ul>	

<b>Standard 4.2.</b> There are sufficient qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the programme.	
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Discuss the staff balance between active artist and regular teaching.</li> </ul>	
<b>5. Facilities, resources and support</b>	
<b>Standard 5.1.</b> The institution has appropriate resources to support student learning and delivery of the programme.	
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Invest in facilities and practising rooms.</li> <li>· Extend the opening hours of practicing rooms and find a better system for dealing with the occupation of the rooms.</li> </ul>	
<b>Standard 5.2.</b> The institution's financial resources enable successful delivery of the programme.	
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· /</li> </ul>	
<b>Standard 5.3.</b> The programme has sufficient qualified support staff.	
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· /</li> </ul>	
<b>6. Communication, organisation and decision-making</b>	
<b>Standard 6.1.</b> Effective mechanisms are in place for internal communication within the programme.	
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Ensure that all teachers use SEQUENS.</li> </ul>	
<b>Standard 6.2</b> The programme is supported by an appropriate organisational structure and decision-making processes.	
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Support the student body council professionally.</li> </ul>	

<b>7. Internal quality culture</b>	
<b>Standard 7.</b> The programme has in place effective quality assurance and enhancement procedures.	
<b>Recommendations</b> · /	
<b>8. Public interaction</b>	
<b>Standard 8.1.</b> The programme engages within wider cultural, artistic and educational contexts.	<b>Partially compliant</b>
<b>Recommendations</b> · Engage in a more structural way within wider cultural, artistic and educational contexts. · Communicate the strengths of this institute more: be proud of what you have. · Prepare students as well as teachers better for the societal role of the musician of the future.	
<b>Standard 8.2.</b> The programme actively promotes links with various sectors of the music and other artistic professions.	<b>Substantially compliant</b>
<b>Recommendations</b> · Take active responsibility for graduates after the achievement of the diploma. · Promote links with various sectors of music and other artistic professions in a more active way.	
<b>Standard 8.3.</b> Information provided to the public about the programme is clear, consistent and accurate.	<b>Fully compliant</b>
<b>Recommendations</b> · /	

## Conclusion

The KCB music programmes succeed in producing students that develop into good musicians. The review team witnessed that KCB's graduated musicians are of an excellent quality. High-qualified teaching staff teaches them. The review team commends this extremely high artistic level that is intended, involving the high quality of teachers and based on a long tradition.

The review team commends also the international environment that is created in the BA and MA programme. The programmes attract many international students. In addition, a lot of international teachers deliver masterclasses and the local staff shows great language knowledge to support all students.

The programme leaders have a clear view on the kind of musicians they want to produce. The institutional management and programme leaders are very eager to achieve their goals and reach their ambitions. It is, nevertheless, important that they choose and prioritise targets they want to develop in a structural way.

The teachers of the BA and MA programme are the driving forces behind the programmes. Almost all initiatives come organically from teachers. The review team perceived 'leadership on distance'. On the one hand, this bottom up approach can be very stimulating and innovative. On the other hand, the review team strongly recommends a more proactive managerial approach. This is considered necessary to achieve the goals faster with long term strategical planning. The review team recommends going through all recommendations and to discuss in the management which of them could be achieved faster by applying a more proactive managerial approach.

The programme leaders have to establish policies that stimulate the professional development of the teaching staff such as research skills, knowledge on new teaching methods and entrepreneurial education. An advantage can be obtained by having the teaching staff share good practices. The implementation of SEQUENS is a good practice that shows that the programme leaders implement effective improvement measures to the benefit of both students and teachers.

The review team invites the BA and MA programme to play a bigger role in the local community, as stated in the learning outcomes about the musician's artistic-societal positioning. This awareness for the wider public has to be embedded in the curriculum so that the students can acquire entrepreneurial and social skills. Currently, the societal role of the musician remains underexposed.

In their communication to society, the programmes should show more what they achieve. They can be proud of what they realised, but this remains (too) unknown to the wider public.

## Annex 1. Site-visit schedule

### Wednesday 16 May - Bachelor and Master Music - Arrival, preparation and half day site-visit

Time	Session	Names and functions of participants from the visited institution	Venue
09:00-11:00	Travel from Antwerp to Brussels; check in at NH Hotel		
11:00-13:00	<b>Review Team meeting</b>	[Location meeting room: Kleine Zavel / Petit Sablon, 5]	Room 143
13:00-14:00	Lunch		143
14:00-15:30	<b>Meeting 1: official welcome and meeting with the institutional management and programme leaders (Bachelor and Master Music)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Kathleen Coessens (director)</li> <li>· Helmut De Backer (head of music programme &amp; study track counsellor)</li> <li>· Peter Daerden (QA coordinator)</li> <li>· Jan D'Haene (coordinator international affairs)</li> <li>· Jan Vanderwegen (student counsellor)</li> <li>· Kristin Van den Buys (research coordinator)</li> <li>· Bart Bouckaert (head of the artistic board)</li> </ul>	143
15:30-15:45	<b>Review Team meeting: Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary</b>		143
15:45-16:00	Break		143
16:00-17:00	<b>Meeting 2: meeting with students and recent alumni (Bachelor and Master Music)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Andrés García Fraile (viola da gamba Bachelor 1)</li> <li>· Jonathan Van der Beek (French horn B1)</li> <li>· Cedric Honings (guitar Ba1 and music writing B3)</li> <li>· Emile Daems (violin B2 and music writing Master 2)</li> <li>· Sascha Fiorino (composition B1 and music writing M2)</li> <li>· Valentin Jousserand (percussion M1)</li> <li>· Jacqueline Berndt (flute M2)</li> <li>· Ye Chen (piano M2)</li> <li>· Gabriele di Franco (jazz-composition Ma2)</li> <li>· Maarten Vandenbenden (alumnus guitar 2017)</li> <li>· Filippo Caporali (alumnus jazz double bass 2016)</li> </ul>	143

17:00-17:15	<b>Review Team meeting: Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary</b>		143
17:15-17:30	Break		143
17:30-18:15	<b>Meeting 3: guided tour and visiting classes (parallel) (Bachelor and Master Music)</b>	[A list of classes which can be visited by the review team has been made available.]	
18:15-19:00	<b>Review Team meeting</b>		143
19:00-20:30	Dinner at <i>Les Petits Oignons</i> (Regentschapsstraat 25)	· Institutional representatives, including Helmut De Backer (head of music programme & study track counsellor)	
20:30-21:30	“Ysaÿe and the Belgian Violin School”: concert by students, alumni and teachers		Concert hall

#### Thursday 17 May - Bachelor and Master Music - Full day site-visit<sup>18</sup>

Time	Session	Names and functions of participants from the visited institution	Venue
09:00-10:00	<b>Review Team meeting</b>		Kleine Zavel, 5 – room 143
10:00-11:00	<b>Meeting 4: meeting with teachers (Bachelor and Master Music)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Carlos Bruneel (head of woodwind section): flute</li> <li>· Piet Nijsten (head of jazz section): arrangement, analysis</li> <li>· Kristin De Smedt (head of music writing section): counterpoint &amp; fuge</li> <li>· Jurgen De Pillecyn (head of composition &amp; conducting section): composition, instruments, orchestration</li> <li>· Rudy Vander Cruyssen: general music education</li> <li>· Peter Van Heyghen: theory of historical music performance, philosophy and aesthetics of early music</li> <li>· Jan Michiels (member of Trabador): piano</li> <li>· Eric Robberecht (co-president of Artistic council): chamber music</li> <li>· David Gistelincx ('Linx'): jazz voice, ensemble</li> </ul>	143

<sup>18</sup> The schedule also includes the site-visit to the musical programme which is being reviewed in a separated report.

		· Anne Op de Beeck (head of accompaniment): accompanying orchestral instruments	
11:00-11:15	<b>Review Team meeting: Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary</b>		143
11:15-11:30	Break		143
11:30-12:15	<b>Meeting 5: guided tour and visiting classes(parallel) (Bachelor and Master Music)</b>	[A list of classes which can be visited by the review team has been made available.]	
12:15-12:30	<b>Review Team meeting: Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary</b>		143
12:30-12:45	<b>Meeting 6: presentation of the student following system</b>	· Jan Vanderwegen (student counsellor) · Helmut De Backer (study track counsellor)	143
12:45-13:30	Lunch		143
13:30-13:45	<b>Review Team meeting</b>		143
13:45-14:45	<b>Meeting 7: meeting with representatives of the profession (Bachelor and Master Music)</b>	· Luc Bartholomeus (alumnus, Director Music Academy Anderlecht, member of 'Cercle of friends KCB') · Anthony De Vriendt (alumnus, French horn solo Belgian National Orchestra) · Tom De Cock (alumnus, Percussion Brussels Philharmonic and Ictus, assistant teacher Conservatoire Royal de Liège) · Shirly Laub (alumna, Teacher at French Royal Conservatoire Brussels, Oxalys, freelance different orchestras) · Paul Dujardin (CEO – artistic director Bozar, member of Council of School of Arts KCB) · Barbara Wiernik (alumna, Jazz singer, teacher in Royal Conservatoire Antwerp) · Dr. Giacomo Danese (Composer, musicologist, professor in Conservatory Cosenza) · Géraldine Clément (alumna, Flute, member Tmesis, freelance in different orchestras)	143
14:45-16:00	<b>Review Team meeting - Preparation for feedback session (on Friday)</b>		143

16:00-16:15	Break		143
16:15-17:30	<b>Review Team meeting - Preparation for feedback session (on Friday)</b> <b>OR</b> <b>Meeting 8: optional meeting - possibility for the review panel to invite specific persons (Bachelor and Master Music)</b>		143
17:30-19:30	Dinner at the restaurant of the NH Hotel		
19:30-20:00	Transfer by taxi to the Musical campus of the conservatoire (Nijverheidskaai 170, Brussels)		
20:00	Performance by students of the Musical programme		Theatre Hall
22:00	Transfer by taxi to the NH Hotel		

#### Friday 18 May - Bachelor Musical - Full day site-visit

Time	Session	Names and functions of participants from the visited institution	Venue
08:15-08:30	Transfer by taxi to the Musical campus of the conservatoire (Nijverheidskaai 170, Brussels)		
08:30-10:00	<b>Preparatory meeting of the Review Team</b>		C105
10:00-10:45	<b>Meeting 1: official welcome at the Musical campus of the conservatory and meeting with the institutional management and programme leader (Musical)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Kathleen Coessens (director)</li> <li>· Lulu Aertgeerts (head of musical programme)</li> <li>· Peter Daerden (QA coordinator)</li> <li>· Kristin Van den Buys (research coordinator)</li> </ul>	C105
10:45-11:00	<b>Review Team meeting: Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary</b>		C105
11:00-11:15	Break		C105
11:15-12:00	<b>Meeting 2: meeting with students and recent alumni (Musical)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Tessy Torfs (Bachelor 1)</li> <li>· Inge Teeuwen (B2)</li> <li>· Mathieu Bekaert (B3)</li> </ul>	C105

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Sofie De Schrijver (B4)</li> <li>· Sain Vantomme (alumna 2017)</li> </ul>	
12:00-12:30	Lunch		C105
12:30-13:00	<b>Meeting 3: guided tour and visiting classes (parallel)</b>	Classes in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Modern Dance</li> <li>· Classical Dance</li> <li>· Individual voice classes</li> <li>· Diction</li> </ul>	
13:00-13:45	<b>Meeting 4: meeting with teachers (Musical)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Bart Buyle (General Music Education)</li> <li>· Peter Kongs (Modern dance)</li> <li>· Wim Lanckrock (Musical aesthetics)</li> <li>· Inge Minten (Voice, Close harmony)</li> <li>· Evelien D'Haeseleer (Diction and phonetics)</li> </ul>	C105
13:45-14:00	<b>Review Team meeting: Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary</b>		C105
14:00-14:15	Break		C105
14:15-15:00	<b>Meeting 5: meeting with representatives of the profession (Musical)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Jan Bernolet (project manager, member of resonance board)</li> <li>· Sam Verhoeven (artistic leader, member of resonance board)</li> <li>· Bob Jennes (producer, member of resonance board)</li> <li>· Martijn Claes (actor, member of resonance board)</li> </ul>	C105
15:00-16:00	<b>Review Team meeting - Preparation for the feedback meeting</b>		C105
16:00-17:00	<b>Public feedback session on findings review team concerning:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Bachelor and Master Music</li> <li>· Bachelor Musical</li> </ul>		Theatre hall
17:00	End of the site-visit; transfer by taxi to the NH Hotel		

## **Annex 2. List of documents provided to the review team**

The following documents were provided by KCB to the review team in advance of the site-visit:

*Self-evaluation Report (SER)*

*Annex 1. Learning outcomes compared to domain-specific and AEC/Polifonia learning outcomes*

*Annex 2. Overview of the programme*

*Annex 3. Matrix learning outcomes/courses*

*Annex 4. Evolution of student numbers*

*Annex 5. Geographical spread of students*

*Annex 6. Global results student survey*

*Annex 7. List of artistic doctorates*

*Annex 8. List of recent research days*

*Annex 9. List of recent masterclasses*

*Annex 10. List of Erasmus partners*

*Annex 11. Erasmus exchange : students*

*Annex 12. Erasmus exchange: teachers*

*Annex 13. Assessment of the courses*

*Annex 14. Admission test applications*

*Annex 15. Study achievement*

*Annex 16. Study duration*

*Annex 17. Teaching staff: FTE table*

*Annex 18. Teaching staff: curricula*

*Annex 19. Successful alumni*

*Annex 20. Institutional review EhB – NVAO report*

