

# MUSIQUE QUALITY ENHANCEMENT

## Report

Quality Enhancement Review of the Bachelor of Musical  
Programme delivered by the

**Koninklijk Conservatorium Brussel**  
**Erasmushogeschool Brussel**

(Brussels, Belgium)



Site-visit: 18 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.....	15
3.1 Admission/Entrance qualifications.....	15
3.2 Student progression, achievement and employability.....	16
4. Teaching staff.....	18
4.1 Staff qualifications and professional activity.....	18
4.2 Size and composition of the teaching staff body.....	19
5. Facilities, resources and support.....	20
5.1 Facilities.....	20
5.2 Financial resources.....	20
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.....	23
8. Public interaction.....	24
8.1 Cultural, artistic and educational contexts.....	24
8.2 Interaction with the artistic professions.....	25
8.3 Information provided to the public.....	26
Summary of the compliance with the Standards and recommendations.....	27
Conclusion.....	31
Annex 1. Site-visit schedule.....	32
Annex 2. List of documents provided to the review team.....	40

## Introduction

The conservatoire in Brussels was founded in 1832. In 1967, the Unitarian Belgian conservatoire was split into an independent Dutch and French speaking institution. From 1994 to 2007 the conservatoire offered a formation in musical as a sub-option in the Drama programme. Meanwhile, in 1995 the Erasmushogeschool Brussel was formed by the merger of several Brussels based higher education institutions (art and not art-related), with the Koninklijk Conservatorium Brussel (from now on: KCB) as one of the participating institutions. In 2007, Musical became an independent professional Bachelor programme (Source: *SER*, p. 4).

Since 2003, Flanders has developed an external quality assurance system of programme evaluations for its University Colleges. Each programme was monitored by an external independent panel. 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 of Musical. MusiQuE coordinated the organisation of the quality enhancement review and carried out the review of the musical programme.

The procedure for the review of the musical programme 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 18 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

- David Higham, Lecturer in Musical Theatre at the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland, Glasgow, Scotland, United Kingdom
- Peter Van Dosselaer, Lecturer in Dance at Fontys Academy of Music and Performing Arts, 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 the musical department of KCB for the organisation of the site-visit and for the warm hospitality. 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 2007 Musical became an independent professional Bachelor programme (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 Musical programme consisted of 46 students (Source: <i>SER</i> , p. 4).

**Reviewed programme:** Bachelor of Musical

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

The 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. 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. 6). The review team learned that the mission statement of the Musical programme was already formulated in 2010. It is the Musical programme's mission to 'train talented students in the integrated application of the three artistic disciplines voice, acting and dance, with emphasis on the creative adoption of acquired techniques, self-activity and individual development leading to flexible, professionally employable artists, with knowledge of repertoire and tools for innovation' (Source: *SER*, p. 6).

The musical programme is a 180 ECTS professional Bachelor programme. In Flanders' higher education, a professional Bachelor programme provides both subject specific and general knowledge instruction. Students have to gain the competences necessary to practice a profession. A professional Bachelor programme prepares students for a profession, whereas an academic Bachelor is a theoretical, research-oriented degree that aims to prepare students for a Master programme.

From its meeting with the programme management, the review team learned that the management would like to transform the programme into an academic Bachelor and Master programme. Currently, the students take four years for the study programme whereas it is custom in Flemish higher education that a 180 ECTS programme can be completed in three years. The programme management considers these four years as essential compared to other musical programmes abroad.<sup>1</sup>

The musical programme at KCB is the only musical programme in Flemish higher education. According to its mission, the programme focuses on voice, acting and dance. The goals are formulated in thirteen learning outcomes (Source: *annex Learning Outcomes Musical Programme*). To establish the learning outcomes, different stakeholders were involved (Sources: *meeting with institution management and programme leaders; meeting with representatives of the profession*). The admission policy for students is based on the mission of the musical programme.<sup>2</sup> The stated goals are relevant and reflect the institutional mission. These learning outcomes are benchmarked with existing foreign Musical programmes.

The programmes' approach to equal opportunities is not part of the institutional vision. The institutional management and programme leaders met by the review are aware that diversity can be improved in the programme. The programme management mentioned that students from other cultures find it challenging to enrol in the musical programme even though these cultures form a large part of the neighbourhood.

---

<sup>1</sup> This will be further elaborated under standard 2.1.

<sup>2</sup> See also standard 3.1. Admission / Entrance qualifications.

Based on the meeting with all stakeholders, the review team is impressed by the committed leadership in this programme. There is openness for feedback from staff and students and also for feedback from stakeholders in the working field. In the programme's profile, the scope on the development of students' performance skills is a sensible outcome of the awareness of the working field. This is a great strength of the programme that will be further elaborated in the following standards.

The review team recommend being more proactive in finding more varied and diverse prospective students by raising awareness on inclusivity and diversity.

### **Compliance with Standard 1**

The review team concludes that the programme complies with Standard 1 as follows:

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Compliance level</b>
Bachelor of Musical	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 mentioned under standard 1, the current professional Bachelor has 180 ECTS but the study programme takes students four years whereas it is custom in Flemish higher education that a 180 ECTS can be completed in three years.<sup>3</sup> The programme management stated clearly in their meeting with the review team that they want to transform the programme into an academic Bachelor and Master. The stakeholders met by the review team are also in favour of such a transformation of the programme (Sources: *Meeting with institution management and programme leader, meeting with representatives of the profession*).

As indicated under the previous standard, the programme has a set of learning outcomes. These learning outcomes are now integrated in the ECTS files of every course. The ECTS files are too difficult to find on the KCB website but are made available to all students. At the start of the year, students are obliged to attend an information session about the programmes' expectations. The review team received detailed descriptions of the curricula of the programmes. Examples of the curriculum overview were provided to the review team in the *SER* and are publicly available on the website (Sources: *SER*, p. 9 - 13; <https://www.kcb.be/en/Programmes>, *meeting with institution management and programme leaders, meeting with students*).

The review team learned from the structure of the curriculum that first the three basic disciplines voice, acting and dance are taught separately through professional training. The foremost technical aspects have to be obtained during the first two years. In the second year, students mainly follow the same subjects as in the first year, but their content is more elaborated and the level of technical mastery increased. In the first two years, all the students also participate in six projects. In the remaining two years, the programme focuses on the integration of the three disciplines. In the third year, an audition training course is introduced. Instead of projects the students now form ensembles and create – under the direction of different guest directors from Belgium or abroad – six productions. The curriculum is completed with the graduation production 'Eigen werk' (Sources: *SER*, p. 8-9, *meeting with students, meeting with teachers*).

The programme management told the review team that they experienced that students have different strengths at the time of admission. Some students have already a lot of experience in singing, dancing or acting while others don't. Because of this, not all graduates are mastering the three musical disciplines at the same elevated level. To make this emphasis on personal development more explicit, the programme management has outlined a 'balance model' mapping the different graduation types. This model is not used to evaluate students, but rather as a monitoring and inventory tool allowing them to trace tendencies and shortcomings. The students, met by the

---

<sup>3</sup> See also standard 1

review team, are in favour of this approach. The review team commends this space and flexibility for the personal development of the students and the possibility to set priorities (Sources: *SER*, p. 7, annex: balance model; *meeting with institution management and programme leaders*, *meeting with students*).

The programme management acknowledges that among the three artistic disciplines more emphasis is put on voice and dance. Therefore, the curriculum now has more monologues. Recently, 'audition training' has become a compulsory course in the third and fourth year. This course aims at optimally preparing students for professional auditions. Over the course of two years, students learn to create a curriculum vitae and to compose a portfolio. During individual classes, the selection and mastery of the audition material are worked on, with emphasis on time management and planning. The Review Team has heard that in the third year students have to do two auditions: an internship audition where producers of musical come together looking at the students' performances and a 'mock' audition in the presence of a professional jury. These auditions make the students met by the review team feel ready to enter the job market. Since 2017 – 2018, students have to undertake a compulsory internship (Source: annex *list of internships*). The first feedback from the internship indicates that this helps students to become familiar with the working field. The review team learned that students doing an internship in most cases can catch up the courses they missed during their internship period.<sup>4</sup>

The teaching methods vary according to the purpose of each course. Some courses are taught individually, but most courses are taught in (small) groups or in class group. This is specific due to the nature of the programme. The review team learned from its meetings with students, teachers and programme management that though there was evidence of good and forward-thinking practise, the quality of some teachers' teaching methods can be improved.<sup>5</sup>

Students are offered many opportunities to present their creative, musical and artistic work. As mentioned before, students participate in six productions. Since 2012-2013, the students work during their fourth year on a graduation production called 'Eigen werk'. The project is staged in June in three public performances on the campus. There is also one guest performance in a professional theatre. The performance has to last 50-100 minutes and represents the three pillars of musical. The language has to be at least 50% Dutch. The choice of material is free, although existing scripts and songs are recommended. The students can bring their own story with the tools and disciplines they find most appropriate. The review team learned that during the whole process, they learn to collaborate and organise themselves, to develop and realise ideas, and to communicate about their performance. 'Eigen werk' challenges the students to show all achieved learning outcomes in this production (Sources: *SER*, p. 13, *meeting with institution management and programme leaders*, *meeting with students*, *meeting with representatives of the profession*).

---

<sup>4</sup> See also standard 3.2.

<sup>5</sup> See also standard 4.1.

Research is not an essential part of a professional Bachelor programme. This will be further elaborated under standard 4.1.

The review team was pleased to see that there is a good daily interaction between teachers and students. Students easily approach teachers and feel safe to ask questions. A prerequisite for programmes where there is a strong connection between students and their teachers, is that in case of conflicts between them, students are aware of the designated services of the programme or the conservatoire where they can go to. The review team found evidence that students are aware of the existing students' services. In case of complaints, students met by the review team stated clearly state that they can go to the Musical Board with their complaints. Student representatives are members of this Musical Board (Sources: *meeting with institution leaders and programme management, meeting with students, annex 6: global results of student surveys*).

The review team understands the wish of the programme management to transform the programme into an academic Bachelor and Master and tends to support this as a long-term goal. In such a case a strengthening and further development of the curriculum is necessary, as well as the incorporation of a much stronger research and reflective attitude. The review team will discuss this further below.

During the site visit, the review team came to the conclusion that the programme management does not have a long-term planning.<sup>6</sup> The review team recommends making concrete plans for the future. What does the programme need to do to transform into an academic Bachelor and Master programme?

To make the emphasis on personal development more explicit, the programme management has outlined a 'balance model' mapping the different graduation types. The review team commends this space and flexibility for the personal development of the students.

The review team commends the internships as they are a fruitful environmental learning experience. The auditions and the internship are an unmistakable added value for the programme: it makes students ready for their profession.

The review team learned from its meetings with students, teachers and programme management that the quality of some teachers teaching methods can be improved. Therefore, it would be beneficial if all teaching staff should share best practices on innovative teaching methods among the whole programme.

Students are offered many opportunities to present their creative, musical and artistic work. The review team finds the high amount of productions a commendable practice. Moreover, the review team was satisfied to see how all students are involved in these productions. The students that do not perform, support the production in technical and supporting roles. This is a very good practice to raise understanding of the role other experts in a

---

<sup>6</sup> In its response to the draft report, KCB asked the review team to clarify this statement. The review team states that they have found out that the programme management never thought about the situation where the leading person is not available any more. This might be dangerous in a situation where this leading person is so crucial for the whole study programme.

production. This is only possible if students see each other as partners in a community. During its meetings, the visit of classes and the performances, the review team witnessed a commendable strong community building between the students. Apart from this, there is a buddy system in place where a last year student supports an incoming first year student. This can be considered as a good practice example.

The review team commends 'Eigen werk' showing the importance giving to the students' artistic identity. It is the final piece in the strong development of the students' performance skills. Working in groups, discovering and developing its own strengths, stimulates a good reflection and self-reflection by the students.

Research is not an essential part of a professional Bachelor programme. It is clear to the review team that students show a self-reflective attitude (Sources: *visit of classes, performance*). Some teachers encourage this attitude through their learning methods while others do not.

From the point of proper and fair use of ECTS a study programme that needs the substantial engagement of students over four years while just rewarding 180 credits is not respecting the students' workload. It is clear though to the review team that this is a systematic problem and cannot be solved by the programme management alone.

### Compliance with Standard 2.1

The review team concludes that the programme complies with Standard 2.1 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor of Musical	Fully compliant

### 2.2 International perspectives

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

The Bachelor of Musical is taught in Dutch and is focussed on the Dutch-speaking, but mainly Flemish market. The student population is largely Flemish. The review team learned from the *SER* that a few students are coming from The Netherlands but also from countries (or regions) where a similar programme is non-existent (Portugal, Greece and French-speaking Belgium). Students coming from other language areas are always given the time to learn Dutch, and are given addresses of evening language schools (Source: *SER*, p. 14).

To bring internationalisation in the programme, the teachers deliberately work on English, French and German repertoire. Some of the teachers are foreign teachers. Nevertheless, most teachers do not have teaching experience abroad.<sup>7</sup> Besides the own teaching staff, foreign lecturers are invited to give masterclasses

Student Erasmus mobility is rather limited. Since 2007-2008, only two of the students have followed a part of their programme abroad. In the same period, three students from abroad have come to musical programme. The musical programme wants to present more abroad. In May 2018 students participated in a Private School Presentation facilitated by ZAV.<sup>8</sup>

Overall, the programme offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international experience. The nature of the programme limits the internationalisation of the programme. Nevertheless, more efforts can be done to stimulate the international perspective. Even when a study time or a project abroad does not directly contribute to the goal of developing skills for performing musicals in Dutch, the expected broadening of the artistic scope by these experiences would support the development of artistic personalities. Sometimes, just living and working in a different cultural environment contribute to a better awareness of one's own cultural identity.

## Compliance with Standard 2.2

The review team concludes that the programme complies with Standard 2.2 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor of Musical	Substantially compliant

## 2.3 Assessment

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

The main methods for assessment of students are performances and presentations. These assessment methods allow student to show the achievement of a combination of many intended learning outcomes

The optional courses voice, acting and dance are assessed through a kaleidoscope performance. 'Audition training' is evaluated based on the students' CV and portfolio, their internship audition, the ZAV screening and a fake audition before a professional jury. The *SER* states that "the Projects and Productions (including the internship) are assessed each trimester. The evaluation of the internship is partly based on a report that an external mentor has to fill in. This report takes into account the intern's commitment and preparation, punctuality, level and quality of the dance, acting and voice performances, as well as the working attitude and interaction. At

<sup>7</sup> See also standard 4.1.

<sup>8</sup> ZAV Künstlervermittlung Berlin is a German government institute to facilitate art job placement, both nationally and internationally.

least one teacher from each section will attend the intern's performance and give him/her/them a score too. This score is mainly based on the intern's professional attitude and the quality of his/her/their performance' (Source: *SER*, p. 16).

During the year, the students receive a lot of feedback. The students met by the review team are satisfied with the constructive criticism of their teachers (Source: *meeting with students*).

The student following system, SEQUENS is introduced in the programme. SEQUENS is a system that maps the evolution of each student in a way that it is visible to all teachers.

The main methods for assessment of students are performances and presentations. These assessment methods allow students to show the achievement of a combination of many intended learning outcomes. The review team commends this appropriate use of learning outcomes. At the same time, this holistic approach sometimes prefers artistic skills compared to others stated in the learning outcomes. An ongoing discussion among staff and students about the learning outcomes in their full specification might be necessary.

During the year, the students receive a lot of feedback. The review team commends the feedback given by the teachers and appreciates that assessment is rather perceived as a tool for student development.

The student following system, SEQUENS, is introduced in the programme. The review team recommends that all teachers should use this to ensure that the feedback that students receive from teachers is consistent and coherent<sup>9</sup>.

### **Compliance with Standard 2.3**

The review team concludes that the programme complies with Standard 2.3 as follows:

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Compliance level</b>
Bachelor of Musical	Fully compliant

---

<sup>9</sup> Source: *demonstration of SEQUENS*.

### 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 admission test. The latter can subscribe for an online application tool.<sup>10</sup>

The test takes two days, with one week in between. On the first day, candidates perform choreography, including both a classic and a modern part, and two songs. After the voice test, all candidates are discussed by the jury, which consists of the head of musical programme and representatives of the voice, acting and dance sections. Decisive criteria for dance are the basic technical skills, body conscience and motoric memory. For voice, the technique, intonation, colour and interpretation are taken into account. Students that have not succeeded, can ask for feedback. On the second day, another voice test takes place in which the candidates perform two monologues. At the end of the second day, the candidate will immediately find out if he or she has passed the test. The jury will also give feedback to candidates that did not succeed (Sources: *SER*, p. 18, *meetings with students*).

The review team learned from the programme management that abilities of the potential students to successfully complete the study programme are taken into account. The incoming students are required to be able to dance, act and sing good, but it is not expected that they are very good on all levels. The quality of the applicants is diverse. Last year, sixteen applicants out of sixty passed the admission test. The programme leaders do not want the programme to contain more than fifty students, in order to maintain the current model of education. (Sources: *SER*, p. 18, *meetings with institution management and programme leaders*).

All potential students who want to study at KCB have to pass an admission test. The review team commends that the KCB website has ample and accessible information for candidates.

The review team commends the awareness and proactive approach of the current developments in precollege education. In the near future a new secondary programme for children from twelve years on will be established. The programme management will closely follow up their progress. The programme management is currently promoting the musical education in the Drama schools in the part-time art education network. (Source: *Meeting with institution management and programme leader*).

#### Compliance with Standard 3.1

The review team concludes that the programme complies with Standard 3.1 as follows:

---

<sup>10</sup> Source: <http://tp.kcb.be/paden.php>

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor of Musical	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 review team learned that about 80% of the credits that are taken are also obtained. After the first Bachelor year, about 30% of the students do not pass. Those students are stimulated to leave the programme. Only in exceptionally cases students redo the first year. At the end of the second year, 5-10% of the students are asked to re-orientate (or redo their study year). Only exceptional, a student does not pass the third Bachelor year (Sources: *SER*, p. 20, *meetings with institution management and programme leaders*).

As mentioned under standard 2.1., the internship and audition training, together with the six productions and 'Eigen werk' make students ready for the labour market. The professionals from the field are invited to come to the programme and share their expertise or scout for future employers. Because of this, the students' and teachers' awareness of the needs of the profession are very high.

To give students some additional orientation about commercial and juridical aspects, representatives from the actors' guild or the Flemish Kunstenloket are invited every year to give workshops. Students and alumni appreciate this. However, entrepreneurship and negotiating contracts, according to them, is seen as lacking or not sufficiently represented in the curriculum (Sources: *SER*, p. 21, *meetings with students and alumni*).

Most of the alumni end up in the professional musical scene in Flanders as well as in the neighbouring countries. Others find employment in spoken theatre or televised drama series. A 2017 survey pointed out that students find work after graduation but they acknowledged that the search for employment can be quite tough: in their experience vacancies are rather scarce. 34% of the alumni decided to follow another programme (in some cases a teacher's programme) after graduating (Source: *SER*, p. 21; *annex global results of the online student survey*).

The review team was able to verify that the programme has proper mechanisms in place to monitor the progression of students throughout their studies and after their graduation. The review team is satisfied with the degree to which the programme analyses its results. It became clear to the review team that the programme leaders have a good overview on the progression and achievements of students, although SEQUENS should be used by all teachers in the future.

The students' and teachers' awareness of the needs of the profession are very high. The review team commends this awareness of the needs of the professional field.



The review team recommends providing information delivered by representatives of the profession about contracts, taxation and intellectual rights properties.

### **Compliance with Standard 3.2**

The review team concludes that the programme complies with Standard 3.2. as follows:

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Compliance level</b>
Bachelor of Musical	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>11</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.

Almost all teachers are active in the artistic scene. The review team had a look at their curricula and professional experience: they are active either as a singer, dancer or actor, or as a director, choreographer or production leader – in musical, operetta, opera, television and film (Source: *annex teaching staff – curricula*).

The review team saw examples of challenging and enriching learning methods that enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. Nevertheless, the review team was informed that some teachers do not seem to teach according contemporary insights in teaching methods. Teachers met by the review team witnessed that they do not receive the possibility for appropriate professionalisation, unless paid by themselves (Source: *meeting with institution management and programme leader, meeting with students, meeting with teachers*).

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 to develop themselves as young professionals. This was confirmed by the visit to the classes. Nevertheless, as stated above, the review team was informed that some teachers do not seem to teach according contemporary insights in teaching methods. Therefore, the review team is convinced that the institution has to pay more attention to continuing pedagogical development of the teachers. The review team recommends sharing the good practices of learning methods between staff members to embed and foster pedagogical development.

The review team recommends KCB to support the development of pedagogical skills of teachers and to skill up to recent developments in the profession. Support of Erasmushogeschool Brussel for continuous professional development should be tailor fit for the School of Arts and its Musical programme.

---

<sup>11</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>12</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.

All stakeholders declare in their meeting with the review team that the programme has sufficient teaching staff: 8,91 FTE or eighteen teachers. The musical programme is also supported by guest teachers and external directors for the projects and productions. They are an added value to the qualifications of the teaching staff (Source: *annex FTE table musical*).

Although the study programme has succeeded to find talented teachers who were also active in the profession in the past, the fact that most talented people went into the profession has made it difficult to find good teachers (Source: *meeting with institution management and programme leader*). The review team recommends that sustained efforts to guarantee and in some subjects even enhance the quality of future teachers will be invested. These people have to be 'holistic artists' with fully adequate pedagogical skills.

---

<sup>12</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 Musical programme is located in the Brussels community of Anderlecht. Currently, there is not enough space because the current number of classes. The programme management is aware that students are in favour of more facilities where they can practice. Even so, in the two dance halls, there are too many props of former productions. Besides this, the programme management has a wish list for its facilities: a separate teachers' room and more storage room would be welcomed. The classrooms could have more beamers and projection screens. On the long term, the programme management would also like to acquire an atelier for decor building and scenography and a sound studio for recordings (Source: *SER*, p. 24).

In case needed, teachers send students to specialised doctors. A list of medical assistance people in Brussels who are used to work with people working in arts, would be beneficial.

As there is currently is not enough space because the current amount of classes, the review team recommends to arrange for additional practise rooms.

During the visit of classes, the review team detected that no hearing protecting is provided. The review team recommends the programme management to provide hearing protection for all students. Also the teaching staff has to be made aware of the need for hearing protection.

The programme management may consider hiring a physical therapist to support students. The students mentioned problem to fit in therapist session in their course schedule. The review team recommends facilitating students' health support more. There could be more signposting in terms of list of e.g. therapists, doctors.

### 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 team. 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 team. 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 to learn from each other's good practices.<sup>13</sup> SEQUENS is a good and useful tool for communication. The programme leaders are recommended to ensure that this tool will be used by all teachers.<sup>14</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 musical programme have a decision-making structure in which all relevant actors including teachers, students and the professional field are involved.

---

<sup>13</sup> See standard 4.1.

<sup>14</sup> See standard 2.3.

## 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 support. The participation rate of students is very high. Focus discussions are organised about internships, among other topics. The results are discussed with the head of musical programme and in the Musical Board (Source: *SER*, p. 28, *meeting with institution management and programme leaders; meeting with students*). KCB uses TRIS survey (Transnational Institutional Cooperation, a derivative of EFQM<sup>15</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. 29).

Representatives of the musical profession as well as alumni are involved in quality assurance through their presence (thrice a year) in a Resonance Board. On a more informal level, there is also an annual alumni day. (Source: *SER*, p. 28, *meeting with institution management and programme leader*).

To structure and monitor all possible areas of improvement, the head of the musical programme draws up 'action plans'. On a regular basis, the quality assurance coordinator monitors the progress (and possible bottlenecks) in achieving the targets. He approaches the responsible people and reports about developments (Source: *SER*, p. 29, *meeting with institution management and programme leader*).

---

<sup>15</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.**

One of the learning outcomes of the programme focuses on the societal role of the graduates.<sup>16</sup> Students have plenty of opportunities to perform, which make them fully prepared to become a musical singer, dancer and actor.<sup>17</sup> The job market is mainly the Flemish and in a few cases the Dutch market.<sup>18</sup>

The students and alumni met by the review team feel prepared to advance society through the use of their knowledge and skills. Still, they are in favour of more information about contracts, taxation and intellectual rights properties, as elaborated under standard 3.1.

The programme engages within wider cultural, artistic and educational contexts. In recent years, students have organised charity performances or contributed to fundraising projects. During the holidays, most students take part in musical internships for children (Source: *SER*, p. 30).

When it comes to preparing students for their role and their contribution to society, the programme has taken the above-mentioned initiatives. Nevertheless, sectors and target groups such as migrants, children and elderly are not in the scope of the programmes.

The review team recommends establishing an explicit policy to engage within the wider cultural, artistic and educational context. Currently, this engagement with the public discourse is still too incidental. KCB has to communicate the strengths of this institute more. The review team is convinced that they have to be proud of what they have. The review team recommends showing this more to the public.

The review team recommends broadening the scope of the students regarding their societal role. This will prepare the students for a broader job market as well. The review team also recommends the programme management to consider the impact of further widening the job market to spoken drama and TV. This would create a wider range of job opportunities for the students. The review team thinks this needs a thorough discussion with the programme's stakeholders.

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

The review team concludes that the programme complies with Standard 8.1 as follows:

---

<sup>16</sup> Learning outcome: *The graduate can use his artistic personality and critical-analytical insight to reflect and communicate on his position in society in general and more particularly in the musical world* (Source: annex *Learning Outcomes*).

<sup>17</sup> See also standard 2.1.

<sup>18</sup> See also standard 2.1 and 2.2.



Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor of Musical	Substantially 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 programme has very close contacts with the profession. The review team was informed by the programme leaders that based on the feedback from the artistic professions, adjustments are made to the programme. This helps the programme to monitor the ongoing needs of the profession.

First of all, there are the internships and the high amount of performances where representatives of the profession are present.<sup>19</sup> Added to that, most of the teachers are active in the artistic field.<sup>20</sup> Representatives of the musical profession and the alumni are involved through their presence in the Resonance Board.<sup>21</sup>

Some alumni are invited to teach, lead projects or direct public productions, become a member of admission test juries, offer info workshops, assist and/or participate on projects and productions, etc. Recently, the programme introduced the concept of 'ensembles in residence', giving alumni the opportunity to stage their production within the walls of the conservatoire (Source: *SER*, p. 31.)

In the context of lifelong learning, the programme management is aiming to offer refresher courses (outside of the official curriculum) in order to keep the dance skills up to the mark (Source: *SER*, p. 31).

The review team commends these strong relations with the professional field and the implementation of changes based on their feedback

### Compliance with Standard 8.2

The review team concludes that the programme complies with Standard 8.2 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor of Musical	Fully compliant

<sup>19</sup> See also standard 2.1.

<sup>20</sup> See also standard 4.1.

<sup>21</sup> See also standard 7.

### 8.3 Information provided to the public

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

Every year, an open day is organised that reaches about hundred people. This event consists of several performances by students, open classes, free tests (singing) and a panel discussion at the end of the day (Sources: *SER*, p. 31; annex *Open Day*). Pupils from the secondary art education network (KSO) can attend a 'taster' day in March, also at the campus.

The public can find detailed information about every study track on the website which is also available in Dutch as noted by the review team. Potential students, current students, alumni and the wider public find clear, consistent accurate and detailed information on the KCB website. The information in English is limited, given the fact that the programme is a Dutch programme.

#### **Compliance with Standard 8.3**

The review team concludes that the programme complies with Standard 8.3 as follows:

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Compliance level</b>
Bachelor of Musical	Fully compliant

## Summary of the compliance with the Standards and recommendations

The review team concludes that the Bachelor of Musical programme complies with the *Standards for Programme Review* as follows:

1. Programme's goals and context	
<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>· Be more proactive in finding more varied and diverse prospective students by raising awareness about diversity.</li> </ul>	
2. Educational processes	
<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>Fully compliant</b>
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Make concrete plans for the future, including clarity in the overview of the curriculum and to clarify what is really expected in the 180 credits.</li> </ul>	
<b>Standard 2.2.</b> The programme offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international perspective.	<b>Substantially compliant</b>
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Stimulate the international perspective more in the whole programme.</li> </ul>	
<b>Standard 2.3.</b> Assessment methods are clearly defined and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes.	<b>Fully compliant</b>
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Discuss assessment criteria in a very clear way.</li> <li>· Make sure that all teachers use SEQUENS.</li> </ul>	
3. Student profiles	
<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>	
· /	
<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>	
· Provide more entrepreneurship and information by people from the profession about contracts, taxation, intellectual rights properties in the curriculum.	
<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>· Share best practices on innovative teaching methods among the whole programme;</li> <li>· Support the development of the pedagogical skills of teachers and of skill up to recent development in the profession.</li> <li>· Ensure that support of EHB for continuous professional development is tailor fit for the School of Arts.</li> </ul>	
<b>Standard 4.2.</b> There are sufficient qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the programme.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	
· Invest in future teachers that are 'holistic artists' with fully adequate pedagogical skills.	
<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 practise rooms.</li> <li>· Develop a policy on hearing protection.</li> <li>· Facilitate accessible health support.</li> </ul>	
<b>Standard 5.2.</b> The institution's financial resources enable successful delivery of the	

programme.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	
/	
<b>Standard 5.3.</b> The programme has sufficient qualified support staff.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	
/	
<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>	
/	
<b>Standard 6.2</b> The programme is supported by an appropriate organisational structure and decision-making processes.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	
· /	
<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>Substantially compliant</b>
<b>Recommendations</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Broaden the scope of the students regarding their societal role.</li> <li>· Prepare students for a broader job market.</li> <li>· Share the strengths of the programme confidently to the public.</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the impact of widening the job market to drama and TV.</li> </ul>	
<b>Standard 8.2.</b> The programme actively promotes links with various sectors of the music and other artistic professions.	<b>Fully compliant</b>
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>/</li> </ul>	
<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>/</li> </ul>	

## Conclusion

The Bachelor of Musical is a professional Bachelor programme that would like to transform into an academic Bachelor and Master programme. This is a proof of the passionate attitude for high quality. The review team witnessed an extremely committed leadership that is open for feedback from students and staff.

The high quality is shown in the students' performances, the internship and 'Eigen Werk'. The professional field is actively involved in this. Students take part in a musical student community where a student buddy system is in place. All students participate in different supporting roles during performances as well. The 'balance model' mapping the different graduation types concerning singing, dancing or acting gives space and flexibility for the personal development of the students and possibility to set priorities.

There is still room for improvement: awareness has to be increased amongst teachers about pedagogical skills, hearing protection and health support. Also, some additional practicing rooms would be in favour of the students. The scope of students can be broadened to prepare them for a more diverse job market.

The 180 ECTS Bachelor that is de facto extended to a Bachelor programme with a study load of 240 ECTS remains a structural problem that needs a solution.

## Annex 1. Site-visit schedule

### Wednesday 16 May - Bachelor and Master Music - Arrival, preparation and half day site-visit<sup>22</sup>

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

<sup>22</sup> The schedule also includes the site-visit to the music programmes which are being reviewed in a separated report



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 Vandenbemden (alumnus guitar 2017)</li> <li>· Filippe 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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Institutional representatives, including Helmut De Backer (head of music programme &amp; study track counsellor)</li> </ul>	

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**

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 Gistelinck ('Linx'): jazz voice, ensemble</li> <li>· Anne Op de Beeck (head of accompaniment): accompanying orchestral instruments</li> </ul>	143
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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Jan Vanderwegen (student counsellor)</li> <li>· Helmut De Backer (study track counsellor)</li> </ul>	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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Luc Bartholomeus (alumnus, Director Music Academy Anderlecht, member of 'Cercle of friends KCB')</li> <li>· Anthony De Vriendt (alumnus, French horn solo Belgian National Orchestra)</li> <li>· Tom De Cock (alumnus, Percussion Brussels Philharmonic and Ictus, assistant teacher Conservatoire Royal de Liège)</li> <li>· Shirly Laub (alumna, Teacher at French Royal Conservatoire Brussels, Oxalys, freelance different orchestras)</li> <li>· Paul Dujardin (CEO – artistic director Bozar, member of Council of School of Arts KCB)</li> <li>· Barbara Wiernik (alumna, Jazz singer, teacher in Royal Conservatoire Antwerp)</li> <li>· Dr. Giacomo Danese (Composer, musicologist, professor in Conservatory Cosenza)</li> </ul>	143

		· Géraldine Clément (alumna, Flute, member Tmesis, freelance in different orchestras)	
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> <li>· Sofie De Schrijver (B4)</li> <li>· Sain Vantomme (alumna 2017)</li> </ul>	C105
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>· <b>Bachelor and Master Music</b></li><li>· <b>Bachelor Musical</b></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. Mission statement of KCB*

*Annex 2. Learning outcomes of the Musical programme*

*Annex 3. Balance model mapping the different graduation types*

*Annex 4. Matrix learning outcomes/courses*

*Annex 5. Overview of internships*

*Annex 6. Learning outcomes of the Ba1-Ba2 projects*

*Annex 7. Temporary assessment of the internship (in Dutch)*

*Annex 8. Overview of productions*

*Annex 9. Teaching staff: curricula*

*Annex 10. Teaching staff: FTE table*

*Annex 11. Global results of the online student survey*

*Annex 12. Members of the Resonance Board*

*Annex 13. Open day Musical*

*Annex 14. Institutional review Ehb – NVAO report*



