

# Executive summary

## Report

### Institutional accreditation

# **Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education “Moscow State P. I. Tchaikovsky Conservatory”**

**(Moscow, Russia)**

**Site-visit: 4-6 December 2018**

## Introduction

In May 2018 the Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education "Moscow State P.I. Tchaikovsky Conservatory" applied to the National Centre for Public Accreditation (hereinafter referred to as "NCPA") for joint international accreditation by NCPA and the Foundation for Quality Enhancement and Accreditation in Higher Music Education - Music Quality Enhancement (hereinafter referred to as "MusiQuE"). For this purpose, NCPA and MusiQuE signed an agreement and developed a joint guidance on external review of the Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education "Moscow State P. I. Tchaikovsky Conservatory" based on the MusiQuE standards for



institutional review.

The procedure of joint international accreditation of the Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education "Moscow State P.I. Tchaikovsky Conservatory" (hereinafter referred to as "the Conservatory") was conducted on December 4-6, 2018 and included the analyses of the Self Evaluation Report, the site visit to the Conservatory and preparation of this Report.

The main goal of the external review is to determine the correspondence of the activity of the Conservatory, delivering study programmes "Art of concert performance" (53.05.01), "Artistic direction of opera-symphony orchestra and academic choir" (53.05.02), "Art of music and theater" (53.05.04), "Musicology" (53.05.05), "Composition" (53.05.06), "Art of musical instrument performance (by types)" (53.09.01), "Art of vocal performance (by types)" (53.09.02), "Art of composition" (53.09.03), "Mastership of musical sound engineering" (53.09.04), "Art of conducting (by types)" (53.09.05), "Musicology and applied musical art" (53.03.06), "Study of art" (50.06.01) to the joint standards of musical education based on the MusiQuE standards for institutional review and the European Standards of Quality Assurance in Education (ESG-ENQA). The Report on External Review is the reason for decision of the National Accreditation Board and the MusiQuE Board on accreditation.

## **CONTEXT AND MAIN STAGES OF THE REVIEW**

### **Terms of Reference**

According to Clauses 1, 3 Article 96 of the Federal Law of the Russian Federation of December 29, 2012 No.273-Φ3 "On education in the Russian Federation", organizations, which implement educational activities, may apply for public accreditation in various national, foreign and international institutions; employers, employer associations and designated organizations have the right to conduct public accreditation.

### **Composition of the Review Panel**

The international experts were nominated by MusiQuE.

The Russian expert was nominated by the Guild of Experts in Higher Education.

The representative of the professional community was nominated by the Department of Science and Education of the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation.

The representative of the students' community was nominated by the Russian Institute of Theatre Arts GITIS.

The composition of the External Review Panel was approved by NCPA and MusiQuE.



The Review Panel included five international and national experts:

- Margus Pärtlas - professor, PhD (Candidate of Arts), Vice Rector for Academic Affairs and Research, Professor of the Department of Music Theory, Estonian Academy of Music and Theatre — foreign expert, Review Chair;
- Darius Kučinskas - professor, PhD, Professor of the Department of Audiovisual Arts, Kaunas University of Technology, member of the Association for the Advancement of Baltic Studies (AABS), member of the International Musicological Society (IMS), member of the Society of Interdisciplinary Musicology (SIM) — foreign expert, Panel Member;
- Yuri Karpov - PhD (Candidate of Arts), Associate Professor, Vice-Rector for Research Activities, Professor of the Department of Choral Conducting, Zhiganov Kazan State Conservatory, expert of the Institute of quality control and accreditation of educational programmes in the field of Culture and Art — Russian Expert, Panel Member, Secretary of the Review Team;
- Elena Kitaeva - PhD (Candidate of Arts), Deputy Head – Head of the Department for Quality Monitoring of Artistic Education, Department of Education and Science, Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation — representative of professional community, Panel Member;
- Edita Tibilova - 1st year postgraduate student, Department of Music Theatre Acting and Directing, Russian Institute of Theatre Arts GITIS — representative of student community, Panel Member.

The focused expert knowledge of the Panel members, long-term experience of working in the system of higher education and profession, active position of students and employers became the basis for effective consideration of issues within the framework of evaluation.

The participation of the Russian and foreign representatives of the higher education system gave an opportunity to analyze the activity of the Conservatory under evaluation in the context of the world trends in quality assurance and within the scope of the national educational system.

### **Purposes and objectives of the review**

The purpose of the joint international accreditation is improving quality of education and forming quality culture in educational institutions, discovering best practices in continuous enhancing the educational quality and public information on educational institutions delivering educational programmes in accordance with the musical education standards



and the European educational quality standards.

## **Stages of the review**

The review included three main stages:

### *1.4.1. Study of the Self-Evaluation Report*

The Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education “Moscow State P. I. Tchaikovsky Conservatory” was responsible for conducting the self-evaluation procedure, developing and timely submitting of the Self Evaluation Report to NCPA and MusiQuE.

According to the Guidelines, developed by NCPA and MusiQuE within the framework of the joint international accreditation, the Self-Evaluation Report is written on 73 pages and includes: introduction, findings, conclusions, annexes. The self-evaluation procedure was conducted on the basis of SWOT-analysis.

According to the review schedule the Self-Evaluation Report was submitted to NCPA in Russian and to MusiQuE in English and mailed to the members of the Review Panel 30 days before the site visit.

While studying the Self-Evaluation Report the Panel members had an opportunity to form a preliminary opinion on the Conservatory activity in regard of its compliance with the Standards.

The members of the Review Panel assessed the quality of preparation of the Self-Evaluation Report with regards to its text structuring, compliance of information with the Report sections; quality of perception; sufficiency of analytical data; availability of references to supporting documents; completeness of information, that on the whole provided them with an opportunity to form a preliminary expert opinion.

At the preliminary meeting of the Review Panel the members formulated the lines of inquiry, which defined the main strategy of the site visit.

### *1.4.2. Visit to the Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education “Moscow State P. I. Tchaikovsky Conservatory”*

The Review Panel visited the Conservatory on December 4-6, 2018 with the purpose of confirming the authenticity of the information, which was presented in the Self-Evaluation Report, collecting extra information on the implementation of the study programmes and checking the compliance of the Conservatory activity with the Standards.



The time line and the agenda of the site visit were preliminarily determined by NCPA and MusiQuE and approved after agreeing with the Conservatory administration.

During the site visit the Review Panel Members conducted a number of meetings and interviews with: the HEI administration and employees responsible for the accreditation procedure; representatives of administrative departments (the financial department, the organization and personnel department, the academic and methodological centre for training of artistic/performing and academic personnel of higher qualification, the educational department, the methodological department, the law department, the S. I. Taneyev Scholarly Music Library); deans and heads of the departments; alumni, teaching staff, undergraduate students, postgraduate students, assistant trainees, and representatives of the professional community.

During the site visit the Review Panel inspected:

- classrooms;
- concert halls (the Great Hall, the Small Hall, the Rakhmaninov Hall, the Nikolay Myaskovsky Concert Hall, the Oval Hall);
- the N. G. Rubinstein Museum;
- the multi-functional production-and-training centre of audio recording and sound engineering;
- the K. V. Kvitka Research Centre of Folk Music;
- the academic and artistic centre of electroacoustic music;
- the Library, the Archive;
- professional television of the Conservatory;
- classes and concerts as students' learning outcomes.

The Chair of the Review Panel managed the Panel's work. The Review Panel considers it necessary to emphasize effective interaction of experts with NCPA and MusiQuE during the expertise and site visit to the Conservatory.

The Review Panel notes a high level of organizational provision and constructive work.

The Conservatory executive staff provided the administrative support, which included arrangement of meetings and interviews, provision with working space, computers with the Internet access, necessary research, academic and methodological documents.

During the site visit to the Conservatory the Review Panel members requested additional documents for scrutiny.

On the last day of the site visit the Chair of the Review Panel presented an oral report on



the general conclusions of the visit to the Conservatory executive staff.



## Summary of the compliance with the Standards and recommendations

1. Institutional mission, vision and context	
<b>Standard 1.</b> The institutional mission and vision are clearly stated	<b>Fully compliant</b>
<b>Areas for improvement</b>  At the same time, the Review Panel considers it is possible to recommend the Conservatory to elaborate its Development Strategy in two directions: (i) to extend horizons for 10-15 years and (ii) to describe the mechanisms of its implementation in more details adding specific target indicators that would allow monitoring and evaluating of the Strategy attainment more exactly and adequately.	
2. Educational processes	
<b>Standard 2.1.</b> The goals of the institution are achieved through the content and structure of the study programmes and their methods of delivery.	<b>Fully compliant</b>
<b>Areas for improvement</b>  The Review Panel recommends to use experience of employers, especially international ones, in the development of curricula and working programmes more effectively. It will allow faster responding to the changes of demands both of the Russian and international markets and better preparing of graduates for life in the conditions of the global concert and performance practices.	
<b>Standard 2.2.</b> The institution offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international perspective.	<b>Substantially compliant</b>
<b>Recommendations</b>  The Review Panel recommends to develop and adopt a long-term plan of enhancing opportunities for internationalization/academic mobility of the Conservatory students and teachers, particularly in part of developing possibilities for two-sided exchange (for example, in the framework of the Erasmus+ programme). Such plan should support long-term (3-10 months) students' travels abroad and may mostly be intended for postgraduate students and assistant trainees.	

<b>Standard 2.3.</b> Assessment methods are clearly defined and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes.	<b>Fully compliant</b>
<b>Areas for improvement</b>  Cooperation between different faculties and departments can be developed further for the purpose of improvement of transparency and comparability of the assessment process.	
<b>3. Student profiles</b>	
<b>Standard 3.1.</b> Clear admissions criteria exist, which establish artistic/academic suitability of students	<b>Fully compliant</b>
<b>Standard 3.2.</b> The institution has mechanisms to formally monitor and review the progression, achievement and subsequent employability of its students.	<b>Substantially compliant</b>
<b>Recommendations</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The Review Panel believes it is necessary to recommend the institution to more actively form the objective and adequate students' idea on the system of the global music performance market as well as the global art space in general and on the self-promoting methods in this environment.</li> <li>· To consider a possibility of establishing a specialized structural unit which should monitor the current internal and international labour market, compile and support a vacancy data base, assist in the Conservatory graduates' employment (similar to the European career advisor). It is also desirable to pay more attention to tracing alumni's employment and careers. The establishment of such a unit is possible due to optimization of the support staff units.</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>Fully compliant</b>



<b>Areas for improvement</b>  The teachers delivering academic courses and having research profile should more actively publish the results of their research work in peer-reviewed journals and books in English to make them more easily accessible for the international community of musicologists and music theorists.	
<b>Standard 4.2.</b> There are sufficient qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the programmes.	<b>Fully compliant</b>
<b>Areas for improvement</b>  The risk of in-house development of human resources is the closed nature of the institution and its creative shrinkage. Keeping this in mind the administration of the Conservatory should adhere to the existing flexibility of the staff policy.	
<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 programmes.	<b>Fully compliant</b>
<b>Areas for improvement</b>  The External Review Panel thinks it is especially important to mention the significant improvement of the facilities and resources of the Conservatory and expresses its wish to complete the reconstruction as soon as possible. Until the reconstruction is completed, the Review Panel recommends to find temporary premises to increase the number of students' practicing rooms.	
<b>Standard 5.2.</b> The institution's financial resources enable successful delivery of the programmes.	<b>Fully compliant</b>
<b>Areas for improvement</b>  The External Review Panel recommends the Conservatory to finalize the Strategy of Risk Management in the principle of break-even activity, taking into account the prediction of possible risks and minimizing losses. It is also recommended to continue enhancing the funding strategy.	
<b>Standard 5.3.</b> The programme has sufficient qualified support staff.	<b>Fully compliant</b>

### Areas for improvement

The External Review Panel recommends the Conservatory administration to restructure the existing system of support staff if possible in order to optimize expenses.

## 6. Communication, organisation and decision-making

<b>Standard 6.1.</b> Effective mechanisms are in place for internal communication within the institution.	<b>Fully compliant</b>
---	------------------------

### Areas for improvement

The electronic document management system and informational and educational environment require further improvement and implementation not only in terms of maintaining the content, but rather increasing the involvement of all the participants of the educational process to this work.

<b>Standard 6.2</b> The institution has an appropriate organisational structure and decision-making processes.	<b>Fully compliant</b>
--	------------------------

## 7. Internal quality culture

<b>Standard 7.</b> The institution has a strong internal quality culture, supported by clear and effective quality assurance and enhancement procedures.	<b>Fully compliant</b>
--	------------------------

### Areas for improvement

The Conservatory could use the external experts more actively and more effectively (representatives of employers, reputable representatives of the professional community) in QA procedures, for example, external experts could be involved in interim and final state attestation.

The External Review Panel considers it is important to develop a document regulating the surveying procedure for students, post-graduates, assistant teachers and teachers of the Conservatory in order to conduct them on a regular basis. The results of the survey should be analyzed and made public.

8. Public interaction	
<b>Standard 8.1.</b> The institution engages within wider cultural, artistic and educational contexts.	<b>Partially compliant</b>
<b>Areas for improvement</b> <p>The Conservatory's unique experience of teaching the basics of music art at its evening music school to different age groups should be expanded to other educational institutions. The Conservatory could coordinate this experience sharing.</p>	
<b>Standard 8.2.</b> The institution actively promotes links with various sectors of the music and other artistic professions.	<b>Fully compliant</b>
<b>Areas for improvement</b> <p>The increase in the number of agreements between the Conservatory and art and culture institutions can strengthen the relationships between the representatives of creative professions.</p>	
<b>Standard 8.3.</b> Information provided to the public about the institution is clear, consistent and accurate.	<b>Fully compliant</b>
<b>Areas for improvement</b> <p>The Conservatory, being the central national music platform, could publish the news of other national music HEIs, thus enhancing networking.</p>	

## Conclusion

Based on the analysis of submitted documents, data and interviews, the External Review Panel made a conclusion that the Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education "Moscow State P.I. Tchaikovsky Conservatory" complies with the requirements of the joined standards in music education.

The External Review Panel recommends the National Accreditation Board and the MusiQuE Board to accredit the Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education "Moscow State P.I. Tchaikovsky Conservatory", delivering study programmes "Art of concert performance" (53.05.01), "Artistic direction of opera-symphony orchestra and academic choir" (53.05.02), "Art of music and theater" (53.05.04), "Musicology" (53.05.05), "Composition" (53.05.06), "Art of musical instrument performance (by types)" (53.09.01), "Art of vocal performance (by types)" (53.09.02), "Art of composition" (53.09.03), "Mastership of musical sound engineering" (53.09.04), "Art of conducting (by types)" (53.09.05) and "Musicology and applied musical art" (53.03.06), "Study of art" (50.06.01) for the period of six years.