



# REPORT

**BA Training and MA STUDIOS**

**P.A.R.T.S.**

**Brussels, Belgium**

**20-22 March 2024**

## CONTENTS

List of abbreviations .....	3
Introduction.....	4
Key data on P.A.R.T.S.....	6
Alignment with Institutional Goals and Strategy .....	7
1. Governance and decision making at programme level .....	8
1.1. The programme goals and context.....	8
1.2. Programme’s stakeholders role in decision making.....	11
2. Students’ perspectives .....	15
2.1. Admission and student-centred learning.....	15
2.2. Students’ progression and assessment.....	18
2.3. Students’ employability .....	20
3. Teachers’ perspectives .....	23
3.1. Staff qualification, professional activity and development.....	23
4. External perspectives.....	26
4.1. International perspectives and experiences for students and staff.....	26
4.2. Engagement within the external institutional and social context .....	27
5. Resources.....	31
5.1 Finances, facilities, services and support staff .....	31
5.2 Health and wellbeing .....	33
6. Communication processes .....	36
6.1. Internal and external communication processes.....	36
7. Quality Culture.....	38
7.1. Quality Culture at programme level.....	38
Summary of the compliance with the Standards and recommendations .....	41
Conclusion .....	46
Recommendation for accreditation .....	47
Annex 1. Site-visit schedule .....	48
Annex 2. List of documents provided to the review team .....	54
Annex 3. Definitions of compliance levels .....	57

## List of abbreviations

<b>BA Training</b>	Bachelor programme 'Training'
<b>CPD</b>	Continuing Professional Development
<b>MA STUDIOS</b>	Master programme 'STUDIOS'
<b>NVAO</b>	Naederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatie Organisatie (Dutch-Flemish Accreditation Organisation)
<b>P.A.R.T.S.</b>	Performing Arts Research and Training Studios
<b>USP</b>	Unique selling point

## Introduction

### P.A.R.T.S. and its programmes

The Performing Arts Research and Training Studios (P.A.R.T.S.) was founded in 1995 as a private initiative by the choreographer Anne Teresa De Keersmaeker. P.A.R.T.S. has always been independent rather than affiliated to a larger educational organisation, and from 1997 and 1998 respectively it has received public funding from the Flemish Ministry of Culture and the Flemish Ministry of Education.

In 2000, the curriculum was restructured into two cycles of two years each: the Training Cycle and the Research Cycle, with both cycles starting only every two years. A new structure started in 2013 with the Training Cycle extended to three years; this evolved into the BA Training programme. Pilot continuation programmes called Research Studios eventually evolved from 2019 into the two-year MA STUDIOS. Both the Training and the STUDIOS cycles passed the 'Toets Nieuwe Opleiding' of the Nederlands Vlaamse Accreditatie Organisatie (NVAO) and were respectively awarded recognition as a professional Bachelor programme (June 2019) and academic Masters programme (July 2020). Each cycle is only offered every three years so that the same cohort of students follows through the entire cycle.

Since 2001, P.A.R.T.S. has operated on a management agreement with the Ministry of Education of the Flemish Government as a registered 'Institution offering excellent art training' (Art. III.119 of the decree of higher education). The management agreement is renewed every five years. P.A.R.T.S. is currently in its fifth policy period (2022-2026). At the time of the review visit P.A.R.T.S. was pursuing 'Sui Generis' <sup>1</sup>status with the Flemish Government which was subsequently approved on 19<sup>th</sup> April 2024.

### Context and scope of the review

P.A.R.T.S. approached MusiQuE to conduct its first external evaluation procedure. Following advice from the NVAO, the Flemish government gave permission to assess both the BA and Masters programme as part of the same process. Both degrees are currently validated until September 2024.

### About this report

This document serves as the assessment report for the BA Training and MA STUDIOS programmes offered by P.A.R.T.S.. The assessment of the programmes was carried out by an independent review team of international peer reviewers. In this report the review team presents its findings, considerations and conclusions.

---

<sup>1</sup> The term 'Sui Generis' or 'of its own kind' refers in the Flemish public sector to a small number of organisations that are self-standing and independent.

Because of the unified nature of the P.A.R.T.S. learning community, and the many shared aspects between the BA Training and MA STUDIOS, the majority of the review team's findings apply to both programmes but where necessary they are differentiated.

### **Steps of the procedure**

The assessment followed a three-stage process:

- P.A.R.T.S. prepared a self-evaluation report and supporting documents, offering background information and insights about the programmes under review;
- an international review team studied the self-evaluation report, visited the institution on-site and reviewed a sample of student-led work and classes live during the site visit before reaching weighted and substantiated conclusions regarding the programmes;
- the review team produced the present assessment report.

### **Composition of the review team**

Mist Thorkelsdottir (Chair), University of Southern California, Head of International Programmes in the Performing Arts

Celia Duffy (Secretary and Peer), Royal Conservatoire of Scotland, Senior Fellow in Knowledge Exchange, former Director of Research and Knowledge Exchange

Lise Uytterhoeven (Peer), London Contemporary Dance School at The Place, Director of Dance Studies

Sulekha Ali Omar (Peer and student representative), KHIO Oslo, recent graduate of the MA Choreography



## Key data on P.A.R.T.S.

<b>Name of the institution</b>	Performing Arts Research and Training Studios (P.A.R.T.S.)
<b>Legal status</b>	Registered Institution offering excellent art training' (Art. III.119 of the Flemish Government decree of higher education).
<b>Date of creation</b>	1995
<b>Website address</b>	<a href="https://www.parts.be/school">https://www.parts.be/school</a>
<b>Departments</b>	Not applicable.
<b>List of reviewed programmes</b>	Bachelor BA Training Masters MA STUDIOS
<b>Number of students enrolled in the programmes reviewed</b>	c.40 for BA Training 12 for MA STUDIOS
<b>Number of teachers serving the programmes reviewed [permanent and part-time staff]</b>	Permanent staff of 6.7 FTE c.60 freelance visiting teachers

## **Alignment with Institutional Goals and Strategy**



## 1. Governance and decision making at programme level

### 1.1. The programme goals and context

**Standard 1.1** *The programme's goals are clearly stated and relevant to the national legal context. They reflect the institutional mission and vision, and they are aligned with the overarching institutional policies and strategy. They are effectively achieved through the content and structure of the curriculum, and its methods of delivery.*

P.A.R.T.S.' history as a small specialist school for contemporary dance, founded in 1995 by the renowned choreographer Anne Teresa De Keersmaeker, has been one of change and development both in its legal status and in the programmes it offers (SER, p.3). Under its current management agreement with the Ministry of Education of the Flemish Government P.A.R.T.S. offers a three year first cycle BA programme, the BA Training, aimed at both dancers and choreographers and a two-year second cycle Masters programme, the MA STUDIOS aimed at choreographers and dance-makers (SER, p.7). The SER notes (p.7) that the current five year funding cycles lead to a lack long-term security. For this reason at the time of the review visit P.A.R.T.S. and the Flemish Government were in the final stages of negotiating a change to status 'Sui Generis' (subsequently approved on 19<sup>th</sup> April 2024) which is seen as an important step in safeguarding P.A.R.T.S.' independence and as a bulwark against being absorbed by bigger higher education institutions (Meeting 1, Directors).

The school's mission statement was revised as part of its preparation for the current process (SER, p.8). It articulates four key elements of P.A.R.T.S.' educational approach: dance training in a collective setting; creative studio practice that includes other artistic disciplines such as music and theatre; a research culture; and students' personal agency. The mission statement recognises its inspiration in the artistic practice of the school's founder, the influence of a broad array of visiting artists as teachers, and learning together and from each other in a non-hierarchical setting (SER, p.8).

The SER summarises those features of P.A.R.T.S.' philosophy, approach and organisation that reflect its mission (SER, p.11) and which are evident in both programmes. Its philosophy emphasises valuing dance craftsmanship, a critical disposition, personal development and collaboration. Its pedagogical approach and organisation emphasises the collective character of the school and its strong sense of community, facilitated by its small scale. The sense of a diverse and enriching learning community was affirmed by students of both programmes (Meeting 6, Students).

The SER outlines how the school's mission is realised through the curricular content and structure of both programmes (SER, pp.9-10). The sense of community is reinforced by the cyclic organisation where only one cohort of each programme is active at any one time.

Programme learning outcomes for both the BA Training and MA STUDIOS are listed under headings reflecting the philosophy outlined above: Creativity and performance; Theory and reflection; Communication and interpersonal collaboration; Transfer to the professional world (SER, Appendix 8, Appendix 9). The specific learning outcomes under these





headings are mapped to the level of each cycle and aligned with the Flemish NVAO and aligned with Dublin Descriptors. The SER notes that both programmes have much in common in their general philosophy but differ substantially in their specific learning outcomes, methods of delivery and organisation (SER, pp.13-14).

The pedagogical emphasis in both programmes is on a strong connection to current artistic practice with intensive bursts of course content led by freelance artist-teachers; participants in Meeting 5 (Guest Teachers) reported that they work with students in a similar way as with professionals.

For the BA Training, physical competence, stagecraft and how to develop a piece is combined with an interest and openness to the world (Meeting 6, Students and Meeting 6B, Representatives of the profession); the SER (p.9) asserts that training the mind is as important as training the body if students are to be more than simply executors of someone else's ideas. This emphasis on creativity and independent thinking is backed up by a strong basis in theory. Students affirmed (Meeting 6, Students) the importance of theory as a differentiator of the P.A.R.T.S. approach. The importance of reflective practice and critical thinking including on the social necessity of art was affirmed in Meetings 1 and 4.

The MA STUDIOS approach was described in Meeting 6 (Students) as an inspiring blend of dance and choreography. It is an academic Masters programme with a focus on independent dance makers, combined with research and working in a collaborating collective (SER, p.13). The possible tensions between the collective and individual approaches were addressed in Meeting 2 (Pedagogical Team). Organisationally, this two-year Masters starts with a 'bridge' year in which students work collectively but also work towards finding their individual artistic voice, following through to independent projects in the second year. The financial insecurity of the MA STUDIOS was noted in Meeting 1 (Directors) and Meeting 4 (Programme Committee).

The review team finds that educational goals are strongly aligned with the mission and vision and that an agile approach permeates all educational decisions. The school is artist-focussed and independent and all layers of the organisation (from part-time teachers to the Board) are engaged with, and committed to, its direction.

The mission and philosophy of P.A.R.T.S. is clearly articulated and reflected in the content and pedagogical approach of both programmes.

The review team agrees that the MA STUDIOS has not quite achieved a clearly differentiated identity as a programme; this is acknowledged by the institution. MA STUDIOS feels a little like a satellite and, as a relatively recent development, not as firmly established as the BA Training; the review team welcomes the priority P.A.R.T.S. is giving to further defining and developing its content and approach. It also strongly supports P.A.R.T.S.' strenuous efforts to secure its financial sustainability. In the opinion of the review team this MA programme is a vital element of P.A.R.T.S.' evolving and distinctive higher education offer and, typically, it has set itself a high bar.

## Compliance with Standard 1.1



The Review Team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 1.1 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor BA Training	Fully compliant
Master MA STUDIOS	Fully compliant

## 1.2. Programme's stakeholders role in decision making

**Standard 1.2** *The delivery of the programme is supported by an appropriate organisational structure, and clear, transparent and effective decision-making processes that include a balanced representation of the programme's stakeholders (students, teaching staff, support staff, representatives of the music profession and related artistic domains).*

The SER (p.15) notes that the organisational structures of both programmes are almost identical and, in turn, overlap with the structure of the institution as a whole. The small permanent team comprises the deputy director, the coordinator, responsible for pedagogical programmes, tutors allocated to each programme, and support staff working in finance and administration. The director, Anne Teresa De Keersmaecker is a member of the Programme Committee and Board of Directors and now a part-time appointment, having delegated much of her role in the management of P.A.R.T.S. to the deputy director. The role of the Tutors is critical, described as the on-the-ground eyes and ears of the deputy director and coordinator in their liaison with both students and visiting teachers (SER, p.15).

The Programme Committee (formerly known as the Faculty) is comprised of senior staff, Tutors and teachers representing the range of disciplines in the curriculum, and has an advisory role in the development and implementation of the programmes. The coordinator works closely with the Programme Committee and deputy director on planning scheduling and appointments of teachers.

Students are not actively involved in the design and development of the programmes and are not represented on the Programme Committee or board (SER, p.17). However, there are various mechanisms for including the student voice in decision-making, for example in the evaluations of teachers and courses and the student representatives in the regular student-staff meetings (SER, p.17) and plenary meetings. P.A.R.T.S. recognises that it could improve student representation in all levels of decision making (SER, p.18); it also points out that the single-cohort structure can lead to unrealistic expectations from students about the pace of change in that their suggestions cannot be implemented until the next cycle. This has been particularly the case in the MA STUDIOS programme.

The number of visiting teachers makes it impractical to involve them in formal decision making processes; their feedback is fed into the coordinator and the Programme Committee which includes visiting teachers in its membership (SER, p.18). Online meetings for teachers, started in COVID, have been continued twice a year and are valued by the somewhat dispersed teaching workforce (SER, p.18).

Non-teaching staff are represented in the weekly staff meetings (SER, p.19).

P.A.R.T.S. does not have a formal consultative forum for external stakeholders, but as its teachers and members of the Programme Committee all have active professional profiles they bring external perspectives to their roles (SER, p.19).

The SER (p.19) comments that a proportion of its decision making is informal in nature but that this is effective due to the small scale of the institution and its short lines of

communication. The SER (pp.19-22) then gives eleven case studies of recent developments and adjustments to programmes as exemplars of agile and efficient decision-making.

In the view of the review team the programmes are properly supported by decision-making and organisational structures with evidence of flexibility, agility and acting on feedback given in the SER case studies. The organisational structure is the same for both programmes, and this is appropriate for their small scale.

The review team found the Programme Committee structure to be an innovative and effective mechanism for programme overview and one that included diverse external professional input (Meeting 4, Programme Committee). It witnessed a weekly staff student meeting when it was clear that the short lines of communication are effective in decision making without the bureaucratic overload that P.A.R.T.S. wishes to avoid.

The review team heard (Meeting 6, Students) that students understood and were clear about the ways in which they could contribute to decision making; they described cases where immediate issues in course content were quickly and effectively resolved and they felt that the Deputy Director's door was open to them. In Meeting 8 BA alumni were proud that some of their feedback had now been implemented and felt that current students would also want to improve the programme for the benefit of future generations. This concern for the future P.A.R.T.S. community is a commendable feature of the school.

The SER noted that P.A.R.T.S. wishes to improve formal student representation in decision making and the review team welcomes that initiative, in line with established HE good practice.

The SER's open airing of difficulties with the MA STUDIOS students' expectation of faster action following feedback is evidence of the institution's open and self-reflective attitude. It agrees that the cyclic structure means that current students are unlikely to experience any changes made in their own generation but questions why, while the programme is still in an early and developmental stage, changes made mid-way to the programme are not possible (SER, p.17).

#### **Suggestion for enhancement**

Following established good practice in HE, P.A.R.T.S. should consider inserting student representation formally into every level of governance and decision-making.

#### **Recommendation for MA STUDIOS**

P.A.R.T.S. prides itself on its agile and responsive decision-making; it should consider how the student feedback in the MA STUDIOS could be acted upon mid-way through the programme.

### **Compliance with Standard 1.2**

**The Review Team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 1.2 as follows:**

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor BA Training	Fully compliant
Master MA STUDIOS	Substantially compliant

## Educational processes

## 2. Students' perspectives

### 2.1. Admission and student-centred learning

**Standard 2.1** *Clear, coherent, and inclusive admission criteria exist, to establish artistic / academic suitability of incoming students at programme level. Admitted students are encouraged to take an active role in creating the learning process and to engage in critical-reflection. They are supported to achieve the intended learning outcomes through an appropriate and effective blend of teaching and learning styles and pedagogies. The programme and its methods of delivery are adequately catered by staff and support services.*

#### Admission processes

Admission processes are described in detail in the SER (p.23). Due to the organisation of both BA and MA programmes in single cohorts, P.A.R.T.S. sees it as a necessity to take particular care in selecting students that will work together and form well-functioning collective cohorts. P.A.R.T.S. emphasises its international admissions process (SER, p.23) in which, after auditions in-country, all international applicants are invited to a final audition in Brussels. All auditions processes are live. P.A.R.T.S. describes its approach to selection as inclusive both in terms of its willingness to waive strict entry criteria for the right candidate (SER, p.24) and its concern to build a diverse cohort in terms of prior education, cultural and socio-economic background (SER, p.25).

For the BA Training, technical dance skills are not the main criterion for selection; prospective students' potential to benefit from and contribute to the P.A.R.T.S. educational experience is prioritised. The age limit for admission to the BA Training is 23 (SER, p.24).

For the MA STUDIOS, after pre-selection via a written submission, the live audition process takes 4-6 days and consists of classes, an interview, talks and tasks including essay writing. The age limit for admission to the MA STUDIOS is 27 (SER, p.24).

Admissions processes are set out in detail on the P.A.R.T.S. website. In Meeting 6 (Students) the review team heard how students had used published study guides on the web to assist their decision to audition for P.A.R.T.S.. Students that attended an 'Open Friday' session also commented that the welcome they received was a major factor in their decision (Meeting 6, Students).

#### Students' role in the learning process

The SER (p.26) describes P.A.R.T.S.' approach to dance education as a collective and collaborative endeavour and its philosophy that students learn as much from each other as from teachers.

The cohort for the BA Training programme numbers around 40 students. The SER (p.27) describes the various formations in which students work, sometimes as a large collective, but usually in smaller groups. Individualised study paths and choices increase over the three years of the programme. Individual processing and critical reflection is prioritised

(SER, p.27); the challenges of working with a very diverse group without similar cultural references and educational experiences is acknowledged and addressed via specific additional interventions (SER, p.27). P.A.R.T.S.' pedagogy requires students to reflect and research, speak up, discuss and come up with their own answers as active participants in the learning process (SER, p.28 and Meeting 6, Students). The SER (p.31) describes the opportunities for students to present their work, including the self-curated graduation festival *P.A.R.T.S.@work*.

The collective philosophy of the MA STUDIOS is described as unusual in programmes at the second cycle (SER, p.27). Rather than being based on individual research profiles, the approach is collective with compulsory taught courses. Students develop their individual trajectories through projects in the second year. P.A.R.T.S. acknowledges (SER, p.28 and Meeting 2, Pedagogical Team) that an appropriate balance between the P.A.R.T.S. collective approach and individual authorship has yet to be defined. The SER (p.30) addresses the varied research elements of the programme and how they are supported and outlines ongoing discussions about the development and presentation format of artistic research in the MA STUDIOS. Graduating MA students have the opportunity to present their final projects in professional venues in Brussels and elsewhere including internationally (SER, p.31).

### **Learning Outcomes**

The SER (p.26) outlines the recent formulation of programme and course learning outcomes as part of the degree recognition processes for both programmes in 2019-2020. The general programme learning outcomes for both BA and MA are based around four pillars:

(1) creativity and performance, (2) theory and reflection, (3) communication and interprofessional collaboration and (4) transfer to the professional world.

Specific course learning outcomes are detailed in the study guides for both programmes. The SER states that '[I]n the daily practice of building and giving specific form to the programme, they remain more or less in the background' (SER, p.26).

### **Staff and support services**

The P.A.R.T.S. pedagogical model emphasises learning from a large number of practising artists as freelance visiting teachers (SER, p.31). The role of the fractional post of Tutor in both programmes is vital in providing a consistent point of contact and presence for students in the studio; they follow up teaching from visiting artists and help guide students' learning (Meeting 2, Pedagogical Team, and SER, p.29). Students are supported by a small team of permanent staff including administrators, technicians and a primary care psychologist (SER, p.32).

The review team commends the care taken over P.A.R.T.S.' audition processes and the extent and clarity of information provided in the public domain. The process is extremely



competitive and places are highly sought after; the review team heard in Meeting 6 (Students) that it was 'impossible to refuse when offered a place'.

Whilst there is ample evidence of an inclusive approach to admissions as regards prior education, cultural and socio-economic background (SER, p.25) that results in a diverse cohort, there are also factors that reduce the inclusivity of admissions processes. These include strict age limits, the full-time nature of both programmes and the lack of provision for students with disabilities (these might include neurodivergence, chronic illness and mental health conditions). Age limits are justified in terms of group building and homogeneity 'opposed to the diversity of origins and previous education that are characteristic for the group' (SER, p.25). The review of age limits for the MA STUDIOS (SER, p.25) is to be welcomed. The review team heard in Meeting 6B (Representatives of the profession) that efforts are being made by P.A.R.T.S. to address provision for students with physical disabilities, and supports this development, but the current lack of accessibility of current facilities make it a long term project.

The review team finds that there is a very clear student-centred approach in both the BA Training and MA STUDIOS programmes. There is a strong sense of belonging nurtured through the one-cohort generation structure that fosters long-term relationships and an emerging professional network from the day students arrive.

It is characteristic of the open and reflective attitude of P.A.R.T.S. that the SER identifies developmental issues in the definition and identity of the MA STUDIOS programme that have yet to be resolved, and that it is working towards a solution. In the opinion of review team, P.A.R.T.S. sets a very high bar.

The review team's recommendations on learning outcomes are addressed in the following Standard 2.2.

Staffing and support services including the pivotal role of Tutors are addressed below in Standard 3.1.

## Compliance with Standard 2.1

The Review Team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 2.1 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor BA Training	Fully compliant
Master MA STUDIOS	Fully compliant

## 2.2. Students' progression and assessment

**Standard 2.2** *The programme has effective procedures in place to formally monitor and review the progression of its students. Assessment methods are clearly defined and effectively demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes. There is an effective complaints and appeals system in place at programme level.*

The SER (p.33) describes P.A.R.T.S.' assessment procedures. There are no examinations, rather throughout their studies students are continuously assessed via 'qualitative permanent evaluation'. In order that teachers see enough of students' work to assess it, students are required to attend 80% of collective classes (SER, p.34). Various catch-up procedures are outlined in cases where attendance falls below 80% (SER, p.34).

Self-evaluation is a key element of both the BA Training and MA STUDIOS programmes (SER, p.33). The review team heard in Meeting 2 (Pedagogical Team) about a culture of openness: students are encouraged to speak up in classes and discuss their progress with teachers.

In the BA Training programme, evaluation reports from teachers and tutors are summarised on a one-word 6-point scale. Pass/Fail is used for the MA STUDIOS and the SER (p.35) comments that although this is becoming the international norm, it is not wholly satisfactory and a more granular approach would be beneficial for students. It also posits the possibility of students setting their own evaluation criteria (SER, p.35).

Formal monitoring and review is carried out by the evaluation committee that meets twice a years for the BA Training and once a year for the MA STUDIOS (SER, p.34). This committee is responsible for decisions on progression including catch-up work, taking into account teachers' and Tutors' reports. Due to P.A.R.T.S.' single-cohort structure and the unlikelihood of a class with a particular visiting teacher being repeated, appropriate catch-up work needs to be arranged. The SER (p.34) describes various approaches to ensure students are given fair opportunities, including attending Summer School courses.

The SER states (p.35) that the complaints and appeals procedure in place since 2016 that involves the evaluation committee and two externals, has never been used.

The SER (p.35) reflects on two aspects of assessment procedures that could be improved: assessment criteria and feedback. Visiting teachers may not communicate specific assessment criteria before a workshop session. Due to tight scheduling, feedback from visiting teachers can be delayed and is sometimes not adequately detailed. The SER's reflections (p.35) on the somewhat informal approach to assessment and feedback from visiting teachers were also echoed in Meeting 5 (Guest Teachers).

The SER (p.42) also describes how visiting teachers may be given 'more or less carte blanche' to deliver content of their choice within a defined area and how P.A.R.T.S. wants to retain the teachers' great freedom with regard to content of lessons (SER, p.44).

The review team finds that the procedures for monitoring, review and progression of students for both programmes is robust. However, P.A.R.T.S.' single-cohort structure, its

system of permanent evaluation and its requirement of 80% attendance has implications for assessment processes: catch-up work can be complicated to arrange and there is the possibility for exclusionary decision-making in the system of qualitative permanent evaluation for students who have extenuating circumstances (e.g. illness or injury), raising questions about fairness. The review team is, however, confident that close attention to the individual's progress characteristic of P.A.R.T.S. allays such concerns overall.

The review team notes that the complaints system has never been used; the absence of evidence of successful resolution of complaints raises questions over the accessibility and effectiveness of the system. However, the small scale of P.A.R.T.S., its ability to closely follow the progress of every individual and its culture of openness and airing difficulties is an important mitigation factor.

The review team finds aspects of communication of assessment criteria and quality of feedback problematic; these could be resolved by rethinking P.A.R.T.S.' approach to learning outcomes. Similarly, well-formulated learning outcomes should be used to appropriately frame visiting teachers' artistic autonomy in their choice of taught content.

While learning outcomes are available in the study guides it is required practice across higher education that there should be direct and active engagement with learning outcomes in programme planning which follows through into assessment; in short, students need to know clearly what is expected of them. Assessment needs to reliably measure if, and to what extent, students have met learning outcomes.

The review team discussed the role of learning outcomes in Meeting 2 (Pedagogical Team). It noted that learning outcomes in course documentation were not always directly linked to creative work in the studio. In the view of the review team there should be no tension between pedagogical and artistic outcomes – learning outcomes should be a result of practice, not in tension with that practice.

The review team found some course learning outcomes over-detailed. For example Body studies I, a 6-credit course has 14 learning outcomes. This is impractical for visiting teachers to communicate effectively and for teachers and students to use.

The review team commends self-evaluation as an element of assessment and P.A.R.T.S.' identified areas of enhancement for feedback and student co-created criteria; learning outcomes could be used to help students structure their self-evaluations and to help provide guidance for visiting teachers.

### **Recommendation 1**

The review team strongly recommends that P.A.R.T.S. reviews its course learning outcomes to make them more user-friendly and effective; P.A.R.T.S. must clarify how assessment measures intended learning outcomes, and how feedback effectively supports students to meet them. The aim should be for constructive alignment of learning outcomes, taught learning activities and assessment. It is particularly important that visiting teachers understand and communicate the link between learning outcomes and studio practice and the flow through to assessment against learning outcomes.

## Recommendation 2

Tight scheduling for visiting teachers should not compromise their capacity to explain assessment criteria or give timely and detailed feedback to students; the review team suggests that P.A.R.T.S. should prioritise this element in guidance and training for visiting teachers.

## Compliance with Standard 2.2

The Review Team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 2.2 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor BA Training	Partially compliant
Master MA STUDIOS	Partially compliant

## 2.3. Students' employability

**Standard 2.3** *The programme has effective mechanisms in place to ensure that students acquire the necessary skills that facilitate their transition towards a professional life in the music and / or related artistic domain. Procedures are in place to formally and effectively monitor students' subsequent employability and professional achievement. The information thus collected is efficiently used to maintain an active link with the music / artistic profession and to further develop the curriculum.*

The SER (p.36) describes how the P.A.R.T.S. philosophy encourages ownership of students' creative processes and confidence in their creative practice which will prepare them for the profession. The school's staffing model of visiting teachers who are active as artists in the profession gives students a head start in understanding the nature of the field; the fact that the student campus is co-located with a professional dance and music company means that students are exposed to artistic professionals every day.

Skills in self-organisation are promoted in both programmes. In the BA Training these include opportunities for self-curated showings; a final student-run festival; internship opportunities in the third year; and management courses. For the MA STUDIOS there is a final festival; professional residencies; Field Work internships; and management courses that focus on creators (SER, p.36).

In Meeting 6B (Representatives of the profession) the review team heard how graduates over the generations have had a significant impact on how the field of contemporary dance has developed and changed. Participants reported that graduates were very well prepared, with a high degree of professionalism, passion for the work and open mindedness to working with other kinds of dancers. The SER (p.37) notes that in student

surveys the rate of satisfaction as regards preparation for the organisational and administrative aspects of a future professional working life could be improved.

The SER (p.37) notes that systematic follow-up of alumni is restricted due to the small scale of the school, but that a recent survey showed that graduates are active in the professional field.

In Meeting 8, alumni commented that they had a very strong feeling of a continuing relationship with P.A.R.T.S., they retain their sense of belonging and benefit from continuing informal support from the institution. They felt that P.A.R.T.S. was not only a school but also a resource centre for its graduates. Graduates were eager to give back: for example, to talk to current students about their experiences of working in the Flemish context and the realities of the profession. In Meeting 8, alumni expressed very clearly that they feel they have a great deal to offer the school, for example in mentoring current students, and that they would like to be more formally involved in new developments.

The review team found that there is a strong sense of belonging nurtured through the generation structure that fosters long term relationships and an emerging professional network from the day students arrive.

It is impressive to see how the institution maintains a safe and supportive learning environment and yet is porous to the external context and Brussels society; this contributes to students' transition to professional life and a sense of artistic and social responsibility.

The commitment to making internship opportunities available for students is commendable.

As mentioned above, in the opinion of the review team P.A.R.T.S. has a very willing and expert resource in its alumni that could be usefully deployed, for example in the development of the MA STUDIOS.

#### **Recommendation 1**

The review team recommends that P.A.R.T.S. should consider how to develop its systems to monitor students after they leave. The review team notes that the process has already started with the recent survey and recognises that P.A.R.T.S. is extremely well networked in the field and has 'an ear to the ground' as regards its graduates. Nevertheless, more formal quantitative and qualitative data collection and monitoring, appropriate to the size and scale of the institution, would be both beneficial and expected in a higher education setting.

#### **Recommendation 2**

The review team recommends that P.A.R.T.S. should consider how to engage alumni in the ongoing enhancement of its programmes, particularly as regards employability.

### **Compliance with Standard 2.3**

**The Review Team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 2.3 as follows:**

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor BA Training	Substantially compliant
Master MA STUDIOS	Substantially compliant

## 3. Teachers' perspectives

### 3.1. Staff qualification, professional activity and development

**Standard 3.1** *Members of the teaching staff are qualified for their role and are active as artists/pedagogues/ researchers. The size and composition of the teaching body are sufficient and appropriate to effectively deliver the curriculum. There are adequate opportunities for teaching staff for continued professional development.*

The SER (p.41) explains that as the institution evolved from artistic practice, it is a cornerstone of the P.A.R.T.S. ethos that its teaching staff are active as artists; theory teachers have equivalent positions as academics.

Of its teaching staff, the vast majority work on a freelance basis. This includes most members of the Programme Committee, which acts as a 'faculty' of senior professionals with a close connection to the school. Only the role of Tutor is contracted on a fractional employment basis, allowing them also to maintain an active artistic profile.

Of the large number of freelancers (40-60), c. 60% are regular, returning teachers (Meeting 3, Permanent Staff) and many have been with P.A.R.T.S. for as long as 25 years (SER, p.41). This gives continuity to the teaching workforce whilst allowing for renewal as required by the evolving curricula of both programmes. The review team heard in Meeting 3 (Permanent Staff) that P.A.R.T.S. is aiming to forward plan contracts for freelancers on a 3 year cycle to give them more continuity.

In Meeting 4 (Programme Committee) the review team heard how freelancers and Tutors work alongside each other to support students' learning: a priority for the Tutor role is facilitative and communicative - building bridges between visiting artistic teachers and students. The breadth and depth of the role is evident from the job description supplied to the review team. The SER (p.42) also outlines how Tutors prepare and brief freelance teachers and inform them of any student issues they need to be aware of. For the MA STUDIOS programme teachers receive a biography of each student. The SER (p.42) notes opportunities for improving this preparation phase for both teachers and students.

P.A.R.T.S. is aware that such a large body of freelance teachers can lead to a fragmented pedagogical approach (SER, p.43). This is balanced against its advantages of offering students a very rich and diverse range of artistic practices and perspectives. The SER notes that this is particularly a problem for the MA STUDIOS programme as a closer connection from teachers to student projects is necessary at this level (SER, p.43).

The SER states that P.A.R.T.S. is generally satisfied that the size and composition of the teaching body is satisfactory and this was affirmed by participants in Meeting 4 (Programme Committee).

---

<sup>2</sup> The standard and related questions refer to all teaching staff regardless of their types of contracts – permanent, temporary, associate, etc.



There is no provision for CPD for freelance teachers. P.A.R.T.S. rationalises this in terms of its small scale as an institution and the cyclical nature of its programmes where courses are not offered every year (SER, p.44). Current opportunities for feedback from freelance teachers are irregular and informal; there is a move to systematise this and give closer attention to teacher training (SER, p.44) including via the leadership of an Erasmus+ project providing guidance around issues of diversity and inclusion (see also below under Standards 4.1 and 4.2).

The review team agrees that the large pool of committed artist-teachers that deliver the programmes and their variety of perspectives and approaches is fundamental to the P.A.R.T.S. experience and benefits students.

The role of Tutor is critical in the realisation of a very flexible pedagogical approach – they are the lynchpin to enable students’ progress and to support them in embodied practice in the studio.

As a small institution with a correspondingly small permanent staff team, provision for ongoing development in current issues in higher education pedagogy would be beneficial. For example, if Tutors and other senior staff were developed in this way, they could feed current pedagogical thinking and practice through to the large team of freelance teachers.

The review team welcomes the Erasmus+ project for training teachers (SER, p.44) but considers that P.A.R.T.S. could explore further opportunities for training in higher education pedagogy.

**Recommendation 1**

Given the critical frontline position of the Tutor and the breadth of the scope and responsibilities of the role, the review team recommends that contingencies are in place in the case of absence in order not to put the student experience at risk.

**Recommendation 2**

P.A.R.T.S. should give further consideration to the professionalisation of its teaching body. This may involve both formal qualifications and continuing professional development. The review team sees this as an important stage in P.A.R.T.S.’ evolution as a degree-awarding institution.

**Compliance with Standard 3.1**

The Review Team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 3.1 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor BA Training	Substantially compliant



Master MA  
STUDIOS

Substantially  
compliant

## 4. External perspectives

### 4.1. International perspectives and experiences for students and staff

**Standard 4.1** *The programme offers a range of opportunities for students and staff to gain international perspectives and experiences.*

The SER (p.46) describes the various facets of P.A.R.T.S.' international makeup and perspective. As a result of extensive international audition processes the student body consists of approximately two thirds of non-EU students, with an average of 25 nationalities from five different continents (SER, p.46). The SER (p.49) describes the various administrative support mechanisms provided, particularly for non-EU students who may need help with travel, accommodation, English language tuition and financial support via scholarships. The teaching body is similarly drawn from the international dance community. P.A.R.T.S. is located in Brussels, itself a super-diverse city.

The school's concentration on internationalism is described as not so much about unifying through internationalism, but rather assuring openness to diverse perspectives (SER, p.46). P.A.R.T.S. does not differentiate fees for EU and international students; as an autonomous institution it is not subject to student quotas and wishes to retain and safeguard this freedom (SER, p.46).

The curriculum of both programmes is described as rooted in western dance practices, but open to cross-cultural influences and thinking – including those introduced by its large cohort of international teachers (SER, p.47 and Meeting 4, Programme Committee).

P.A.R.T.S. provides opportunities for a number of international exchange and partnerships, notably the regular residency for MA STUDIOS at Senegal's Ecole des Sables, bringing together P.A.R.T.S. students with a group of young African dancers and choreographers from across the African continent (SER, p.47). In Meeting 8, former students described their time in Senegal as changing their whole outlook about dancing and 'being'. MA STUDIOS students can apply for international internships in the year after graduation (SER, p.48).

The SER notes a number of other opportunities for both programmes, including those offered by the Erasmus+ programme and several European partnerships to share research and best practices (SER, p.48).

The review team found extensive evidence that P.A.R.T.S. is resolutely international in its outlook and that this outlook is underpinned by many international opportunities for students including exchanges, internships, residencies and projects. P.A.R.T.S.' in-country admission processes promote a diverse international cohort in both programmes.

Internationalism has been a clear strategic objective of P.A.R.T.S. since the very beginning; as an arts education institution in Europe's super-diverse capital it wishes to retain its autonomy in its current recruitment practices without externally-imposed quotas. The review team is confident that P.A.R.T.S. has robust administrative systems to support its large international student body.

The review team notes that exploration of inclusive pedagogies would be beneficial in any endeavours to embed advanced dancers from its collaborative partners into P.A.R.T.S.' programmes and thus reframing notions of excellence; its curriculum remains somewhat aligned with the cosmopolitan Brussels contemporary dance scene rather than reflecting the super-diversity of the capital in which many dance cultures intersect.

The review team heard testimony of the powerful effect of the Ecole des Sables residency in Meeting 8 (Alumni), described as being important artistically for the students and an intense and challenging experience; it commends P.A.R.T.S. for its energetic pursuit of outward-facing learning and experience at all levels.

### Compliance with Standard 4.1

The Review Team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 4.1 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor BA Training	Fully compliant
Master MA STUDIOS	Fully compliant

## 4.2. Engagement within the external institutional and social context

**Standard 4.2** *The programme's educational processes reflect the institutional policies and strategies in place for an active social engagement. The continued development and maintenance of links with the music profession and the wider artistic, cultural, educational and/or other relevant sectors within society is an integrated part of the programme.*

The collective experience is hardwired into P.A.R.T.S.' educational processes and, to an extent, the diverse cohort of students in both programmes encounter social and cultural difference in their everyday experience at the school. The SER (p.50) describes how P.A.R.T.S. is taking a more proactive role in giving students tools and guidance for greater social awareness, particularly around identity and inequality, noting that this has been a particular issue in the MA STUDIOS programme. P.A.R.T.S. is leading the Erasmus+ research project *Diversity in European higher dance education* which will inform its approach. Social consciousness is also embedded in the curriculum through the suite of theoretical courses in both programmes (SER, p.51).

The SER (p.51) describes how collaborations with Brussels-based artistic organisations that work for societal inclusion are becoming embedded into the curriculum. These include *Platform K* (inclusion for young people with disabilities), *LaboLobo* (inclusion for elderly people) and *Globe Aroma* (inclusion for newcomers and refugees). BA Training students collaborate with *Platform K* and *Labolobo* during Artistic Practice - X-week. P.A.R.T.S.'

summer school gives another opportunity to explore these collaborations as a laboratory for new practices and teachers. Recently this has featured the interaction between contemporary dance and urban dance, collaborations with *Platform K* to make the programme accessible to dancers with disabilities and an intensive on inclusion and intergenerational practices (SER, p.52).

The SER (p.52) notes that these collaborations help the school to understand ongoing needs in the field of contemporary dance and to help close the gap between professional contemporary dance and wider society.

P.A.R.T.S. students are located in a professional environment, sharing a campus with *Ictus*, a professional music ensemble and *Rosas*, a professional dance company (Meeting 4, Programme Committee). A compelling P.A.R.T.S. of the P.A.R.T.S. experience is learning with working artists (Meeting 6, Students) and although P.A.R.T.S. can seem like a 'bubble', it is porous in its exposure to different teachers and different aesthetics (Meetings 6 and 6B). Participants in Meeting 6B (Representatives of the profession) affirmed P.A.R.T.S.' reach into the professions and openness to the world via organised projects, invited talks and interactions and continuous informal networking.

P.A.R.T.S. describes itself as a 'learning institution' (SER, p.12) and this is evidenced in its various active social engagement projects as well as its open and reflective attitude towards societal inclusion and its place in society. The review team commends P.A.R.T.S.' lead in the Erasmus+ project in diversity as further evidence of how it confronts and addresses challenging contemporary issues.

There is very strong and obvious support from the professional field, evidenced in a number of ways from organised projects, the summer school, its co-location with professional companies and, no less important to note, the strength of informal networking and close communication with the artistic professions.

**Suggestion for enhancement**

Recognising the existing strong lines of communication with professional stakeholders, P.A.R.T.S. might consider ways to involve them more formally in discussions for curricular developments, including for the MA STUDIOS programme.

**Compliance with Standard 4.2**

The Review Team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 4.2 as follows:

Programme		Compliance level
Bachelor Training	BA	Fully compliant

Master STUDIOS	MA	Fully compliant
-------------------	----	-----------------

## Learning resources and student support



## 5. Resources

### 5.1 Finances, facilities, services and support staff

**Standard 5.1** *The programme has means and resources to ensure its successful delivery and to secure its sustainable development.*

#### Finances

P.A.R.T.S. operates under a five-year management funding agreement with the Flemish Government but at the time of the review visit was pursuing a change to Sui Generis status (subsequently approved on 19<sup>th</sup> April 2024) that would better secure long term funding (SER, p.53). Currently P.A.R.T.S. raises 20-25% of its income, but the remaining 80% has been subject to a series of across the board cuts in the Flemish Community that threaten the quality of its programmes and further diminish already slim financial margins (SER, p. 54).

P.A.R.T.S. regards itself as a financially healthy institution with appropriate financial reserves (Meeting 7, Board). However, the SER (pp.54-57) articulates three major financial challenges: (1) exploitation of the major new infrastructure; (2) the financing of scholarships; and (3) the financing of the MA STUDIOS programme: currently only one cycle of the MA STUDIOS programme is in the multi-year budget, with the next due to being in September 2025. Its long term future remains uncertain.

#### Facilities and services

A major infrastructure project is underway, scheduled for completion mid-2025. This will include three additional studios with technical equipment and sprung floors and one open-air roof studio; new changing rooms; a new fitness room and more meeting rooms, all wheelchair accessible. These new facilities are principally aimed at servicing the MA STUDIOS programme (SER, p.57). A programme of further work includes the upgrading of the Rosas Performance Space, new floors for the current P.A.R.T.S. studios; and sustainable energy solutions.

In Meeting 6 (Students), students from both programmes appreciated the provision of studio facilities as well as both technical and financial support for performances and projects. Students also noted the availability of help with administrative issues such as visas.

The library is currently housed in a classroom and is accessible four times a week and on request; the catalogue is digitised (SER, p.58) and available to students and the borrowing system will be digitised by the 2024-25 academic year. The institutional archive is not publicly accessible, but a strategic plan is being developed for its development (SER, p.58).

The SER (p.61) describes P.A.R.T.S.' digital facilities as small-scale and generally low-tech. There is no learning management system and some concern that off the shelf technical solutions would not be appropriate for such a small and niche institution (SER, p.62).

#### Support staff



A small team of 6.7 permanent staff members lead and coordinate the operations of the school. The SER (p.60) outlines a new personnel policy, being developed to address concerns about the heavy workload of permanent staff. Due to its small scale there is no formal route for training or CPD (SER, p.61).

In the view of the review team, students benefit from access to high quality studio facilities, to audio visual resources and to technical support that directly facilitates their independent artistic practice. They also benefit from being part of an artistic centre where professionals and visiting artists interact. Students in Meeting 6 were well aware and appreciative of the breadth and quality of resources available to them.

Outstanding new state of the art studio facilities and the redesign of the campus to include accessibility will further enhance the student experience, especially for the MA STUDIOS programme. The inclusion of new communal meeting points in the new building is aligned with the values of the organisation as regards inclusion and dialogue with wider society.

The review team was impressed by the committed and knowledgeable permanent support staff it met in Meeting 3 (Permanent Staff). In Meeting 7 (Board) it encountered a highly networked, expert and engaged board; this gives the review team a high level of confidence in the institution's financial strategy and management.

The review team commends P.A.R.T.S.' energetic fundraising and growth in earned income for example from the summer school which contributes to its financial resilience. In Meeting 7 (Board) it discussed risk management with members of the board; it shares P.A.R.T.S. concerns about the financial challenges noted above.

In the view of the review team the continuity and stability of the MA STUDIOS programme is vital; it is the only English language dance Masters course in Brussels and is critical both for P.A.R.T.S. and to feed into the profession at large. Its delivery hinges on the new facilities and associated operational resources; therefore every effort must be made to ensure proper funding for running the additional spaces.

The review team had some concerns about library facilities. The site visit took place in the classroom that serves as the library; there is only very limited access for students. Photocopied 'readers' used in theory courses were made available to the review team. Both students and the institution regard the theoretical component of P.A.R.T.S. education as vital; its current library resources do not match that aim.

The P.A.R.T.S. institutional story and history is highly significant in the sector and the archive is central in telling that story; the review team commends the efforts to develop the archive.

P.A.R.T.S. characterises itself as low-tech. Nevertheless, every session attended by the review team was using some sort of technical equipment, from cameras, sound equipment, computers to projectors. The practice the students are engaging in is highly intermedial and mediated. There are also course management and administrative digital solutions that could contribute to lightening the workload of staff and benefit students.

### **Recommendation 1 for MA STUDIOS**



Academic delivery costs for the MA STUDIOS programme must be fully recognised in future funding agreements to alleviate uncertainty about its continuity.

### **Recommendation 2**

P.A.R.T.S. should investigate ways and means to improve access to existing library stock and to expand library resources to support independent research at both levels, but particularly for the MA STUDIOS programme through online journals, databases and e-books. These ways and means might include partnership arrangements with larger institutions.

### **Suggestion for enhancement**

P.A.R.T.S. should keep abreast of digital course management and administrative solutions that could benefit both students and staff.

## **Compliance with Standard 5.1**

The Review Team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 5.1 as follows:

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Compliance level</b>
Bachelor BA Training	Fully compliant
Master MA STUDIOS	Substantially compliant

## **5.2 Health and wellbeing**

**Standard 5.2** *The programme ensures a safe learning and working environment. The programme provides effective support for all students and staff to preserve and improve their mental and physical wellbeing.*

The SER emphasises that safety, mutual respect and shared responsibility are core values of the school (SER, p.62).

Injury prevention and physical wellbeing is embedded in the BA Training programme (SER, p.62). P.A.R.T.S. has a large network of specialists that students can access in case of injuries and a budget for students with limited financial means. P.A.R.T.S. also covers the costs of consultations with a physiotherapist or osteopath with an annual budget of 100 Euros per student.

The school actively promotes its values of mutual respect including through its Code of Conduct, House Rules and Class Etiquette policies. The recommendations of a working group against discrimination made up of staff and students have been adopted into policy (SER, p.63). The specific risk factors of working with the body are addressed in the Code

of Conduct and complaints procedures; knowledge of these procedures is disseminated through a series of obligatory workshops for students (SER, p.65).

The SER (pp.63- 65) details P.A.R.T.S.' approach to counselling and treatment of mental health issues and stress. The SER (p.64) describes various interventions, including a primary-care psychologist available 3 hours per week; a therapy fund; confidential advisors; and awareness workshops.

The review team heard about current initiatives in wellbeing, including the new wellbeing mission statement (Meeting 3, Permanent Staff). In Meetings 2 and 4 the review team heard how professional boundaries now more clearly delineated.

The SER (p. 64) notes recurring feedback from students about workload and the strict absence policy. This was echoed by students in Meeting 6, where students spoke of feeling overwhelmed by the sheer abundance of learning offers and the intensity of the P.A.R.T.S. experience and how that can be stressful. Alumni in Meeting 8 reported that they had voiced a need to lessen the intense workload to allow time to work independently and to process learning and that they now perceive a change in this regard. The SER (p.64) notes that scheduling and workload is under review in the MA STUDIOS programme.

The review team welcomes the various initiatives across the broad field of wellbeing and finds that P.A.R.T.S. fulfils its responsibilities in this area. There is a holistic culture of care, backed up by policy and actions. These include a growing infrastructure of qualified staff; ensuring that the policies such as the code of conduct are effectively disseminated; a focus group on wellbeing; and provision of a healthy hot lunch every day.

In Meeting 8 (Alumni) the review team heard positive affirmation of changes made in recent years via specific initiatives and actions enabling young artists to flourish and work at a pace that gives them the necessary time to develop autonomy and manage their learning. P.A.R.T.S. recognises the potential risks to students' wellbeing resulting from their intense workload and attendance requirements.

#### **Suggestion for enhancement 1**

The review team commends the student wellbeing mission statement and encourages P.A.R.T.S. to develop it into a student wellbeing strategy which would bring it into line with accepted practice in dance higher education internationally.

#### **Suggestion for enhancement 2**

The review team suggests that the review of student workload already underway for the MA STUDIOS programme should also be undertaken for BA Training students. It should include attention to the credit framework for courses and accredited contact time, a consideration of potential overloads and the effects of the attendance policy.

**Compliance with Standard 5.2**

The Review Team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 5.2 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor BA Training	Fully compliant
Master MA STUDIOS	Fully compliant

## 6. Communication processes

### 6.1. Internal and external communication processes

**Standard 6.1** *Effective mechanisms are in place for internal communication within the programme. Information provided to the public about the programme is, clear, consistent, regular, and accurate.*

The SER (p.66) notes that the relatively small scale of P.A.R.T.S. and the fact that everyone works in the same building facilitates short and efficient lines of internal communication. Operational matters are discussed in an all-student weekly meeting, complemented by a notice board, email and a Google Drive repository of documentation (SER, p.66 and Meeting 3, Permanent Staff).

The main vehicle for external communication is the website, detailing information about the programmes, teachers, events and an archive of documentation including press articles. Maintenance and updating of the website are the responsibility of the school administrator; there are weekly updates and an annual audit and refresh of content (Meeting 3, Permanent Staff). The website also includes full programme information in the form of complete study guides; participants in Meeting 6, students reported that this was important factor influencing their decision to audition at P.A.R.T.S..

The SER describes P.A.R.T.S.’ move to mainly digital means of communication including its website, social media channels and contact databases to reduce its reliance on paper (SER, p.67).

Having attended a weekly meeting and experienced life at P.A.R.T.S.’ public areas, studios and café, the review team experienced first-hand how communication works in the programmes. It heard from staff and students (particularly in Meetings 3, 6 and 8) about the ‘conversation culture’ at P.A.R.T.S. as a special and clearly effective way of communicating.

The review team heard in Meeting 8 (Alumni) how prospective applicants coming to auditions used published materials, particularly study guides to inform their decision making and conforms to their subsequent experience.

#### Compliance with Standard 6.1

The Review Team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 6.1 as follows:

Programme	Compliance level
Bachelor BA Training	Fully compliant
Master MA STUDIOS	Fully compliant

# Quality Culture

## 7. Quality Culture

### 7.1. Quality Culture at programme level

**Standard 7.1** *The programme builds an environment where internal and external feedback is sought and connected, and where staff and students are actively involved in an ongoing dialogue about the quality of education and the programme activities. The programme is thus enabled to ensure the quality of its curriculum and educational processes, and to work towards an all-encompassing quality culture.*

The SER (p.68) emphasises that to an important extent the quality culture at P.A.R.T.S. is informal: its small scale, flexibility, short lines of communication and ‘conversation culture’ facilitate this. The school regards itself as a ‘learning institution’ that continuously collects feedback about itself and aims to improve its way of working through dialogue with its stakeholders (SER, p.12).

The preparation of the SER serves as an example of P.A.R.T.S.’ quality culture in action. The SER describes how thematic focus groups were set up including teachers, tutors, alumni and national and international external experts with the immediate goal of gaining insights to nurture the SER but also to identify possible changes and developments to enhance the quality of the programmes (SER, pp.4-5).

The SER (pp.68-71) categorises the various structural processes that are involved in ensuring quality as: organisationally led; student-led; teacher-led; and external stakeholder-led.

Internal quality processes on an organisational level include the evaluation committees and the regular steering committees. The Programme Committee also plays an important role in quality assurance (SER, p.68). An interdisciplinary group, it is composed of 14 staff members (many of whom hold posts elsewhere), Tutors and teachers, including 3 alumni, and acts as a kind of ‘faculty’, with oversight of both programme development and implementation. Regarding the evaluation committee, the SER (p.35) describes how P.A.R.T.S. sees each round of evaluation as a test to the system, and how that committee evaluates the efficacy and fairness of student assessment.

Students can voice immediate concerns and feedback in weekly meetings; they are also invited to assess classes and teachers anonymously several times a year although take-up of this method is low, at a quarter to a third of the cohort (SER, p.69). Student feedback on major changes for a future cycle is regularly sought (SER, p.35). Student self-evaluation is another mechanism for the school to gain insights into how they view the programme (SER, p.69) and post-evaluation feedback can result in adjustments to evaluation procedures (SER, p.35).

Feedback from teachers is sought via written reflective reports on their course (SER, p.69) but due to the short-term nature of teachers’ contracts it is difficult to involve them more formally in decision making. The role of the Tutors and coordinators is critical in this regard

as they act as a bridge between teachers in the studio and the institution. Their feedback is fed into steering committees and the Programme Committee.

Formal external quality assurance procedures consist of the five-year management agreement with the Flemish Government and the accreditation processes carried out for the first time in 2019 for the BA Training and in 2020 for the MA STUDIOS (SER, p.70). P.A.R.T.S. complements these with informal external benchmarking and professional exchange and input from its large cohort of visiting teachers (SER, p.71). The SER reports only limited insights and the high cost of previous benchmarking for the BA Training but plans to undertake a formal benchmarking study for the STUDIOS programme to enhance its further development (SER, p.71).

In the view of the review team there is a shared commitment to ongoing enhancement at every level: from students to the board to teachers to external stakeholders – everyone the review team met during the site visit took ownership of the quality culture of the whole institution.

The review team finds that the informal nature of much of P.A.R.T.S.' quality culture is effective and it saw evidence of open and purposeful dialogue at all levels of the school. These informal processes are complemented by appropriate organisational structures.

The review team sees opportunities for further development in annual course monitoring processes and action planning; there is a low take up of student feedback questionnaires which should prompt P.A.R.T.S. to consider more effective ways of gathering formal feedback. There is the possibility that power dynamics in student briefing meetings mean that some students might not feel enabled to give feedback on their programme of study in an open group setting.

The review team welcomes the proposal to carry out an external benchmarking exercise to guide the development of the MA STUDIOS; it agrees that formal benchmarking is costly but in its view this exercise could be designed and executed in a cost- and time-effective manner if its goals and scope were carefully articulated.

The review team considers that P.A.R.T.S. could involve external stakeholders from the professions, including its own alumni, more formally in its quality assurance mechanisms.

#### **Suggestion for enhancement 1**

The review team suggest that P.A.R.T.S. pursues opportunities for further development in annual course monitoring processes, action planning, and formal and confidential student feedback.

#### **Suggestion for enhancement 2**

The review team suggest that P.A.R.T.S. could involve external stakeholders, including its own alumni and professional visiting teachers, more formally in its quality assurance mechanisms.

#### **Suggestion for enhancement 3**

P.A.R.T.S. should consider carrying an external benchmarking exercise to guide the development of the MA STUDIOS.

### Compliance with Standard 7.1

The Review Team concludes that the programmes comply with Standard 7.1 as follows:

Programme		Compliance level
Bachelor Training	BA	Fully compliant
Master STUDIOS	MA	Fully compliant



# Summary of the compliance with the Standards and recommendations

The review team concludes that the P.A.R.T.S. programmes comply with the *Standards for Programme Review* as follows:

1. Governance and decision making at programme level	
<p><b>Standard 1.1</b> The programme's goals are clearly stated and relevant to the national legal context. They reflect the institutional mission and vision, and they are aligned with the overarching institutional policies and strategy. They are effectively achieved through the content and structure of the curriculum, and its methods of delivery.</p>	<p><b>BA Training</b> Fully compliant</p> <p><b>MA STUDIOS</b> Fully compliant</p>
<p><b>Recommendations / Suggestions for enhancement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Standard 1.2</b> The delivery of the programme is supported by an appropriate organisational structure, and clear, transparent and effective decision-making processes that include a balanced representation of the programme's stakeholders (students, teaching staff, support staff, representatives of the music profession and related artistic domains).</p>	<p><b>BA Training</b> Fully compliant</p> <p><b>MA STUDIOS</b> Substantially compliant</p>
<p><b>Suggestions for enhancement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Following established good practice in HE, P.A.R.T.S. should consider inserting student representation formally into every level of governance and decision-making.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P.A.R.T.S. prides itself on its agile and responsive decision-making; it should consider how the student feedback in the MA STUDIOS could be acted upon mid-way through the programme. <b>(Recommendation for MA STUDIOS)</b></li> </ul>	
2. Students' perspectives	
<p><b>Standard 2.1</b> Clear, coherent, and inclusive admission criteria exist, to establish artistic / academic suitability of incoming students at programme level. Admitted students are encouraged to take an active role in creating the learning process and to engage in critical-reflection. They are supported to achieve the intended learning outcomes through an appropriate and effective blend of teaching and learning styles and</p>	<p><b>BA Training</b> Fully compliant</p> <p><b>MA STUDIOS</b> Fully compliant</p>

pedagogies. The programme and its methods of delivery are adequately catered by staff and support services.	
<b>Recommendations / Suggestions for enhancement</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	
<b>Standard 2.2</b> The programme has effective procedures in place to formally monitor and review the progression of its students. Assessment methods are clearly defined and effectively demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes. There is an effective complaints and appeals system in place at programme level.	<b>BA Training</b> Partially compliant <b>MA STUDIOS</b> Partially compliant
<b>Recommendations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The review team strongly recommends that P.A.R.T.S. reviews its course learning outcomes to make them more user-friendly and effective; P.A.R.T.S. must clarify how assessment measures intended learning outcomes, and how feedback effectively supports students to meet them. The aim should be for constructive alignment of learning outcomes, taught learning activities and assessment. It is particularly important that visiting teachers understand and communicate the link between learning outcomes and studio practice and the flow through to assessment against learning outcomes.</li> <li>• Tight scheduling for visiting teachers should not compromise their capacity to explain assessment criteria or give timely and detailed feedback to students; the review team suggests that P.A.R.T.S. should prioritise this element in guidance and training for visiting teachers.</li> </ul>	
<b>Standard 2.3</b> The programme has effective mechanisms in place to ensure that students acquire the necessary skills that facilitate their transition towards a professional life in the music and / or related artistic domain. Procedures are in place to formally and effectively monitor students' subsequent employability and professional achievement. The information thus collected is efficiently used to maintain an active link with the music / artistic profession and to further develop the curriculum.	<b>BA Training</b> Substantially compliant <b>MA STUDIOS</b> Substantially compliant
<b>Recommendations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The review team recommends that P.A.R.T.S. should consider how to develop its systems to monitor students after they leave. The review team notes that the process has already started with the recent survey and recognises that P.A.R.T.S. is extremely well networked in the field and has 'an ear to the ground' as regards its graduates. Nevertheless, more formal quantitative and qualitative data collection and monitoring, appropriate to the size and scale of the institution, would be both beneficial and expected in a higher education setting.</li> </ul>	

- The review team recommends that P.A.R.T.S. should consider how to engage alumni in the ongoing enhancement of its programmes, particularly as regards employability.

### 3. Teachers' perspectives

**Standard 3.1** Members of the teaching staff are qualified for their role and are active as artists/pedagogues/ researchers. The size and composition of the teaching body are sufficient and appropriate to effectively deliver the curriculum. There are adequate opportunities for teaching staff for continued professional development.

**BA Training**  
Substantially compliant  
**MA STUDIOS**  
Substantially compliant

**Recommendations:**

- Given the critical frontline position of the Tutor and the breadth of the scope and responsibilities of the role, the review team recommends that contingencies are in place in the case of absence in order not to put the student experience at risk.
- P.A.R.T.S. should give further consideration to the professionalisation of its teaching body. This may involve both formal qualifications and continuing professional development. The review team sees this as an important stage in P.A.R.T.S.' evolution as a degree-awarding institution.

### 4. External perspectives

**Standard 4.1** The programme offers a range of opportunities for students and staff to gain international perspectives and experiences.

**BA Training**  
Fully compliant  
**MA STUDIOS**  
Fully compliant

**Recommendations:**

- None

**Standard 4.2** The programme's educational processes reflect the institutional policies and strategies in place for an active social engagement. The continued development and maintenance of links with the music profession and the wider artistic, cultural, educational and/or other relevant sectors within society is an integrated part of the programme.

**BA Training**  
Fully compliant  
**MA STUDIOS**  
Fully compliant

**Suggestions for enhancement:**

- Recognising the existing strong lines of communication with professional stakeholders, P.A.R.T.S. might consider ways to involve them more formally in discussions for curricular developments, including for the MA STUDIOS programme.

5. Resources	
<p><b>Standard 5.1</b> The programme has means and resources to ensure its successful delivery and to secure its sustainable development.</p>	<p><b>BA Training</b> Fully compliant</p> <p><b>MA STUDIOS</b> Substantially compliant</p>
<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.A.R.T.S. should investigate ways and means to improve access to existing library stock and to expand library resources to support independent research at both levels, but particularly for the MA STUDIOS programme through online journals, databases and e-books. These ways and means might include partnership arrangements with larger institutions.</li> <li>• Academic delivery costs for the Masters programme must be fully recognised in future funding agreements to alleviate uncertainty about its continuity. <b>(Recommendation for MA STUDIOS)</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Suggestions for enhancement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.A.R.T.S. should keep abreast of digital course management and administrative solutions that could benefit both students and staff.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Standard 5.2</b> The programme ensures a safe learning and working environment. The programme provides effective support for all students and staff to preserve and improve their mental and physical wellbeing.</p>	<p><b>BA Training</b> Fully compliant</p> <p><b>MA STUDIOS</b> Fully compliant</p>
<p><b>Suggestions for enhancement:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The review team commends the student wellbeing mission statement and encourages P.A.R.T.S. to develop it into a student wellbeing strategy which would bring it into line with accepted practice in dance higher education internationally.</li> <li>• The review team recommends that the review of student workload already underway for the MA STUDIOS programme should also be undertaken for BA Training students. It should include attention to the credit framework for courses and accredited contact time, a consideration of potential overloads and the effects of the attendance policy.</li> </ul>	
6. Communication processes	
<p><b>Standard 6.1</b> Effective mechanisms are in place for internal communication within the programme. Information provided to the public about the programme is, clear, consistent, regular, and accurate.</p>	<p><b>BA Training</b> Fully compliant</p>

	<b>MA STUDIOS</b> Fully compliant
<b>Recommendations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	
<b>7. Quality Culture</b>	
<b>Standard 7.1</b> The programme builds an environment where internal and external feedback is sought and connected, and where staff and students are actively involved in an ongoing dialogue about the quality of education and the programme activities. The programme is thus enabled to ensure the quality of its curriculum and educational processes, and to work towards an all-encompassing quality culture.	<b>BA Training</b> Fully compliant <b>MA STUDIOS</b> Fully compliant
<b>Suggestions for enhancement</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The review team suggests that P.A.R.T.S. pursues opportunities for further development in annual course monitoring processes, action planning, and formal and confidential student feedback.</li> <li>• The review team suggest that P.A.R.T.S. could involve external stakeholders, including its own alumni and professional visiting teachers, more formally in its quality assurance mechanisms.</li> <li>• P.A.R.T.S. should consider carrying out an external benchmarking exercise to guide the development of the MA STUDIOS.</li> </ul>	

## Conclusion

P.A.R.T.S. is a small-scale, very well regarded and sought-after provider of higher education in contemporary dance practice and choreography. It is a confident and highly effective institution, efficiently and creatively run by an impressive staff team; it values its independence and ability to do things its own way, whether in the operation of its unusual cyclic structure in which students work intensively with their cohort for the duration of their programme, its high degree of international recruitment without government-imposed quotas or differentiated fees, or its cherished informality and light-touch, non-bureaucratic, operations.

The review team found there is a very strong quality culture at P.A.R.T.S., evidenced by its 'conversation culture' and characterisation of itself as a learning institution; this is manifested in many ways across the school including in its willingness to engage in open and honest dialogue in the meetings with the review team and acknowledge problematic areas in the SER. P.A.R.T.S. also found that undertaking the SER against MusiQuE standards prompted new thinking, such as a revision of the mission statement, as well as identifying areas that needed attention or could be improved, for example, training and development for teachers. The review team finds this commendable and has every confidence that the recommendations it has made will be thoughtfully addressed.

The way in which P.A.R.T.S. works is often informal and implicit rather than formal and explicit; the review team has suggested some ways in which it feels reinforcing that informal culture with explicit mechanisms (e.g. making a workable and explicit link between course learning outcomes and studio practice or introducing student representation on committees) and tightening up some procedures (e.g. monitoring of graduates) will ultimately safeguard its cherished light-touch agility. This is in line with international expectations of a degree-awarding Sui Generis institution and with P.A.R.T.S.' developing maturity as a world-class player in higher education.

It is often difficult to separate P.A.R.T.S.' programmes, the school itself and its environment – everything is connected by a clear mission and philosophy. As stated in the SER (p.15) the organisational structures of the BA and the MA are almost identical and in turn overlap with the structure of the institution. Consequently, both programmes attract an international cohort and are taught by an array of professional visiting professionals; both programmes enjoy enviable facilities as well as opportunities for internships and residencies; both programmes set out to educate both mind and body at differentiated levels.

However, the MA STUDIOS programme is still developing and in some ways has still to find a confident expression of its identity and USP; this is a priority for P.A.R.T.S.. In the site visit senior staff and board members were frank about the financial precarity of the MA STUDIOS programme and the need for a sustainable source of income to operate and maintain its new infrastructure.

In the view of the review team it is of the utmost importance that the autonomous status of this special and unusual institution is safeguarded. P.A.R.T.S. has a very strong case for support; it is a world-leading institution in contemporary dance education that enhances the reputation of Europe's capital, Brussels. The review team was impressed by the artistic energy and integrity of P.A.R.T.S. and wishes it well in its next phase.

## Recommendation for accreditation

Based on the institution/programme(s) compliance with the MusiQuE Standards stated above, the Review Team would propose the following programmes to be accredited:

1. BA Training
2. MA STUDIOS

## Annex 1. Site-visit schedule

Day	Time	Meeting (working session)	Participants of the meeting (names and positions of the participants from the visited institution)	Location
Day 0 – Tuesday 19/03/2024/		Arrival of Review Team members Check in at Hotel		Hotel Neufchatel - Rue de Neufchatel 34, 1060 Bruxelles
	17:00-20:00	<b>Preparatory meeting of the Review Team (Briefing Session)</b>	Review Team alone	PARTS: Classroom 2
	20:00-	Dinner	Review Team + PARTS team	La Buvette (Alsebergsesteenweg 108, 1060 Sint-Gillis)
Day 1 – Wednesday 20/03/2024/	9:00-9:45	<b>Meeting 1</b> <b>Direction PARTS</b>	director deputy director	PARTS: Classroom 2
	9:45-10:00	Coffee break		
	10:00-11:00	<b>Meeting 2</b> <b>Pedagogical team/Steering team Training &amp; STUDIOS</b>	deputy director coordinator Training & STUDIOS tutor Training tutor STUDIOS	PARTS: Classroom 2
	11:00-11:15	<b>Review Team meeting</b> <i>Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary (debriefing)</i>		PARTS: Classroom 2
	11:15-11:30	Break		
	11:30-12:30	<b>Meeting 3</b> <b>Meeting with PARTS team (permanent staff)</b>	financial and administrative management coordinator Training & STUDIOS student administrator production program	PARTS: Classroom 2



			production events + communication student counsellor	
	12:30-12:45	<b>Review Team meeting</b> <b>Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary</b>		PARTS: Classroom 2
	12:45-13:45	Lunch @ PARTS macrobiotic canteen	Review Team alone	PARTS Canteen
	13:45-15:00	<b>Meeting 4</b> <b>Hybrid meeting with Program Committee</b>	theory teacher artistic practice teacher artistic practice teacher technique teacher composition teacher/research committee Erasmus+ music teacher technique teacher body studies & movement research theatre teacher	PARTS: Classroom 2
	15:00-15:15	<b>Review Team meeting</b> <b>Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary (debriefing)</b>		PARTS: Classroom 2
	15:15-15:30	Break		

	15:30-16:15	<b>Meeting 5</b> <b>Online meeting with guest teachers</b>	technique Training & STUDIOS - exchange Ecole des Sables ballet yoga composition graduation work Training - choreography & composition STUDIOS repertoire Rosas technique & repertoire Trisha Brown artistic practice Training & movement research STUDIOS choreography & composition STUDIOS theory Training & STUDIOS theory Training music Training	PARTS: Classroom 2
	16:15-17:15	Guided tour – Review of the facilities (PARTS classrooms/library/canteen, etc., new infrastructure, Rosas Performance Space & offices )	Deputy director, infrastructure coordinator and student janitor	PARTS Campus; meetup @ Classroom 2
	17:15-18:30	<b>Review Team meeting</b> <b>Reflection on the first day and preparations for day 2</b>		PARTS: Classroom 2
	19:00	Dinner Review Team		Perruche - Bistrot du coin (Bondgenotenstraat 113, 1190 Vorst)

<b>Day 2 – Thursday 21/03/2024</b>	9:00–10:25	<b>Meeting 6</b> <b>Meeting with students</b>	<b>Training: 8 students</b>  <b>STUDIOS: 3 students</b>	PARTS: Classroom 2
	10:25-10:55	<b>Review Team meeting</b> <b>Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary (debriefing)</b>		PARTS: Classroom 2

	10:40-10:55	Break		
	10:55-11:30	<b>Meeting with the representatives of the profession (online)</b>	artistic coordinator Platform K artistic coordinator Pianofabriek Kunstenwerkplaats	
	11:55-12:25	Laura Hicks / contact-improvisation Training		PARTS: studio 2
	12:25-12:40	<b>Review Team meeting Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary (debriefing)</b>		PARTS: Classroom 2
	12:40-13:40	Lunch @ PARTS macrobiotic canteen	Review Team alone	
	13:40-14:25	<b>Meeting 7 Meeting with members of the board of directors</b>	president board member	PARTS: Classroom 2
	14:25-15:10	Short presentations optional block	Repertoire: A Love Supreme by Thomas Vantuycom & Cynthia Loemij Creation: Nancy Naous Personal work: group Letitcia Ferreira + group Irene Rojo	PARTS Campus; meetup @ Classroom 2
	15:10-15:25	<b>Review Team meeting: Review Team members share conclusions with Secretary (debriefing)</b>		PARTS: Classroom 2
	15:25-15:40	Break		

	15:40-17:00	<b>Meeting 8</b> Hybrid meeting with alumni and representatives from the dance profession	Alumni: generation XI generation XIII Research pilot Generation XII Training + STUDIOS #1 STUDIOS #1 generation XIII generation X generation XI generation XIII - online generation XII - online	PARTS: Classroom 2
	17:00-18:30	<b>Review Team meeting</b> Reflection on the first day and preparations for day 3		PARTS: Classroom 2
	18:45 - 19:45	Presentation STUDIOS	Osamu Shikichi (30min), Jair Montes Rangel (30min)	(Osamu) Rosas 4 ; (Jair) Studio 2 PARTS
	20:00	Dinner	Review Team alone	Tero Brussels (1 Rue Saint-Bernard, 1060 Saint-Gilles)

<b>Day 3 – Friday</b> 22/03/2024	9:00–10:00	<b>Meeting 9</b> Extra session if required by the Review Team (members of the team may explore more thoroughly specific area, meet other representatives of their choice)	As notified by the Review Team	PARTS: Classroom 2
	10:00-10:15	Break		
	10:15-12:00	<b>Review Team meeting</b> Preparation for the feedback meeting		PARTS: Classroom 2
	12:00-13:00	<b>Meeting 10</b> Feedback to the institution	Leadership of the institution (normally the same group as in the first meeting)	PARTS: Classroom 2

	13:00-14:00	Lunch	Review Team alone	PARTS canteen
	<b>END OF THE SITE-VISIT</b>			
	Departure of the Review Team members / Free time			

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

### Introduction

Appendix 1: Focus groups in preparation of the Self Evaluation report

### 1 Governance and decision-making at programme level

#### 1.1 The programme's goals and context

Appendix 2: management agreement 2022-2026

Appendix 3: policy plan 2022-2026

Appendix 4: timeline 2017-2027 Appendix 5: overview of courses and credits BA Training

Appendix 6: overview of courses and credits MA STUDIOS

Appendix 7: examples of year plans and week plans (folder)

Appendix 8: basic data about the Bachelor programme (administrative data about the course, domain-specific learning outcomes, learning outcomes of the programme)

Appendix 9: basic data about the Master programme (administrative data about the course, domain-specific learning outcomes, learning outcomes of the programme)

Appendix 10: Study guide Bachelor 2022-2025 (including learning outcomes, overview of courses and ECTS files of each course)

Appendix 11: Study guide Master 2022-2024 (including learning outcomes, overview of courses and ECTS files of each course)

Appendix 12: Code of Conduct

Appendix 13: House Rules (folder)

Appendix 14: Class Etiquette

Appendix 15: Evaluation documents: evaluation procedures for both programmes (folder)

#### 1.2. Programme's stakeholders role in decision making

Appendix 16: Organisational chart PARTS 2024

Appendix 17: Profile and function of the members of the Programme Committee Appendix 18: Agendas (2019-2024) and reports (2023-2024) of the Faculty/Programme Committee (folder)

Appendix 19: Reports of the Student-Staff meetings 2021-2024 (folder) Appendix 20: Profile of the members of the Board of Directors

### 2. Students' perspectives

#### 2.1. Admission and student-centered learning

Appendix 21: List of pre-selections of the BA Training auditions 2022 (website)

Appendix 22: Schedule of the final audition BA Training 2022

Appendix 23: Documents for the jury of the final audition BA Training 2022 (folder)

Appendix 24: Communication towards candidates for the audition BA Training 2022 (folder)

Appendix 25: Notes about student statistics

Appendix 26: Student statistics 2013-2016 (applications, effective students, profiles, completion, dropout...)

Appendix 27: Information about the written application MA STUDIOS 2022 (website)

Appendix 28: Schedule of the audition MA STUDIOS 2022

Appendix 29: Documents for the jury of the audition MA STUDIOS (folder)

Appendix 30: Communication towards candidates for the audition MA STUDIOS 2022 (folder)

Appendix 31: Information on teaching methodologies in BA and MA

Appendix 32: Examples of syllabi and course work (video, writings) in BA and MA (folder)

Appendix 33: Examples of artistic research in the MA (essays, reflection papers, videos of Master Projects) (folder)

Appendix 34: Student performance opportunities 2013-2024 (folder)

Appendix 35: Programme of the student festival (BA) 2022 (website)

Appendix 36: Programme of the Graduation Festival (MA) 2021 (website)

## **2.2. Students' Progression and Assessment**

Appendix 15: Evaluation procedures BA and MA (including notes about transparency and timeline)(folder)

Appendix 37: Examples of student reports (folder)

Appendix 38: Data about catch-up work since 2019

Appendix 40: Examples of diplomas, diploma supplements and transcripts (folder)

Appendix 41: Projects with the professional field 2013-2024

Appendix 42: Internship rules BA 2024-25

Appendix 43: Overview of internship (BA) / Field work (MA) projects since 2015-16

Appendix 44: Syllabus of the management course (BA) 2021-22

Appendix 45: Alumni survey about employment and perspectives on employability

Appendix 46: Selection of biographies of alumni 2013-2022 (folder)

## **3. Teachers' perspectives**

### **3.1. Staff qualification, professional activity and development**

Appendix 47: Bios of the teachers

Appendix 48: Statistics about the teachers 2013-2024 (profile, hours, courses)(folder)

## **4. External perspectives**

### **4.1. International perspectives and experiences for students and staff**

Appendix 49: International activities within and outside the curriculum

Appendix 50: International cooperation, Erasmus+

Appendix 51: Overview of international partnerships

Appendix 52: Living in Brussels guide for BA students

Appendix 53: Living in Brussels guide for MA students

Appendix 54: Language policy

### **4.2. Engagement within the external institutional and social context**

Appendix 55: Overview of activities on social and community engagement

## **5. Resources**

### **5.1. Finances, facilities, services and support staff**

Appendix 56: Multi-annual budget 2022-2026

Appendix 57: Overview of scholarships since 2002 (numbers, profiles, sources)

Appendix 58: Presentation of the actual construction and renovations

Appendix 59: Overview of facilities and equipment

## **5.2. Health and wellbeing**

Appendix 60: Working group Against Discriminations 2020-2021 (original manifesto, recommendations, follow-up measures)(folder)

## **6 Communication processes**

### **6.1. Internal and external communication processes**

Appendix 61: Examples of public communication (to general public, teachers, alumni, professional field, other dance schools) (folder)

## **7 Quality culture at programme level**

Appendix 62: Feedback of students on classes and workshops (folder)

Appendix 63: General feedback of teachers on their courses (folder)

Appendix 64: Jury report on the External evaluation 2021

Appendix 65: Benchmarking study 2020



### Annex 3. Definitions of compliance levels

- **Fully compliant.** *A standard is fully compliant when the approaches, structures or mechanisms relevant to that standard are fully implemented in a coherent and consistent way.*
- **Substantially compliant.** *A standard is substantially compliant when the standard is in place, while minor gaps have been observed but the manner of implementation is mostly effective. In such cases Review Teams are asked to include a recommendation as to how full compliance can be achieved.*
- **Partially compliant.** *A standard is partially compliant when the standard is in place, while significant gaps have been observed or the manner of implementation is not sufficiently effective. In such cases Review Teams are asked to include a recommendation as to how full compliance can be achieved or a condition\*.*
- **Not compliant.** *A standard is not compliant when the approaches, structures or mechanisms relevant to that standard are lacking or implemented inadequately. In such cases Review Teams are asked to include a strong recommendation or a condition\*.*

*(\*Please note that conditions can only be formulated in accreditation reports and not in quality enhancement review reports.)*