

Music Masters for New Audiences and Innovative Practice
Book of Procedures & Instruments
for
Internal Quality Assurance

Version 7, 17-7-2009

Contents

1. Short Introduction
2. Description of elements
 - 2.1 Financial and operational results: financial, student and teachers databases of participating institutes
 - 2.2 Student satisfaction: student questionnaire after entrance examination
 - 2.3 Student satisfaction: student questionnaire after module
 - 2.4 Student satisfaction: student questionnaire after graduation
 - 2.5 Student satisfaction: early leavers questionnaire
 - 2.6 Student satisfaction: alumni questionnaire
 - 2.7 Teacher satisfaction: teacher questionnaire
 - 2.8 Peer/professional field satisfaction: information from external assessors
 - 2.9 Peer/professional field satisfaction: information from external evaluators
 - 2.10 Society satisfaction: press clipping collection procedure
3. Format for reporting

1. Short Introduction

This “Book of Procedures & Instruments” contains the elements used for internal quality assurance in the joint programme “Music Masters for New Audiences & Innovative Practice” (in the rest of this document abbreviated as “JM”).

The goal of internal quality assurance in higher education is to gather evidence of results obtained and on that basis take decisions on ameliorations of the JM, thus guaranteeing that in the future similar (or better) results may be expected. On the basis lies the so-called PDCA-cycle, also known as the Deming-cycle after its inventor dr. W. Edwards Deming. The PDCA-cycle is basically a feedback loop. PDCA stands for “plan, do, check, act” and is based on the idea that quality rises if one repeats the four steps of the cycle continuously. In education this involves for example to plan an educational module, teach the module (do), check if the teaching has been in conformity with the plans and has lead to results, on that basis make adaptations in the module (act), plan the next execution of the module, et cetera.

The internal quality assurance instruments presented in this Book of Procedures & Instruments are instruments related to the “check side” of the PDCA cycle. They are instruments for monitor and control by the steering group of the JM of basically two types of information: concrete financial and operational results as well as stakeholder satisfaction. In short, financial and operational results will be derived from the existing databases of the participating institutes as well as from the proper student database from the JM. Stakeholder satisfaction will be measured by a set of programme-specific instruments, mainly questionnaires for the various stakeholders.

Internal quality assurance at present is often linked to external quality assurance in the form of accreditation, in which an external body (often linked to the ministry or even the ministry itself) decides on the basis of evidence whether or not you are permitted to award degrees and/or whether or not you will be funded with public money. The basic questions are: do you do what you promise, are you in control, and will you be able to keep up your quality in the future. However, internal quality assurance remains first and foremost the responsibility of the institution(s). Installing some sort of internal quality assurance should be a normal thing for any programme wishing to deliver quality.

This Book of Procedures & Instruments is put together for the general programme manager in the first place, and also for the local programme coordinators and the steering group. The programme manager is the one who on the one hand has to make sure that all programme coordinators of the participating institutions take care of the proper execution of the internal quality assurance system at their institute, on the other hand the programme manager takes care that all information from the various institutes will be presented on a general level to the steering group. To facilitate this process, a format for reporting on the results of the internal quality assurance system has been included at the end of this document.

The participating institutes in the JM have all agreed to use the programme-specific instruments for stakeholder satisfaction, next to their own institutional instruments or, if they wish so, as a replacement of them. If, however, institute-specific instruments are available that cover completely the content of the instruments in this publication, then institutes may continue to use their own instruments instead of the instruments suggested in this publication. All institutes should keep in mind that the ultimate goal of this publication is to provide the steering group with adequate information on a generic (and not on the institutional) level.

2. Description of elements

2.1 Financial and operational results: financial, student and teachers databases of participating institutes

Instrument	Financial, student and teacher databases of participating institutes		
Responsible	Programme coordinators in the institutes		
Aim of activity	Generate the most important performance indicators on students, teachers and finances of the JM.		
Target values	<p>Student:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Input: 35 students/year * Throughput: after 1 year 25 on schedule, 5 after schedule, 5 early leavers? * Output: 23 graduates after 2 years, 28 after 3 years, 30 graduates after 4 years of study <p>Teacher:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Number of teacher exchanges for teaching modules; t.b.d. * Number of teacher exchanges entrance/final examinations; t.b.d. <p>Finances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Overview of financial state of affairs: conform budget 		
Report by/ Report to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report by programme coordinators to programme manager at the end of the year - Report by programme manager to steering group at the end of the year 		
Report by means of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Short report (most important performance indicators + analysis) by programme coordinators to programme manager - Short summarizing overall report focusing on general points to be addressed to the steering group 		
Frequency and deadline(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report by programme coordinators to be sent to programme manager in September - Overall report to be sent to steering group by programme manager in October 		
Short description	Date	Activity	Executed by
	June/ August	Mail to programme coordinators for information	Programme manager
	September	Reports to programme manager	Programme coordinators
	October	Overall report to steering group	Programme manager
	Early November	Discussion overall report, decisions and actions	Steering group
Remarks	Programme manager will install and keep up to date a proper JM student database that may generate much of the information needed on student facts and figures.		

2.2 Student satisfaction: student questionnaire after entrance examination

Instrument	Student questionnaire after entrance examination		
Responsible	Programme coordinators in the institutes		
Aim of activity	Measure student satisfaction for the entrance examination		
Target values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All questions on average satisfactory (<3) - Overall satisfaction <3 		
Report by/ Report to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report by programme coordinators to programme manager 2 weeks after the entrance examinations - Report by programme manager to steering group 4 weeks after the entrance examinations 		
Report by means of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Short report (average scores on all questions + analysis + actions taken) by programme coordinators to programme manager - Short summarizing overall report focusing on general points to be addressed to the steering group 		
Frequency and deadline(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Questionnaire to be filled in directly after completing the entrance examination but before hearing the result - Report to be sent to programme manager in September - Overall report to be sent to steering group by programme manager in October 		
Short description	Date	Activity	Executed by
	June	Mail to programme coordinators for information	Programme manager
	September	Reports to programme manager	Programme coordinators
	October	Overall report to steering group	Programme manager
	Early November	Discussion overall report, decisions and actions	Steering group
Remarks			

Entrance Audition Questionnaire

1. Where did you find out about the programme?

- Prospectus
- Website
- A friend
- A teacher
- Another source (please give details in the box below)

2. Why did you choose to apply for this institution as your home institution?

3. How would you rate the following statements about the application and audition process?

Please tick one alternative on each line (1 = fully agree; 5 = fully disagree).

	1	2	3	4	5
The information available prior to application adequately described the course					
The application procedure was straight forward					
I understood what I needed to do for the audition					
The audition was well organized					
The audition was well conducted					
Audition tasks related to my understanding of the programme					

4. If you have additional feedback / comments about the module please write them in the box below.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

2.3 Student satisfaction: student questionnaire after module

Instrument	End of module student questionnaire		
Responsible	Programme coordinators in the institutes		
Aim of activity	Measure student satisfaction for every educational module		
Target values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All questions on average satisfactory (<3) - Overall satisfaction <3 		
Report by/ Report to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report by programme coordinators to programme manager after each module - Report by programme manager twice a year (after each semester) to steering group 		
Report by means of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Short report (average scores on all questions + analysis + actions taken) by programme coordinators to programme manager - Short summarizing overall report focusing on general points to be addressed to the steering group 		
Frequency and deadline(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Questionnaire to be filled in directly after each module, report to be sent to programme manager 4 weeks after last session module - Overall report to be sent to core group of teachers (sem. I)/steering group (sem. II) by programme manager six weeks after end of semester 		
Short description	Date	Activity	Executed by
	January	Mail to Programme Coordinators for information	Programme Manager
	End of first semester	Filling in of questionnaire	Students
	4 weeks after end of first semester	Reports to programme manager	Programme coordinators
	6 weeks after end of first semester	If necessary: overall report to group of Core Teachers	Programme manager
	After meeting group of Core teachers	If necessary: message to Steering Group	Programme Manager
	End of second semester	Filling in of questionnaire	Students
	September	Reports to programme manager	Programme coordinators
	October	Overall report to steering group	Programme manager
Early November	Discussion overall report, decisions and actions	Steering group	
Remarks	In the first two years it might be wise to evaluate all modules. Afterwards the frequency can be diminished, e.g. each module is evaluated at least once every 2 years.		

End of Module Student Questionnaire

1. How would you rate the following statements about the module content?

Please tick one alternative on each line (1 = fully agree; 5 = fully disagree).

	1	2	3	4	5
The aims of the module were clear					
The module content matched the course description					
The content of the module reflected the objectives of this master programme					
The administration of the module was effective					
The assessment of the module was appropriate					
The workload of the module was neither too high nor too low					

2. How would you rate the following statements about your personal engagement?

Please tick one alternative on each line (1 = fully agree; 5 = fully disagree).

	1	2	3	4	5
My attendance at the sessions was good					
I organized my individual preparation time appropriately					
I took appropriate responsibility for my own development					
I took the opportunity to ask and get help for my problem					

3. How would you rate the following statements about the teaching? (Note: "teacher" includes mentor, tutor, lecturer, workshop leader etc)

Please tick one alternative on each line (1 = fully agree; 5 = fully disagree).

	1	2	3	4	5
The teacher's ability to lead seminars/workshops was good					
The teacher's expectations were neither too high nor too low					
The teacher had a good rapport with the group					
There was enough time for questions, discussions or comments					
The quality of feedback given by the teacher was good					

4. Approximately how many hours per week did you spend on the module?

- 0-3 3-6 6-9 9-12

5. If you have additional feedback / comments about the module please write them in the box below.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

2.4 Student satisfaction: end of programme student questionnaire

Instrument	End of programme student questionnaire		
Responsible	Programme coordinators in the institutes		
Aim of activity	Measure student satisfaction for the complete(d) JM		
Target values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All questions on average satisfactory (<3) - Overall satisfaction <3 		
Report by/ Report to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report by programme coordinators to programme manager at the end of the year - Report by programme manager to steering group at the end of the year 		
Report by means of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Short report (average scores on all questions + analysis + actions taken) by programme coordinators to programme manager - Short summarizing overall report focusing on general points to be addressed to the steering group 		
Frequency and deadline(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Questionnaire to be filled in directly after completing the master's programme by each student, report to be sent to programme manager 4 weeks after end of year - Overall report to be sent to steering group by programme manager six weeks after end of year 		
Short description	Date	Activity	Executed by
	At completion of studies	Filling in questionnaire	Students
	September	Reports to programme manager	Programme coordinators
	October	Overall report to steering group	Programme manager
	Early November	Discussion overall report, decisions and actions	Steering group
Remarks			

End of Programme Student Questionnaire

1. How would you rate the following statements about your home institution?

Please tick one alternative on each line (1 = fully agree; 5 = fully disagree).

	1	2	3	4	5
The content of the seminars/workshops was appropriate					
The quality of the teaching was good					
The quality of facilities/resources was appropriate					
Access to facilities/resources was good					

2. How would you rate the following statements about the period abroad?

Please tick one alternative on each line (1 = fully agree; 5 = fully disagree).

	1	2	3	4	5
The content of the seminars/workshops was appropriate					
The quality of the teaching was good					
The quality of facilities/resources was appropriate					
Access to facilities/resources was good					
The organisation of the period abroad was good					
The period abroad satisfied my expectations					

3. How would you rate the following statements about the programme in general?

Please tick one alternative on each line (1 = fully agree; 5 = fully disagree).

	1	2	3	4	5
The vision of the programme was clear					
The programme has satisfied my expectations					
The administration of the programme was effective					
My skills have developed as a result of the programme					
The programme has prepared me to be culturally active as an artist					
The programme has helped me to build contacts for my career					

4. How would you rate the whole programme on a scale of 1 (high) to 5 (low)?

1 2 3 4 5

5. If you have additional feedback / comments about the programme please write them in the box below.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

2.5 Student satisfaction: early leavers questionnaire

Instrument	Early leavers questionnaire		
Responsible	Programme coordinators in the institutes		
Aim of activity	Gain insight into reasons why students leave the JM prematurely		
Target values	- Not applicable		
Report by/ Report to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report by programme coordinators to programme manager at the end of the year - Report by programme manager to steering group at the end of the year 		
Report by means of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Short report (analysis + actions taken) by programme coordinators to programme manager - Short summarizing overall report focusing on general points to be addressed to the steering group 		
Frequency and deadline(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Questionnaire to be filled in by students directly after they have decided to stop studying the programme - Short report to be sent to programme manager by programme coordinators 2 weeks after the end of the year - Overall report to be sent to steering group by programme manager 4 weeks after end of year 		
Short description	Date	Activity	Executed by
	Directly after leaving the programme	Filling in questionnaire	Student
	September	Reports to programme manager	Programme coordinators
	October	Overall report to steering group	Programme manager
	Early November	Discussion overall report, decisions and actions	Steering group
Remarks	When a student decides quitting the programme it is essential to include filling in the questionnaire in e.g. a personal contact moment with the mentor. Once a student has physically left, it becomes be nearly impossible to obtain useful information from them.		

Early Leavers Questionnaire

1. Why did you initially choose this programme of study?

2. How confident were you that this was the right programme of study when you started?

- I was 80-100% sure
- I was 60-80% sure
- I was 40-60% sure
- I was 20-40% sure
- I was 0-20% sure

3. In your decision to leave the programme, how important were the following factors (1 = very important; 5 = not important)?

	1	2	3	4	5
Programme Content					
The quality of the teaching					
Access to/quality of facilities and resources					
Employment or career opportunities					
Medical or health grounds					
Lack of funding					
Child Care responsibilities					
Personal relating to family					
Exclusion (not academic fail)					
Institution Accommodation					

4. Please expand on the factor(s) above.

5. How would you rate the whole programme on a scale of 1 (high) to 5 (low)?

1 2 3 4 5

Please explain your rating of the programme in the box below.

6. What are you going to do now that you have left the programme?

- Other study (please expand below)
- Work (please expand below)
- Other (please expand below)
- I do not know

7. If you have additional feedback/comments about the programme and why you left, please write them in the box below.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

2.6 Student satisfaction: alumni questionnaire

Instrument	Alumni questionnaire		
Responsible	Programme manager		
Aim of activity	Measure alumni satisfaction after two and five years		
Target values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All questions on average satisfactory (<3) - Overall satisfaction <3 		
Report by/ Report to	- Report by programme manager to steering group each year		
Report by means of	- Short report (average scores on all questions + analysis + actions taken) by programme manager to the steering group		
Frequency and deadline(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Questionnaire to be filled in two and five years after graduation by each alumnus - Overall report to be sent to steering group by programme manager six weeks after end of year 		
Short description	Date	Activity	Executed by
	June	Mail to programme coordinators for information	Programme manager
	September	Reports to programme manager	Programme coordinators
	October	Overall report to steering group	Programme manager
	Early November	Discussion overall report, decisions and actions	Steering group
Remarks			

Alumni Questionnaire

1. Gender

Female Male

2. Age

Under 25 25-34 35-49 50-64 65 and over

3. Year of graduation from the programme _____

4. How would you rate the following statements regarding the skills you developed in the programme?

Please tick one alternative on each line (1 = fully agree; 5 = fully disagree).

	1	2	3	4	5
The programme developed practical skills					
The programme developed my communication skills					
The programme developed my academic skills					
The programme developed my independent learning skills					
The programme developed my networking skills					
The skills developed during the programme were appropriate to the professional world					
I utilise the skills I developed during the programme in my present career					

5. How would you rate the value of the following items since graduation?

Please tick one alternative on each line (1 = not useful; 5 = very useful).

	1	2	3	4	5
The 'Action Research' module					
The 'Project Management and Entrepreneurship' module					
The 'Leading and Guiding' module					
The 'Performance and Communication skills' module					
The exchange period					
The 'Professional Integration Project'					
The mentoring received during the programme					
Contact with external partners involved in the programme					
Other professional contacts made via the programme					
Help given by programme staff					

Please use this box to expand upon the items above or other factors that helped you find employment

6. How would you rate the following statements about how your degree is more widely viewed?

Please tick one alternative on each line (1 = fully agree; 5 = fully disagree).

	1	2	3	4	5
The degree is respected by other music professionals					
The reputation of my home institution increases the perceived value of my degree					
The reputation of my exchange institution has increased the perceived value of my degree					

7. Which statement best describes your situation for the first 6 months following graduation?

- I worked
- I was unemployed
- I continued in study
- I had maternity/paternity/child care leave
- Other, what _____

8. At the moment I am:

- Employed
- Unemployed
- Studying full-time
- On maternity/paternity/child care leave
- Other, what _____

If you are not employed at the moment go to the last question.

9. My present employment is

- A full-time job
- A part-time job

10. My employer is

- The public sector
- The private sector
- The third sector (organisations, communities etc.)
- Self employed
- Other, what _____

11. My employment is

- Permanent, i.e. I have an employment contract made for the time being
- Temporary, i.e. I have a fixed-term employment contract
- as entrepreneur or freelancer
- Subsidised

12. My current job title: _____

13. My job is located in the municipality/country of _____

14. My current monthly gross salary in Euros:

- 1200
- 1201 - 1400
- 1401 - 1600
- 1601 - 1800
- 1801 - 2000
- 2001 - 2200
- 2201 - 2400
- more than 2400

15. Please use the box below to provide additional comments or feedback about the programme and its impact upon you since graduation

Thank you for answering our questions.

2.7 Teacher satisfaction: Teacher questionnaire/list of questions

Teachers in the JM will give feedback in a number of ways.

To start with, in the normal human resource cycle of every institute teachers will probably at given points in time, in an interview with their manager, be asked their opinion on their work, the working circumstances et cetera. As it is not sure that in all institutes the human resource cycle is the same, and as it is not sure feedback from those interviews is programme-specific and will reach the programme management of the joint master, we agreed that a separate instrument of gathering data on teacher's views on the programme should be developed.

For that reason, we developed a teacher questionnaire, to be filled in yearly by all teachers contributing to the programme. This questionnaire looks into general facts of the joint master, and follows hereafter.

In addition to that, we decided that it would be a good thing if after every semester, teachers would be asked their opinion specifically on the module(s) delivered. We agreed that it would probably be better to handle this in a live meeting between co-ordinator and teachers instead of handing the teachers a second questionnaire. We also agreed that it would be wise to give co-ordinators a short list of points to be addressed in an evaluative meeting after the semester. This short list is to be found after the teacher questionnaire.

Instruments	Teacher questionnaire/list of questions		
Responsible	Programme coordinators in the institutes		
Aim of activity	Determine satisfaction of teachers working in the JM		
Target values	<p>Note: two sub-instruments: questionnaire + list of possible questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Questionnaire: all questions on average satisfactory (<3), overall satisfaction <3 - List of possible questions: not applicable 		
Report by/ Report to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report by programme coordinators to programme manager at the end of the year - Report by programme manager to steering group at the end of the year 		
Report by means of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Short report (average scores on questionnaire, outcomes of list of possible questions, + analysis + actions taken) by programme coordinators to programme manager - Short summarizing overall report focusing on general points to be addressed to the steering group 		
Frequency and deadline(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - List of possible questions used twice a year in semester evaluation discussions - Questionnaire to be filled in at the end of the year by each teacher - Report to be sent by programme coordinators to programme manager 4 weeks after end of year - Overall report to be sent to steering group by programme manager six weeks after end of year 		
Short description	Date	Activity	Executed by
	End of each semester	Semester evaluation discussion	Programme coordinators/ Teachers
	June	Fill in questionnaire	Teachers
	September	Reports to programme manager	Programme coordinators
	October	Overall report to steering group	Programme manager
	Early November	Discussion overall report, decisions and actions	Steering group
Remarks			

Yearly Teacher Questionnaire

1. How would you rate the following statements about the content and the teaching of the programme?

Please tick one alternative on each line (1 = fully agree; 5 = fully disagree).

	1	2	3	4	5
The objectives of the programme are clear to me					
I understand the structure of the programme and my role within it					
The modules I teach are clear					
Appropriate students are selected for the programme					
The quality of teaching within the programme is generally good					

2. How would you rate the following statements about the organisation of the programme?

Please tick one alternative on each line (1 = fully agree; 5 = fully disagree).

	1	2	3	4	5
The programme is well managed					
It is clear to me who is responsible for what in the programme					
I receive sufficient information to carry out my work					
I am informed in time about decisions taken in the programme					
I am satisfied with my working environment					
The facilities are good					

3. How would you rate the following statements about the programme team?

Please tick one alternative on each line (1 = fully agree; 5 = fully disagree).

	1	2	3	4	5
The programme team meets regularly					
The atmosphere in the programme team is professional					
My voice is heard within the programme team					

4. How would you rate the following statements about the possibilities for professional development?

Please tick one alternative on each line (1 = fully agree; 5 = fully disagree).

	1	2	3	4	5
I am encouraged to think about my professional development needs					
I am encouraged to take up professional development opportunities					
There are sufficient possibilities for funding my professional development					

5. If you have additional feedback/comments about the programme, please write them in the box below.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

List of questions to be addressed in semester evaluation for modules

1. Is the module in general fit for repetition next year?
2. Are the goals of the module still valid?
3. Is the content of the module satisfactory (content of teaching, content of assignments, etc)?
4. Have we got the right teachers for this module?
5. Are the resources (classrooms, instruments, audiovisuals, library opportunities, guest teachers, budget, etc) alright?
6. Is the student workload in the module appropriate?
7. Is the final assessment of the module alright?

2.8 Peer/professional field satisfaction: information from external assessors

In the JM, we will regularly ask “outsiders” to function as assessors of specific modules, next to the teachers in the programme. We call these outsiders “external assessors”: peers/members of the professional field who take up a role in assessing individual students’ work in various modules.

The verdicts of these external assessors tell us not only something about the students’/programme’s quality, but also can be seen, in terms of internal quality assurance, as satisfaction statements from external stakeholders (peers/professional field). Keeping track of those statements should be part of the internal quality assurance system.

Whether or not this external assessor is actually allowed to mark students’ work is dependent on national regulations and for each institute to decide. In any case, it is important that for each assessment a short report is written in which at least the main marks of the external assessor are clearly singled out.

Once every year, each institutional co-ordinator of the JM will be asked to make a general overall analysis for the steering group of the contribution of external assessors.

Instrument	List of points to be addressed by external assessors		
Responsible	Programme coordinators in the institutes		
Aim of activity	Gain insight in satisfaction of peers/professional field		
Target values	Qualitative demonstration of overall satisfaction on the JM.		
Report by/ Report to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report by programme coordinators to programme manager at the end of the year - Report by programme manager to steering group at the end of the year 		
Report by means of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Short report on remarks of external assessors by programme coordinators to programme manager - Short summarizing overall report focusing on general points to be addressed to the steering group 		
Frequency and deadline(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report to be sent by programme coordinators to programme manager 4 weeks after end of year - Overall report to be sent to steering group by programme manager six weeks after end of year 		
Short description	Date	Activity	Executed by
	June	Mail to programme coordinators for information	Programme manager
	September	Reports to programme manager	Programme coordinators
	October	Overall report to steering group	Programme manager
	Early November	Discussion overall report, decisions and actions	Steering group
Remarks	The frequency of reporting may in the long run be altered from yearly to bi-yearly.		

2.9 Peer satisfaction: information from external evaluators

External evaluators are people who, from an outsiders' position, oversee the complete JM offered by the respective institutes, maybe observe final examinations, and report back their findings to the programme management. In the JM we have chosen for a collegial external evaluation cycle: assessments of the students of one institution nearing completion of the JM (such as assessment of the Professional Integration Project or the final semester of mentoring) will be visited by one representative of one of the other partners in the joint master. This representative, which we will call an external evaluator, would sit in the assessments, probably talk to some students and teachers, look into some final work of other modules (e.g. in several portfolios of students), and talk his findings through with the persons responsible for the JM within the institution visited. As external evaluators come from outside the institute they can function as truly external evaluators from the point of view of the institute. As they know the programme in detail, they can at the same time offer in-depth comments.

Instrument	List of points to be addressed by external evaluators		
Responsible	Programme coordinators in the institutes		
Aim of activity	Gain insight in satisfaction of peers		
Target values	Qualitative demonstration of overall satisfaction on the programme		
Report by/ Report to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report by external evaluators to programme manager at the end of the year - Report by programme manager to steering group at the end of the year 		
Report by means of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Short report on their findings by external evaluator to programme manager - Short summarizing overall report focusing on general points to be addressed to the steering group 		
Frequency and deadline(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report to be sent by external evaluators 4 weeks after visit - Overall report to be sent to steering group by programme manager six weeks after end of year 		
Short description	Date	Activity	Executed by
	Before visit	Instruction for external evaluators	Programme Manager
	4 weeks after visit	Report sent to programme manager	External evaluators
	October	Overall report to steering group	Programme manager
	Early November	Discussion overall report, decisions and actions	Steering group
Remarks			

2.10: Society satisfaction: press clipping collection procedure

Every institute participating in the JM will collect over the year as many press/media clippings as possible concerning the JM. These may be reviews from projects in local or regional newspapers, interviews with students or teachers on their work in the JM, et cetera. Once every two year each local co-ordinator delivers to the steering group a short description of the amount a character of articles/interviews et cetera in the media. If very worthwhile articles on the programme have appeared, they should be sent to the general programme co-ordinator so that he can keep up a small collection of press clippings.

Instrument	Data from press clippings		
Responsible	Programme coordinators in the institutes		
Aim of activity	Measure satisfaction of society in general by keeping track of (positive and negative) press clippings concerning the JM, its students and teachers by all of the institutes		
Target values	- No more than 10 % of press clippings are negative on the programme		
Report by/ Report to	- Report by coordinators to programme manager each year - Overall report by programme manager to steering group each year		
Report by means of	- Set of press clipping + short analysis by programme coordinators to programme manager - Overall selection of most telling press clippings plus short overall analysis by programme manager to the steering group		
Frequency and deadline(s)	- Press clippings gathered throughout the year by programme coordinators, to be sent in with a short analysis 4 weeks after the end of each year to programme manager - Overall selection + analysis to be sent to steering group by programme manager six weeks after end of year		
Short description	Date	Activity	Executed by
	June	Mail to programme coordinators for information	Programme manager
	September	Reports to programme manager	Programme coordinators
	October	Overall report to steering group	Programme manager
	Early November	Discussion overall report, decisions and actions	Steering group
Remarks			

3. Format for reporting

This format for reporting can be used:

- by the programme coordinators to prepare their report for the programme manager,
- by the programme manager to prepare his report for the steering group.

1. Financial and operational results

Student:

- * Input: number of students
- * Throughput: numbers on schedule/behind/leavers
- * Output: numbers of graduates after 2/3/4 years

Teacher:

- * Number of teacher exchanges for teaching modules
- * Number of teacher exchanges entrance/final examinations

Finances:

- * Financial state of affairs: conform budget?

2. Student satisfaction: student questionnaire after entrance examination

Average scores on all questions¹ + analysis + actions taken

3 Student satisfaction: student questionnaire after module

Average scores on all questions + analysis + actions taken

4 Student satisfaction: student questionnaire after graduation

Average scores on all questions + analysis + actions taken

5 Student satisfaction: early leavers questionnaire

Average scores on all questions + analysis + actions taken

6 Student satisfaction: alumni questionnaire

Average scores on all questions + analysis + actions taken

7 Teacher satisfaction: teacher questionnaire

Average scores on all questions + outcomes of list of possible questions + analysis + actions taken

8 Peer/professional field satisfaction: information from external assessors

Short report on remarks of external assessors

9 Peer/professional field satisfaction: information from external evaluators

Short report on remarks of external evaluators

10 Society satisfaction: press clipping collection procedure

Short analysis of press clipping collection

¹ If the amount of filled-in questionnaires is too small for reliable averages: short qualitative evaluation of answers.