

Report on Regional meetings 2017

Zagreb, 10.11.2017



UK and Ireland - Deborah Kelleher

In attendance were representatives from Leeds College of Music, Royal Conservatoire of Scotland, Leeds University and the Royal Irish Academy of Music. The group noted the absence of the other regional members with regret - they felt that it would be valuable to have all attendees at the meeting.

1. How does your institution relate to the AEC?

UK representatives felt that participation and membership in the AEC was especially important in the light of the Brexit vote, as they wish to continue to cooperate and network with their European peers.

In general, networking at the AEC meetings was regarded as the primary value of the AEC membership.

The discussions and topics were also commented on as valuable.

2. Report on last year's meeting

The group reiterated their request to ask AEC to seek data on how many conservatoires teach more than one discipline. They requested that this be undertaken as it is the third year that they have requested this.

3. Feedback on the Congress so far

Highlights have been the deepening of the student voice at the Congress. It seemed to be more secure and embedded this year. Students no longer felt that separate parallel sessions (suggested last year) were necessary. The group had a good conversation about how this could be moved on further, as there were two students in attendance.

The programming of the Congress felt 'samey' in layout - could AEC look at varying the format?

4. EASY

The UK conservatoires are not in a position to use EASY because they have their own system that is obligatory.

5. AEC sustainability plan

The group expressed concern at the higher prices for membership. The so called 'richer' countries still face challenging government cuts, thereby giving them less room for manoeuvre financially than a GNP might indicate.

6. Simultaneous translation

There was no objection to this proposal.

7. SMS - has your institution spread the word about working groups?

All confirmed that they have.

8. National overviews

The UK group suggested that CUK would be approached to progress the national overviews.

South/East Europe - Georg Schulz

Attending:

Austria

Graz Irene Hofmann-Wellenhof

Vienna Sabine Roth

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Sarajevo Maja Ackar Zlatarevic and Senad Kazic

Croatia

Pula Dražen Košmerl and Sabina Vidulin

Osijek Antoaneta Radočaj-Jerković

Zagreb Dalibor Cikojevic, Marina Novak and Mladen Janjanin

Czech Republic

Brno Richard Fajnor

Hungary

Budapest Gyula Fekete, Beata Furka, Júlia Torda and Nemes László

Romania

Bucharest Diana Mos

Sanda Dodik from Banja Luka has informed Georg that she had to leave because of urgent matters at home but she wants to get the minutes. Aneta Ilic from Belgrade missed the meeting but was at the congress, so she has asked for the minutes as well.

In the **first introductory round** Dalibor explained that his academy has invited representatives from Osijek and Split, which are currently not members of AEC, to the congress to inform them about AEC's activities. Antoaneta from Osijek is present and very welcome; the representative from Split was unable to come to the meeting. The two new representatives from Pula (Dean and the Head of the Department of Music Pedagogy) are very welcomed by the group as well.

When looking through the **minutes of last year** only two issues are raised: Georg promises to inform the members when the **matchmaking area on AEC's webpage** will be available. The members confirm their urgent interest. Regarding the **National Overviews** Dalibor mentions that they have had other priorities recently ;-) (and everyone understood). Richard offers to provide a possible contact for Slovakia (and did after the meeting). Georg is asked to contact Zoran Pehceviski in Skopje who is still in charge there as a dean of music faculty to get the document for Macedonia. Senad Kazic proposed that he could contact institutions in Montenegro. This is very welcomed even if there is no member AEC institution in this country.

The first **feedback about the congress** is very positive, the theme is great, it is considered as good to address the theme from different perspectives, the LO and the ECMA session are appreciated, Richard was at the MusiQuE pre-conference workshop and assess it as better prepared than last year. Marina is missing continuity of topics raised at the previous congress. She suggests repeating parallel sessions that are appreciated and even to go in some cases deeper into the subject. All members are asked to fill in the questionnaire, because only these answers could inform the congress committee about possible needs for repetition of sessions in the next year. Dalibor proposes to organise a pre-conference workshop as education for leaders which is very welcomed by the members.

A vivid discussion about **European projects** comes up. Beata from Budapest is actually administrating one project as coordinator and one as member of the consortium. She tells that work for running the project is even higher than for applying for it from administrative

side and from the academic side (Nemes László) as well. Regarding applications she advises the member to better present the project to the special priorities of the call. Beata asks AEC to lobby against the different amount of “salaries” for experts per day in different countries. Even if the living cost f.e. in Brussels are higher, the work in Hungary should not be paid less than a third because of lower GDP. This practice is discriminating the workforce in countries with lower GDP.

Irene is asking about the **policies for ERASMUS+ outgoing mobility** in the region. In the answers problems with the recognition of subjects, constrains regarding not to prolong study times because of mobility and above all financial obstacles are mentioned. For many students of the region living costs in northern countries are absolutely unaffordable. From Budapest the problem of matching incoming and outgoing students for subject-specific study places is reported. There are different solutions for financial issues, e.g. students that prolong their stay have to pay in a fund that is used for other students to support them.

Beata wants to know the actual status of **UMR**, because Budapest was participating (and Zagreb as well) but has not got a feedback. Georg informs that unfortunately there won't be a public ranking, because there were too few answers to the student questionnaire, but that UMR has promised to inform every participating institution after the congress. For the participation organisations a great frustration is reported to deliver data with much work and not to be visible through a public ranking.

Concerning the **sustainability plan** members asks Georg to briefly explain the concept. Georg asks everyone after that to go through the documents regarding their special situation before the GA, likewise with the strategic plan. The members are happy to stop the simultaneous translation because they don't use it at all.

In the end some problems with the **EUphony project**, a project between Budapest, Zagreb, Ljubljana, Sarajevo, Belgrade and Graz are raised from Beata concerning the changed concept. Georg will take care about the communication between the partners.

Spain and Portugal - Ingeborg Radok Žádná with Ángela Domínguez

Introduction to the discussion, welcome words by Stefan Gies, AEC CEO, Ingeborg Radok Žádná and Angela Dominguez.

1. Feedback on Congress Programme

Positive reaction, the representatives found that relevant topics had been raised and discussed, the programme seemed to be more interesting than last year. They highly appreciated students' involvement and collaboration. Some of the raised issues could be discussed in smaller groups - type parallel session. The continuity of presented and discussed topics and issues (Gothenburg→Tbilisi→ Zagreb) was appreciated. Angela explained the interconnection of topics within the running and new EU projects. The representatives proposed to have a “wrap-up” session during the congress (could be a parallel session) where main highlights of all AEC platform events (PJP, IRCs, EMP and EPARM) are shared, and a “Congress wrap-up” session could be included in the programmes of all the platforms for a better connection between platforms and congress.

2. Spanish and Portuguese specific issues

The problem of recognition of HME in Spain was raised, Stefan explained the position of AEC and its limited possibilities of advocacy. He stressed the necessity of common approach of the Spanish music schools representatives. Some good ideas were proposed by Spanish and Portuguese colleagues - e.g. to organize an event concerning HME, in Spain, inviting Spanish authorities as well as the representatives of AEC, to present

Spanish and Portuguese activities in the MHE area, to invite the Spanish authorities to the next AEC Congress to take part in a debate on the legal context and legislation in HME sector in EU countries. There are also other ways in which AEC could help to solve the recognition problem in a more direct way - it is important that the Spanish members try to change their mind-set and share as well the positive achievements/practices at local/regional/national level. The positive atmosphere is very important. Also the common dealing with problems or specific issues was recommended.

3. Other discussed topics

Ingeborg Radok Žádná informed the group briefly about **EASY project, updated Strategic Plan and Sustainability plan** (to be discussed in details during the GA, the goal was to make AEC less dependent on project funding, a moderate raise of the membership fee and registration fee for AEC events was discussed). The group was rather surprised about it, but the discussion didn't get into details. The question of the **simultaneous interpretation** was raised - the group has no objections to replacing it with written translated documents as they are willing and capable to communicate in English. The new **SMS project** was mentioned (including the new open calls for working groups - WG).

Spanish and Portuguese colleagues expressed a slight disappointment about their **involvement in existing and future WG** - they have the impression that the representation of countries and regions in different WG is not well balanced (there are few or no members from Spain and Portugal in WG, although they are interested and they applied). It seems to them that still the WG are quite north/centre European - they will never be able to learn/change this situation. These concerns should be transmitted to Council and taken into account for the coming-up WG calls. Angie explained the proportional representation depends sometimes on the partner's involvement in the project. A new format/platform is implemented within the programme - groups organized by mixing AEC regional groups.

The meeting was positive, with some very good ideas and proposals for the future.

Armenia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Poland, Russia, Ukraine - Zdzisław Łapiński

At the annual AEC Congress in Zagreb only three countries were represented: Armenia, Belarus, and Poland. Probably, as in previous years, the **costs of participation** were an economic barrier for absent countries. In Regional Meeting only representative of Poland took part. In addition there were two special guests: Member of the European Parliament - Bogdan Zdrojewski and a young Spanish pianist, presently studying in Krakow - Guillermo Rodriguez (representing polish students' community).

There was no need for **introduction** because all representatives of polish Academies are regularly attending AEC meetings and their needs are fully addressed by AEC.

The **topic of congress** was perfectly chosen and the programme was very interesting - finally close to the music. Especially Presentation by the Project ECMA deserved special attention.

Polish Rectors are rather cautious about **EASY project** and they are waiting for the further development.

All polish representatives understand financial risk and fully support **Sustainability Plan**.

The **simultaneous translation** in present way is a waste of money - it would be better to have written translation of important documents to more languages.

The discussion about the **Music Teacher Education system** concentrated upon the system of verification how the students are prepared to teach in the future. The general opinion was that the theory is on the good level but practical part of educational process does not meet the expectation.

Nordic and Baltic countries - Kaarlo Hildén

Minutes: Tuovi Martinsen & Kaarlo Hildén

1. Feedback from the Congress

- i. Parallel sessions
 - a. Descriptions of the content vs. reality: the speakers should keep their presentations and sessions within the limits of the given topic. This was not always the case
 - b. There should be a better gender balance (e.g. Keynote speakers), in many presentations examples and references only from men. Leadership and women is an important theme in conservatoires.
 - c. One topic for the whole conference can be too limiting to be interesting for all - perhaps there could be more than one? Now some sessions felt a bit forced in order to fit under the general theme - the theme did not always carry (comment: the host comes up with the theme related to the local agenda. Suggestion: to have a thematic day and during other days, the focus could on something else
 - d. Level of speakers. They should always be leading experts in their field and open up new interesting perspectives. This was not always the case this time.
 - e. Suggestion for a theme - a look into the unknown future. What scenarios can be created? How to act in changing world? Inviting experts and researches on the future

2. Report from last year's regional meeting and an overview on how things have developed

- i. ANMA
 - a. The mentoring initiative (p. 92) is finally going forward and the first mentor-mentee -relationships have been established. An evaluation will be done later and the program developed accordingly. Not too late to join in - especially a need for new mentees. The mentors are managers and IRCs, the idea is to support less experienced colleagues in their professional development. More information: www.nordplmusic.net
 - b. EASY Pilot was discussed in the last meeting. The situation is now much better, after many challenges.
 - c. National overviews collected by AEC. Can be found on AEC web-page. We are still missing Norway. Who is the contact person in Norway? No-one of the participants had received a request.
 - d. U-Multirank. If you want to participate, it is important to react when the call is out and also make sure enough students answer the questionnaire.

3. Remarks on the upcoming agenda of the General Assembly

- i. The Strategic Plan, p. 56, was discussed. The structure is now clearer with 4 pillars. The 5th element is more operational, has to do with efficiency.
- ii. Sustainability Plan, p. 62, was discussed. The main concern is how to make AEC less dependent on project funding without decreasing the level or quality of activities. The membership fees and income targets were discussed. Is the raise of the income coming from services realistic? It was noted, that the independence of Musique seems to be in challenged, if it is to be an incoming

generating component for AEC? This was felt to be a principled and problematic question, both for the Musique and for the AEC. It was also noted, that a pressure to use Musique services was felt.

- iii. Simultaneous translations
 - a. Major costs for the AEC
 - b. Suggestion to stop that and invest instead in producing written material in more languages
 - c. It will be a problem for the AEC, if only half of the Europe will not attend the congress
 - d. Is there a possibility to find external funding for translations e.g. from the EU?

4. Other topics - is there something the AEC should be doing/ should no longer do?

- i. AEC should have an even closer collaboration with ELIA. A more proactive role was wished for. Organization of joint conferences or seminars, now still time-wise overlapping activities. Comment: already joint working groups and ongoing discussions between the council and the Elia board.
- ii. Lack of global outlook. E.g. in opening session always NASM greeting, but not from other parts of the world, why not? Too much focus on US.
- iii. Lobbying towards the Commission. Has the AEC lobbying activity decreased? Comment: The AEC is working very actively to influence decisions that are important for us. The activities will be reported in the GA, it does not seem to be decreased
- iv. Artistic research would need better publication forums - journals dominated by the universities
- v. Is this an area, where the AEC members could join forces?
- vi. ANMA (by Claus Olesen, chairman)
 - a. Executive Committee is planning to have a meeting in Oslo to meet with the AEC President Eirik Birkeland
 - b. Elections for the Executive committee. Faster decision-making and nominations from countries is needed.
 - c. Next thematic day and General Assembly in Odense, 9-11 April, 2018. The theme for the not decided yet. Suggestions for the theme by the attendees:
 - 1. Looking into future
 - 2. Changes in artistic market
 - 3. Academisation of music schools (requirements for leaders)
 - 4. Church music - perhaps a theme for symposium, as not every school has it. But an important issue in Nordic area. Role of the church in the society, inviting stakeholders into discussion, widening the recruitment. Fits well with future discussion.
 - 5. Sweden: decreasing funding affects quality - ANMAs possibilities in influencing on politicians, give out statements, etc. Survival strategies to share
 - 6. Denmark: Are we competitive enough on a global scale?
 - 7. To seek inspiration from other fields (e.g. architecture and design)
 - 8. Future-oriented sub-themes: student recruitment, sustainability, what is happening in the higher education market
 - d. Chairman's term is ending - new chairman? Claus Olesen is happy to continue, but new candidates are welcome.
- vii. **Summing up the session:**

One of the strengths of this region seems to be able to agree on and execute initiatives. Thus, this network has a possibility to influence the development of the sector within this region and also the AEC if there is need and will.

Italy - Lucia di Cecca

The regional meeting was attended by all the Italians who came to the Congress.

- Lucia Di Cecca opens the works with a brief introduction to provide the context of the meeting, explaining when and why regional meetings were introduced in the Congress, and the importance of these meetings to reinforce bonds and exchange of information between the General Assembly and the Council.
- After a round of presentations, Di Cecca asks everyone for **feedback on the congress** and in general on the congress program so far. All present agree that the alternation of plenary and parallel sessions is a better organizational model than the previous one, which included only plenary sessions. The downside of having many parallel sessions is that you cannot follow all those you are interested in. A solution could be to publish reports of all sessions on the website, even better would be to film all sessions. Regarding the content of the sessions, Riccardo Ceni (Parma) asks for more technical ones and particularly focusing on financial aspects (funding).
- Di Cecca asks if everyone knows the **services offered by the AEC** and if there are any suggestions.
 - Leonella Grossi Caprioli (Brescia) asks for more information on the research activities of the partners and suggests to organize a section on the website where everyone can publish information on their activities. The colleagues point out that having more information about what is done is useful in all areas, not just in research, and that the AEC could survey all existing projects.
 - Pierluigi Destro (Padua) asks for more information on projects with third countries, citing the usefulness of European Cultural Antennas that unfortunately no longer exist. All present agree and it is proposed to organize informative seminars for KA107 projects, as was done for strategic partnerships.
- Di Cecca asks if everyone knows well the **AEC website** and if they use it. Some do, others don't. Di Cecca illustrates the sections of the site which, according to her, are the most important or the most useful. "Mission Statement": the new Strategic Plan will be discussed during the Assembly on Saturday, it is on the Reader; "Membership": you can find here updated info on all AEC members; "National Overviews": they have been recently updated and are very useful for learning about the different training systems in all countries; "Work & Policies": it contains many documents which can be useful for our institutions.
- The **new SMS project** is then illustrated with all its strands and the Working Groups which are being formed; Di Cecca invites everyone to pay attention to the calls and to participate; at the moment WG calls are open for: "Diversity, Identity, Inclusiveness", "Entrepreneurial Mindset for Musicians", "Teacher Education in the Digital Age"; the call for "Innovative Learning&Teaching" WG has just been closed and an Italian teacher has been selected too; in 2018 it will be opened the call for "Music and Music HEI's Role in Society". Regarding the other WGs, the call for the EPARM WG is open (Italians cannot candidate as there is already an Italian teacher); in 2019 it will be opened the call for the P&J WG.
- Di Cecca illustrates the **AEC sustainability plan** and invites everyone to read it carefully on the Reader. It is important to talk about it now as it also affects the membership fee and the meetings fee. In the past, the AEC could count on operational grants from the European Commission, but since 2014 funding can be given only for specific projects. The goal of the new sustainability plan is to make the AEC independent from project funding by 2021.

- Ernesto Pulignano (Salerno) believes that being independent from EC funding and totally dependent on its members makes the AEC more tied to individual countries and that the weight of each country in the AEC should be proportional to the fees that are paid. Many do not agree: they underline that linking membership fee to GNP (gross national product) is the best way to respect differences between countries. The topic is carefully discussed.
- Di Cecca asks if there is any suggestion on **services to be further developed** by the AEC, in particular paid services, and anticipates that the AEC will offer writing and revision of projects. Ceni suggests to lobby with the EC on some specific issues such as Erasmus, insisting on the specificity of our sector and that it is not correct that our projects compete with the Universities' ones.
- Many are interested in **EASY**.

Germany, Austria - Elisabeth Gutjahr

Anliegen für die Generalversammlung

(z. B. Finanzen, Simultanübersetzung, Serviceleistungswünsche an die AEC?)

- Konzept für die Nachhaltigkeit des AEC (Vorbereitung durch Schreiben Stefan Gies)
=> keine Wortmeldungen
- Strategischer Plan der AEC => keine Wortmeldungen
- Simultanübersetzungen beim Jahreskongress:

Diese werden kaum in Anspruch genommen. Die Meinungen dazu sind unterschiedlich, es ist ein Thema seit Gründung der AEC und es besteht weitgehend Fürsprache, als Ausdruck der Vielfalt Europas. Diese Identität hat eben ihren Preis.

Als Alternative aber gäbe es auch die Möglichkeit, sämtliche Referate in der Muttersprache zu halten und dann simultan ins Englische übersetzen zu lassen, dann würde die Vielfalt auch auf dem Podium sicht- und hörbar werden.

Es kommt die Anregung: Nicht die Reden übersetzen, sondern die Diskussionen. Fertiggestellte Reden können ja bereits im Vorfeld übersetzt und verteilt werden.

Fazit (Zusammenfassung): Vielfalt der Sprachen soll gewährleistet bleiben. Denkbar sind zwei Möglichkeiten.

- a. Wie bisher: Die vier Hauptsprachen werden weiterhin simultan übersetzt.
- b. Referate können auf der Bühne in allen Muttersprachen gehalten werden. Sie werden dann simultan ins Englische zu übersetzt.

Anmerkung: Die schriftliche Übersetzung von Reden im Vorfeld birgt das Risiko, dass bei Abweichungen vom Skript in der Vortragssituation (und davon sollte man ausgehen) die Übersetzung ins Straucheln gerät.

- Angebote der AEC als kostenpflichtige Serviceleistungen - MusiQue ist hier für den Bereich der Akkreditierung ein mittlerweile erfüllter Wunsch. Längere Diskussion über EASY, keine direkten Anregungen oder Rückmeldungen.

Weiterer Vorschlag von Stefan Gies: Die AEC könnte eine Serviceleistung entwickeln für die Unterstützung von (EU)-Förderanträgen - im Vergleich zu Unis haben kleine Einrichtungen, wie Musikhochschulen kaum das Potential den Aufwand für eine erfolgreiche Antragstellung zu stemmen. Die Finanzierung dieser Service-Leistung könnte die generelle Leistung und eine Erfolgsprämie berücksichtigen.

France, Luxembourg - Jacques Moreau

In a round presentation, each member introduced him/herself and expressed his/her interest in participating to the AEC activities. All members that were registered in the Congress participated in the meeting.

CHARLIER	Chantal	CMDL (Dammery les Lys)
GIRBAL	Valérie	ESMD Nord de France (Lille)
HUMETZ	Bruno	
MOREAU	Jacques	Cefedem Auvergne Rhône-Alpes (Lyon)
DEVAUX	Sylvain	CNSMD de Lyon
MILHAT	Morgane	
REPLUMAZ	Isabelle	
SERRY	Viviane	CRR de Nantes
BAUMGARTNER	Benoît	Le pont Supérieur (Nantes)
AMUSSEN	Gretchen	CNSMD de Paris
VAILLANT	Thierry	
DESOUCHES	Emmanuelle	PSPBB (Paris)
GARDEUX	Laurent	
GRAELL CALULL	Roser	
DECREUX	Jean-Jacques	CESMD de Poitou-Charentes (Poitiers)
MARTINEZ	Anne-Sophie	

The main subjects mentioned were:

- To avoid any shyness in the English language for French members, encouragement to French members to participate in working groups, which is important to give a voice to French cultural perspectives;
- The importance of the students place within the AEC, and the good news of the next translation in French of the students guide;
- It is important for pre-college institutions to have a place within the AEC, as they are preparing the students for higher education;
- The importance of being autonomous as a Higher Musical Education Institution: French institutions seems to be less autonomous than others in EU;
- An interest in exchange sessions on practices, where a lot of information can be shared;
- Some concerns on the Congress organisation:
 - MusiQuE presentation: from one year to another one, it seems not appropriate to attend the repeated session;
 - For the parallel sessions, a larger voice given to the public, even for the plenary sessions; on that perspective, the students and the LOs sessions were successful;
- A difference between what is perceived of the recognition of higher musical education in many other countries and eh same in France;
- AEC is only about music, but many institutions have also dance or drama, some also visual arts; would it be possible to have place within the Annual Congress to allow those institutions to share common concerns?
- The impact of the French directors association Anescas, for the visibility of the HME institutions in France;
- The importance of developing the doctorate within HME institutions.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION

The evolution of the AEC:

- Creation is seen as the common point of institutional culture within higher musical education institutions. This approach allows to put less relevant divisions into perspectives.
- The AEC has grown from a directors' club to a remarkably professional organization. This change happened at the time of the Polifonia project. This program has been a huge success, it has come to the heart of questions about teaching. It has thus brought the world's attention onto the AEC. Today, the concerns of all institutions are taken into account: the president and the CEO are paying a deep attention to that. The AEC is also systematically open to the extra-European world: the presence on the Council of a member representing non-European institutions is a strong sign.
- The AEC has always been a little ahead; it is therefore always useful to follow the issues carefully.
- Student participation is a very important step forward.
- The advancement of artistic research, its place in the institutions, the publication of the white paper on research, are important elements as well.

EASY

- Unanimously hailed as an excellent job, and thanks to the AEC for investing in this project.
- The issue of EASY registration costs is raised because institutions are easily in the higher brackets. The economy in time is considerable, but the registration fee is considered too important by several institutions.

The Strategic Plan

- Stefan Gies did a tremendous job for clarifying the plan, which became very readable. The financial sustainability plan is very appreciated, it is very important to have this anticipatory vision.

Languages used during congresses

- One member wants round tables in several languages on the same subject, expressing by the way a concern about the too modest use of translations. A written translation, and in a greater number of languages, could be a solution: it would facilitate, in the institutions, a dissemination of the debates and information.

Shared/Joint Masters

- There is a specific problem in higher music education - not only French - for the implementation of shared/joint masters. The AEC could help with this problem.

The entire group congratulates Gretchen Amussen, who, due to her next retirement, attends her last AEC Annual Congress. The group expresses her many thanks for the huge work she did within the AEC as a French representative.

Associate Members - Bernard Lanskey

Attendees:

Bernard Lanskey, Yong Siew Toh Conservatory of Music, Singapore (Chair)
Christopher Chen, Suzhou University of Science & Technology, China
Robert Cutietta, University of Southern California, USA
Mist Thorkelsdottir, University of Southern California, USA
Thomas Novak New England Conservatory, USA
Scott Harrison, Queensland Conservatorium, Australia
Brenda Ravenscroft, Schulich School of Music, McGill University, Canada
Margaret Barrett, The University of Queensland, Australia
Don McLean, University of Toronto Faculty of Music, Canada
Isabelle Panneton, Faculté de musique de l'Université de Montréal, Canada
Jennifer Rosenfeld, icadenza, USA
Martin Prchal, Royal Conservatory of The Hague, The Netherlands
Jenny Ang, Yong Siew Toh Conservatory of Music, Singapore

- Bernard Lanskey welcomed everyone to the meeting and updated the group on the following AEC agenda.
- AEC's plans to adopt **EASY** - a common online application system for ERASMUS and other mobility schemes applications. Associate members will also be able to join access. In order to join the EASY platform, institutions will be charged 600 - 950 euros/year. Mist shared that the platform is easy to use, allows easy sharing of learning outcomes easily as well as pre-screening of students. Others art forms are also included.
 - Follow up: Could Associate Members use EASY to administer bilaterals between Associate members?
- AEC was working on a **Sustainability Plan** (AEC Beyond 2021). The Plan included: reducing dependency on EU project funding; membership fees to be determined by Gross National Income of the country in which institutions are situated. However, Associate Membership fees would remain as a flat fee. The Sustainability Plan would be discussed at the General Assembly.
- Associate Members were invited to review the **AEC Strategic Plan 2016-2020** from a non-European perspective AEC Pillar 4: Fostering the value of music and music education in society In relation to the above AEC pillar, the meeting offered that Associate Members could contribute to the working committee by suggesting topics for the Council to consider. It also suggested that the Council could consider other stakeholders in music beyond Higher Education and outside of Europe.
- Discussion on what **Associate Members would value from the AEC** (What kind of services would we need and be willing to pay for that AEC could develop?): Maintain data sharing with Associate Members; Inclusion in AEC projects eg ECMA; Facilitate staff exchange and short term residencies; Advocate for more associate membership; A panel discussion at AEC congress that discusses non-European agenda; Build greater visibility of exchange possibilities out of Europe, achieving reciprocal exchanges into Associate member institutions.
 - AOB: Brenda Ravenscroft asked what would the AEC value from Associate Members and what do they see Associate members to be contributing. Bernard replied that the AEC had increased awareness beyond Europe and would have no resistance to further dialogue.