

## 11 Report and Outcomes

### 11.1 Review report

The Review Team will draft a report, normally in English, within ten weeks of the site visit. This report will be based on all the information received by the team through the institution's own self-evaluation document and supporting materials (see 8.2.2) and on insights gained during the site visit.

#### 11.1.1 Structure and creation process of the draft report

The first version of the draft report is prepared by the Secretary, building on written contributions made by the other Review Team members. The report is structured as follows:

- Table of Contents
- Introduction (information on the context of the review, data on the institution/programme and composition of the Review Team)
- Analysis of how each standard is met:
  - o Description of the situation in the institution, based on elements from the self-evaluation report and precisely quoted (for example, “[self-evaluation report, p. 16]”) and on findings from the site-visit duly referenced (for example, “Students met indicated that” or “[meeting with administrative staff]”)
  - o Statement assessing the compliance of the institution/programme/joint programme with these standards
  - o Comments and suggestions for improvement
- A summary, in table format, of the compliance with standards
- A summary of recommendations and conditions, if appropriate
- In the case of an accreditation procedure, a proposal to the MusiQuE Board concerning the accreditation of the institution/programme/joint programme

The report may also address other issues which the Review Team finds relevant to the aims of the review exercise.

Within six weeks after the site visit, the Secretary will send the draft version of the report to the other members of the Review Team, who will be given two weeks to send their feedback. The revision process of the draft version is organised internally by each Review Team (for example, some Chairs will prefer to review the draft report first before forwarding it to the other Team members, others will prefer that feedback is collected by the secretary from all Review Team members first).

Once all Review Team members agree on the draft version, it is sent to the MusiQuE staff (unless the secretary was a member of the MusiQuE staff, in which case it is deemed to have been already received). In case of disagreement amongst Review Team members about any element of the report, the Chair will attempt to resolve the matter by correspondence but ultimately is empowered to make the final decision, wherever possible following the view of the majority of the panel.

#### 11.1.2 Statement on the institution's/programme's compliance with the standards

For each standard, compliance needs to be assessed by the Review Team as follows:

- 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 weaknesses 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 weaknesses 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.

The verdict on compliance should be duly justified.

### **11.1.3 Proposal on the accreditation of the institution/programme/joint programme**

In the case of an accreditation procedure, the Review Team is asked to conclude its report with a proposal to the MusiQuE Board concerning the accreditation of the institution/programme/joint programme that has been reviewed. The proposal should be expressed as follows:

“Based on the institution’s/programme’s/joint programme’s compliance with MusiQuE standards, it is proposed that the institution/the (joint) programme be accredited/ be accredited with conditions/should not be accredited”

In each of the above cases there may be additional recommendations attached to the proposal.

### **11.1.4 Institution’s response to the report**

The draft report is normally sent by the MusiQuE staff to the institution by email (pdf version) within ten weeks of the visit. The institution is invited to comment on the factual accuracy of the report within four weeks from the date of the email. A written response should be addressed to the Review Team and sent by email to the MusiQuE staff indicating the institution’s general reaction to the report and, where applicable, a list of factual points for which correction is requested.

In the case of an accreditation procedure, the concluding part of the report, with its proposal to the MusiQuE Board concerning the accreditation of the institution/programme/joint programme, will be omitted at this stage of the process.

### **11.1.5 Final report**

The Review Team will consider any comments submitted by the institution and adjust the report to ensure factual accuracy and, where this changes such matters, consistency between the corrected factual information and the conclusions drawn. The revised report will be sent by the MusiQuE staff to the institution by email within four weeks of receipt of the institution’s comments.

The normal expectation is that there will not be further revision of the report at this stage. Exceptionally, if an institution can justify a claim that its factual corrections have not been

properly addressed in the first revision, a further iteration may be agreed to, at the discretion of the Review Team chair.

The revised report, which is now regarded as final, is sent to the MusiQuE Board by the MusiQuE staff. In the case of an accreditation procedure, this is the point where the concluding part of the report, with its proposal to the MusiQuE Board concerning the accreditation of the institution/programme/joint programme, is added.

## **11.2 Review outcomes and consequences**

The final report is considered by the MusiQuE Board at its following meeting or through email exchange if the following meeting will take place more than three months after the final report is ready. The Board can request access to all the self-evaluation documents.

### **11.2.1 Outcomes of a MusiQuE Quality Enhancement Review**

In the case of a Quality Enhancement Review, the result of the procedure is the final report itself, which includes the list of standards met, substantially met and not met, highlights the institution's/programme's strong points, and provides advice and suggestions/recommendations for change.

The institution will receive a letter from the MusiQuE Board stating that the institution/programme/joint programme has been reviewed by MusiQuE with reference to the MusiQuE standards and procedures and referring to the summary of compliance with standards. The letter will also inform the institution about the possibility of a follow-up process, involving the filling in of a follow-up template within 6-12 months after the delivery of the final report (see section 13).

### **11.2.2 Outcomes of a MusiQuE accreditation procedure**

In the case of an accreditation procedure, in addition to the report and advice, the result will include a decision on the accreditation of the institution/programme/joint programme, with the following possibilities:

- Accreditation
- Conditional accreditation
- Not accredited (in cases where there is non-compliance with a significant proportion, usually defined as six or more, of the 17 standards or, exceptionally, when non-compliance is less substantial than this, but the extent and seriousness of the conditions needing to be met is such that the Review Team deems it unrealistic for them to be fulfilled within the maximum period allowable – see below).

In all these cases, additional recommendations may be developed by the Review Team in order to assist the institution with its further improvement.

Where the decision is to grant accreditation, this will be for a period of 6 years unless national legislation sets a different interval.

Where conditions are attached to accreditation, the institution will be given a period of 12 months to show that the conditions have been fulfilled (with adjustments to national contexts if the requirements are different) by filling in the follow-up template (see 13.1). In exceptional, well justified cases, this period can be shortened or extended (to a maximum period of two years).

If, by the expiry of the maximum period allowed, an institution that has been given conditional accreditation fails to show that the conditions have been fulfilled, the MusiQuE Board will make an evaluation of progress achieved and, on that basis, take one of the following three actions:

- authorise a further extension to allow the fulfilment of any remaining conditions
- call for a team of 2 people from the initial review team to visit the institution a second time, at the cost of the institution, to determine 'on the ground' whether the condition has, in practice, been fulfilled or is close to fulfilment
- in extreme cases, withdraw the conditional accreditation. If this should be the Board's decision, the institution has available to it the same courses of action to redeem matters as an institution not granted accreditation at the original decision (see below).

Where the decision is not to grant accreditation, clear reasons should be given. An institution is free to re-apply for accreditation after a period of one year. In such a case, a new self-evaluation document is required (but may be largely focussed upon how the institution has addressed the previous reasons for withholding accreditation) and a new Team will be assembled.

## **11.3 Decision-making process**

### **11.3.1 MusiQuE quality enhancement reviews**

Before authorising the communication of the report to the institution, the MusiQuE Board reviews the report for overall consistency with, and relevance to, the review standards and, provided it is satisfied on these counts, endorses the report. It is the responsibility of the Board to investigate with the Review Team where concerns of consistency arise.

In case of differences between the positions of Board members and of the Review Team, the Review Team Chair (or another member of the Review Team if the Chair is unavailable) will be invited to express the opinion of the Review Team by means such as a Skype session where open questions will be discussed.

As the Board members will need to feel fully informed about the situation, the Board may therefore decide to go back to the Review Team and/or MusiQuE staff to request more information, either immediately by email or by the following Board meeting.

### **11.3.2 MusiQuE accreditation procedures**

The MusiQuE Board will consider each final report written in the framework of accreditation procedures and will take the final formal decision on the accreditation of the institution/programme/joint programme based on the proposal of the Review Team (see 11.1.3).

The Board will check if the justifications listed by the review team for each standard support the level of compliance with each standard.

In case of differences between the positions of Board members and of the Review Team, the Review Team Chair (or a member of the Review Team if the Chair is unavailable) will be invited to express the opinion of the Review Team.

If they are to make a decision differing from the recommendation of the Review Team, the Board members will need to feel fully informed about the situation. The Board may therefore decide to go back to the Review Team and/or MusiQuE staff to request more information, either immediately by email or by the following Board meeting.

Where the Board is in agreement with the Review Team's recommendation, the decision on accreditation is made by simple majority. Where the Board feels it necessary to modify the Team's recommendation, it is normally necessary for its decision to be unanimous.

#### **11.4 Publication of results**

In line with the Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG), all reports have to be published in full.

An electronic copy of the whole report is uploaded to the MusiQuE website (page [Completed Reviews](#)) at the end of the procedure (i.e. for Quality Enhancement reviews: when the final report is sent to the institution; for accreditation procedures, when the entire process, including possible monitoring actions in relation to conditions identified by the Review Team, is completed).

The institution is entitled to use the summary of the report's findings, or extracts from it, in any responsible way that it sees fit – as part of the evidence base for formal quality assurance procedures or, where relevant, in its own institutional publicity.