

## **14 Quality Assurance of MusiQuE and its procedures**

As with any organisation that practises a policy of continuous quality enhancement, MusiQuE operates both internal and external quality assurance procedures, the former being integrated into its everyday working and the latter being implemented at periodic intervals.

### **14.1 Internal quality assurance**

The key focus of internal quality assurance for MusiQuE is upon its review procedures: how they are run, how they are perceived by institutions and by Review Teams and how they can be improved. MusiQuE employs a variety of feedback mechanisms and, on an annual basis, draws up a report informed by this feedback so that its actions to implement continuous enhancement are transparent and readily available to interested parties.

#### **14.1.1 Feedback mechanisms**

Once the final report has been sent to the institution by the MusiQuE Board, feedback questionnaires are sent by the MusiQuE staff to the reviewed institutions as well as to the reviewers.

Questionnaires addressed to reviewed institutions aim at collecting feedback on:

- The institutional experience of producing the documentation (number of persons involved in the production of the self-evaluation report, ownership of the process, difficulty in collating the documentation, relevance of the questions to the institution/programme, usefulness of the self-evaluation questions and process, usefulness of the MusiQuE material, etc.)
- the composition, efficiency and professionalism of the Review Team
- the clarity of the report
- the relationship of the MusiQuE procedure to the national accreditation context and framework

Questionnaires addressed to Review team members aim at collecting feedback on:

- the adequacy and usefulness of the documentation produced by the institution and of the supporting material provided by MusiQuE
- the composition of the Review Team, the allocation of tasks within the team and the relevance of the briefing received
- the relevance and clarity of the MusiQuE standards
- communication with the other review team members and with the institutions' representatives
- the post-review process
- language issues

Once every year, the MusiQuE staff compiles all results of the questionnaires and makes an analysis of any trends discernible in these results. The results and their analysis are then considered by the Board, which also has access, if required, to the original questionnaires. The Board then decides on any actions that it believes should be undertaken to improve the review system and, where applicable, to fine-tune the standards themselves. Where action is proposed, this is fed into the review process for procedures and standards described in 6.1.

The MusiQuE staff is responsible for alerting the MusiQuE Board independently of the standard annual process if answers given by the peer-reviewers to the feedback questionnaire reveal issues within the Review Team or in relation to the attitude of one of the reviewers. Where such a situation arises, the following procedure applies:

- Members of the MusiQuE Board will be tasked to investigate the matter further by contacting the respondent to the questionnaire, and possibly other members of the Review Team concerned, in order to understand the issue.
- A report will be made by the Board member, either verbally at the following Board meeting or by email.
- Where there is found to be an issue, action will be taken to prevent another occurrence of the problematic situation. The Board may, for example, decide to add notes in the Register of peer-reviewers concerning relationships between some reviewers, who should not serve together on the same team again; it may act to remind a peer-reviewer of his/her obligations in relation to the guidelines and Code of Conduct; or, if the issue warrants this, it may even ask a peer-reviewer to withdraw from the Register.

#### **14.1.2 Annual Report**

The MusiQuE Board is in charge of producing and publishing an annual report on all its activities for the year, noting any good practice observed and identifying any areas where it believes beneficial changes might be made. It will be as complete and transparent as possible, but where elements of the internal report might raise issues of confidentiality, it will be edited with a view to its being appropriate for publication on the MusiQuE website.

The annual reports produced by the MusiQuE Board will form an important part of the evidence trail scrutinised by the External Evaluator (see below) and used in the compilation of the self-evaluation report that the MusiQuE Board will prepare as part of periodic external reviews.

### **14.2 External quality assurance**

#### **14.2.1 External Evaluator**

An external evaluator is appointed by the MusiQuE Board to review material documenting MusiQuE's activity, and especially the annual report. The evaluator should be independent of the operations of MusiQuE and may come from within or outside the music education sector.

The external evaluator is appointed for 2 years, and is in charge of producing an annual evaluation report with comments addressed to the Board. Where relevant, the annual report produced in the following year by the Board will make reference to recommendations from the previous External Evaluator's report and how these have been addressed.

#### **14.2.2 External reviews**

MusiQuE wants to be accountable to its users and stakeholders. For this purpose, MusiQuE undergoes an external review every five years, in line with the Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG). This external review will also aim at being listed on the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR). The MusiQuE Board is in charge of preparing for external reviews.