9   The Review Team

9.1   Composition of Review Teams

For each Review, the MusiQuE staff and the institution agree on the areas of expertise needed according to the specificities of the institution/programme (for example: expertise in jazz, expertise in early music, etc.) and on the number of reviewers needing to be appointed to conduct the review appropriately.

9.1.1 Number of reviewers on the Review Team

Normally, there will be a minimum of 4 members in a Review Team, including the Chair and the student member. However, the number of members may vary depending on the size and range of the institution and on the scope of the review (programme, multiple programmes, institutional, etc.).

9.1.2 Areas of expertise needed in the Review Team

A review/accreditation team should have sufficient expertise, experience and overall balance to cover all aspects of the review and/or accreditation task. Such expertise will normally include institutional management and governance, artistic and academic management and artistic and professional experience, each at an appropriate level. Knowledge of the country-specific system of higher music education and of the legislation applicable in that country will be addressed where possible and as appropriate.

9.1.3 International dimension

Normally, all reviewers, with the exception of the student, will be, or have been, professionally active principally outside the country in which the institution is located although, as indicated above, some familiarity with the national system of that country among the Review Team is desirable.

Except in rare cases, the language of the review will be English. Reviewers should normally therefore have a good basic proficiency in reading, understanding, speaking and, preferably, writing in English. Key documents provided by the institution or, at least, crucial sections of longer documents should be available in English and, where necessary, should be translated to a professional standard.

At the same time, it is essential that institutional representatives have the opportunity to express themselves in the language of the country where the review is being conducted. It is therefore recommended that the Review Team include at least one member who is able to understand/speak the language in question. In cases where it is felt necessary, the institution will be asked to hire a translator.

For further discussion of language arrangements, see 10.5.1.

9.1.4 Appointment procedures

9.1.4.1   Appointment of peer reviewers

When composing suitable review teams, MusiQuE staff will always begin by selecting peers already listed on the Register who have appropriate expertise. Depending on the national regulations, institutions/programmes may also suggest candidates for the review team and participate in the discussion on the Review Team's composition. Whenever appropriate (e.g. for Quality Enhancement Reviews), a team may also

include a novice/freshman/newcomer in order to allow for an element of training/learning-by-doing to take place. Under such circumstances, care will be taken to ensure that there is a correspondingly high level of experience elsewhere in the team.

The proposed composition of a Review Team will take into account a wide range of factors: the number of peers needed, the areas of expertise identified by the institution, the profiles of the peers (level of experience in reviewing institutions, languages spoken, etc.) as well as gender balance. More emphasis will be put on the collective level of competence and experience of the team than on individual competences and experiences.

The proposal submitted to the MusiQuE Board should include at least three names for each type of expertise identified, in order to ensure that other reviewers can be contacted quickly if the preferred one is unavailable. It will also indicate clearly the individuals thought suitable to take on the role of chair. The order in which the reviewers should be contacted may either be proposed by the MusiQuE staff or left to the discretion of the Board.

The Board members agree on the final proposed composition of the Review Team either during their regular meetings or by email, depending on the timeframe of the review procedure. In the case of email processes, Board members are asked to send their comments within one week. In the event of contradictory views, the Chair of the Board is asked to make the final decision.

9.1.4.2   Appointment of students

Students are recruited, whenever possible, from the country in which the reviewed institution is situated, in order to facilitate their understanding of the higher education system being considered.

The MusiQuE staff will usually contact representatives of other higher music education institutions in the country, asking them to recommend students. The MusiQuE staff will be provided with the CV of one or more students, either via direct contact or through the person(s) recommending the student(s).

Students should:
- Be proficient in English (minimum C1 on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages[12]) or in another language in the rare cases where the language of the procedure will be other than English
- Be enrolled on a programme at least at the level of studies being considered during the review (e.g. the student recruited for a review concerning Bachelor programmes will be enrolled on a Bachelor, Master's or Doctoral programme)
- Ideally, be involved in the student association/union/other equivalent body in their institution and, as a result, be experienced in representing other students in decision-making processes
- Be critical, solution-oriented and open-minded to various perspectives and methods

---

[12] See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/CADRE1_EN.asp.

- If possible, have had experience abroad (project, course, ERASMUS year, etc.) during their studies

The MusiQuE staff may contact students by phone to explore if these elements are met. The students' CV(s) is/are then submitted to the MusiQuE Board for approval. The order in which the students will be contacted (if relevant) might be proposed by the MusiQuE staff or left to the decision of the Board.

9.1.5 Procedures to prevent conflicts of interest

A conflict of interest may arise from past, current or planned association between an expert and members of the institution. It is the responsibility of all parties (MusiQuE, the reviewers and the institution) to make an immediate disclosure should they become aware of a potential conflict of interest.

9.1.5.1 Questionnaire to peers invited to join Review Teams

Once the proposed composition of the Review team has been agreed upon by the MusiQuE Board, the MusiQuE staff will then contact reviewers to invite them to participate in the review. This invitation will include a short questionnaire on conflict of interest which reviewers are asked to fill in and sign. This questionnaire comprises the following questions:

- Are you related to, or in conflict with, staff members of the institution to be reviewed?
- Have you ever been employed at the institution to be reviewed?
- Are you in negotiations to obtain future employment at the institution to be reviewed?
- Are you involved in any formalised joint cooperation with the institution to be reviewed?
- Do you have any other issues which could potentially create conflicts of interest?

In cases of doubt, where a connection of some sort is acknowledged but is either slight or well in the past, the MusiQuE Board will be consulted as to whether it disqualifies the individual.

At this invitation stage, prospective reviewers will also be asked to agree with the code of conduct (see below).

9.1.5.2 Consultation of the institution

Once the proposal for Review Team is complete and approved by the MusiQuE Board, it is sent to the institution by the MusiQuE staff for information. The institution is asked to point out any potential conflict of interest from its own perspective and can ask that a reviewer be taken out of the list, if duly justified. In cases when the institution has been involved in the discussions on the Review Team's composition (depending on the national regulations), such a consultation is not applicable.

9.1.6 Inviting potential members of the Review Team

The MusiQuE staff then proceeds to inviting by email the various Review Team members in the order approved by the MusiQuE Board. The invitation message presents the visit and its context, and the invitation includes:

- A briefing paper mentioning the dates of the site-visit, the type of review to be conducted, the working language, the planned composition of the Review Team, an overview of the responsibilities of the Review Team members, a summarised timeframe for the review procedure, information on expenses and honorarium, as well as links to the MusiQuE standards and procedures
- The letter from the institution requesting a review, which explains the reasons and context of the review
- The Guidelines and Code of Conduct of MusiQuE reviewers (see 9.2)
- The questionnaire to peers invited to join Review Teams, designed to point out any conflict of interest (see 9.1.5.1)

Depending on the availability of reviewers and on their answers to the questionnaire, the MusiQuE staff confirms their participation to the Review Team and starts arranging the Review Team members' travels. Once the Team is complete, the schedule designed by the institution following the MusiQuE template (see http://www.musique-qe.eu/documents/templates) is shared with the reviewers for comments. Closer to the site-visit, the Review Team receives the documentation from the institution, practical information, as well as meeting sheets to be used to prepare each meeting.

9.2 Roles, responsibilities and code of conduct

9.2.1 Roles and responsibilities of Review Team members

The duties of review and accreditation teams include the assessment of documentation provided by institutions, the undertaking of a visit to the institution and the production of a review report. The Team is composed of the Chair, the peers, the student and the secretary, whose respective responsibilities are outlined below.

9.2.1.1   The Chair is responsible for:

a) discussing with the Review Team members and agreeing the areas of enquiry (themes to be covered) for each meeting with the various institutional representatives
b) determining the running order of each meeting (the sequence in which Review Team members will pose their questions)
c) within meetings with institutional representatives:
   a. making introductions
   b. taking responsibility for the first section of each meeting - outlining areas of enquiry, etc.
   c. directing the order of proceedings
   d. running to time
   e. within time constraints, ensuring that all peers are able to pursue their areas of enquiry in full and that, where appropriate, they are enabled to provide input into other areas
   f. concluding each meeting in a positive manner, having first given the institutional representatives time to add any other relevant information and comments.
d) in the concluding summarising meeting, outlining the elements of good practice, recommendations and other important points arising from the review

e) answering the feedback questionnaire after the review and notifying the MusiQuE staff of any problem in relation to the peers' attitudes

9.2.1.2 Other reviewers (peers and student) are responsible for:

a) preparing adequately for the review (being familiar with the key documents from the institution and those from MusiQuE)
b) during the site visit:
   a. referring to documents or previous discussions as appropriate
   b. ensuring that they observe the order of proceedings as agreed with, and directed by, the Chair
   c. ensuring that their questions are focused on the pre-agreed areas of enquiry (themes to be covered) unless otherwise invited by the Chair
c) contributing to the final reviewers' report by assisting the Secretary to summarise the key outcomes of each meeting during the review, and by giving input on the first draft report after the review

9.2.1.3 The Secretary is responsible for:

a) the coordination of review preparations (team, material, schedule)
b) communicating with the institution and with the peers, before and after the review
c) conducting a briefing session for the peers during the first gathering of the Review Team
d) during the site-visit meetings
   a. writing minutes of each meeting,
   b. actively assisting the peers during Review Team meetings by providing overviews of issues discussed and of areas of enquiry still to be covered
   c. ensuring that the peers comment on all areas of enquiry in order to collect sufficient material for report writing
   d. coordinating the logistics in cooperation with the institution's representatives
   e. preparing the final meeting in collaboration with the Chair and team members using tools provided
e) writing the first draft of the experts report, based on the peers' comments

9.2.2 Code of conduct for Review Team members

At the time of first contacting potential Review team members, all those responding positively are asked to confirm that they subscribe to the Code of Conduct for Review Team members. This states that all Review Team members should:
a) be free of conflicts of interest (confirmed in greater detail via a questionnaire)
b) handle all data with the outmost confidentiality
c) ensure that a fruitful dialogue takes place during the site visit
d) avoid referring to their own (institutional) experience, as well as giving informal advice and feedback, unless by permission of the Chair
e) respect the local culture of the institution
f) avoid voicing any directly comparative value judgment during the meetings (be it negative or positive)
g) avoid interruptions of colleagues or institutional participants, leaving time for the latter to have their say
h) consider the internal objectives and strategies of the institution in addition to the QA/accreditation standard (rather than the QA/accreditation standards only)

i) consider the relationship between all aspects examined (such as facilities, teaching, research)
j) reference the evidence they provide in careful and specific terms (e.g. by mentioning "students met by the Committee" instead of just "students").