

PEER REVIEW METHODOLOGY (D.T 2.5.3)

Introduction

The aim behind peer reviewing is to support and mentor the less experienced partners in establishing sites and offers in the framework of the Route of Reformation by offering them advice and help provided by the more experienced partners within the consortium.

Every partner shall take full advantage of the European cultural route.

Since there is no allocation of personnel costs for carrying out the peer reviews (only travelling costs) the process has to be short and effective for both parties.

Step 1: Selection of reviewers¹

- Description of a reviewer´s profile (skills and tasks)
- Survey and invitation for nominating reviewers: Who is willing to? Who is able to? Who has which skills and competences?
- List including a short description of every reviewer.

→ **See the additional document “Annex 1: Profile Reviewing Team”.**

Step 2: Selection of reviewees

- Survey of regions/partners that need and want support by peer reviewing: Who is willing to receive peer reviews? Which competences are needed? Which reviewers would be preferred?
- List including a short description of every region concerning their needs.

→ **See the additional document “Annex 2: Information Request_Peer Reviewing”**

¹ The term „reviewer“ not necessarily means a single person, in fact it should be a reviewing team.

Step 3: Matching

The crucial issue will be to find the right reviewer/reviewing team for each region/reviewee. It's not only competences and skills that count but also personal acceptance of each other's.

There are at least two possible ways of matching:

- a. Based on the two lists the reviewees contact their preferred reviewer directly.
- b. A task force elaborates suggestions for the matching of reviewee and reviewer.

Anyway the coordinating institution (SPES) will have to know who collaborates with whom.

Step 4: Exchange of information

Before the reviewers visit to the site, both sides should exchange information about

- the status quo of RoR's development in the region and the process so far,
- important stakeholders involved and
- concrete challenges in presence and future.

A checklist will be provided to make sure that all relevant information can be provided.

→ See the additional document "Annex 3: Preparation of Peer Review"

Step 5: Peer reviewing on the spot

The following is a suggestion for a full 2-days review. Given the fact that there is no budget for personnel costs it may occur that the two parties agree on a condensed 1-day review which means that analysis issues should be dealt with beforehand.

Day 1: Arrival and informal get together. First introduction to relevant people and the region, including its project.

Day 2: Visit to the (planned) site. Stakeholder dialogues on challenges. Problem analysis. Clear definition of goals. Exchange of experience.

Day 3: Workshop on necessary future tasks to reach the defined goals with selected project group. Elaboration of a work breakdown structure.

Day 4: Departure.

Step 6: Reporting

Not only reporting about the peer review itself will be interesting but also a kind of ex-post evaluation of the changes and achievements caused by the reviewing process.

The report on the peer review should include topics like

- starting situation,
- goals for the peer review,
- measures undertaken during the review,
- methods and settings applied,
- workplan for the future,
- way of supervision after finishing the on-site review.

→ See the additional document “Annex 4: D.T2.5.4 Template Peer Review Report”

Step 7: Ex-post evaluation (optional)

An ex-post evaluation can deal with questions like:

- Which of the measures had been carried out, and which not (reasons for that)?
- Which effects, which impact did those measures have on what and whom?
- Are the goals still relevant? If yes to what extent the goals have been reached (%)?
- Which experiences and lessons learned can be provided to potential new members of RoR?

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Profile Reviewing Team

PROFILE OF REVIEWING TEAM

as part of the Peer Review Methodology (D.T2.5.3)

Project index number and acronym	CE81, ECRR
Lead partner	Rural Association for Development ThLG
Responsible partner for D. T2.5.3	Upper Austrian Tourism Board (PP 12)

Team constellation	The reviewing team should consist of 3-4 experts from at least one other partner within the consortium. A peer review coordinator will be nominated within the team.
Demands	The team should cover the required experiences and competences as indicated by the reviewed partner (see questionnaire submitted before).

Required skills, attitudes and competencies for the reviewing process

The reviewing team...

- should be fluent in English,
- should have good communication skills (use appropriate questioning techniques, active listening, appreciative language),
- should act in an attitude of supportive curiosity,
- should frankly provide the expertise needed by the reviewed partner,
- should be able to spend three to four days on the reviewing process (two days for travelling, one or two days for reviewing).

Tasks of the reviewing team

The reviewing team should address following tasks:

- Analyse the material delivered before the date of the on-site-review (see preparatory checklist), especially the information about efforts concerning the installation of the Route of Reformation.
- Attend meetings and discussions with regional stakeholders on site.
- Perform field visits in order to assess the status quo of the Route of Reformation in the reviewed region.
- Use the provided guidelines and templates in order to make sure that the different reviewing processes can be compared and assessed.
- Produce a report including a SWOT analysis and recommendations for the future development of the reviewed region.

Tasks of the peer review coordinator

In preparation of the peer review:

- Act as the contact point between the reviewing team, the hosting partner and the responsible task leader (PP 12).
- Collect suggestions for the design of the on-site review and communicate them with his team and the hosting region.

During the peer review:

- Ensure that the team asks the relevant questions and respects the skills, attitudes and competencies as mentioned above.
- Organize short meetings of reflecting the reviewing process constantly.

After the peer review:

- Finalise the report together with the reviewed region and deliver it PP 12.

Annex 2: Information Request_Peer Reviewing

INFORMATION REQUEST

Peer Review Process

July 31st 2018

Dear Partners!

In order to develop a good and sound peer review methodology I would like to ask you to fill in this questionnaire until **September 15th 2018**. It should help us in matching the right reviewers for the reviewed regions/partners. Thank you for your efforts and help!

1. People of our region (or members of our network) who are willing and able to act as a reviewer within ECRR:

Name:

Institution/organization:

Role within ECRR/RoR:

Expertise (please mark):

<input type="checkbox"/> Science	<input type="checkbox"/> management	<input type="checkbox"/> politics
<input type="checkbox"/> (religious) history	<input type="checkbox"/> volunteering	<input type="checkbox"/> marketing
<input type="checkbox"/> fundraising	<input type="checkbox"/> regional management	<input type="checkbox"/> tourism
<input type="checkbox"/> arts	<input type="checkbox"/> public & stakeholder participation	<input type="checkbox"/> facility management
<input type="checkbox"/> others (please fill in a short description):		

Contact data²:

Name:

Institution/organization:

Role within ECRR/RoR:

Expertise (please mark):

<input type="checkbox"/> Science	<input type="checkbox"/> management	<input type="checkbox"/> politics
<input type="checkbox"/> (religious) history	<input type="checkbox"/> volunteering	<input type="checkbox"/> marketing

² Contact data will be used to build the reviewing teams and to allow both sides (reviewers and reviewees) to get in contact before the on-site-review.

<input type="checkbox"/> fundraising	<input type="checkbox"/> regional management	<input type="checkbox"/> tourism
<input type="checkbox"/> arts	<input type="checkbox"/> public & stakeholder participation	<input type="checkbox"/> facility management
<input type="checkbox"/> others (please fill in a short description):		

Contact data:

Name:

Institution/organization:

Role within ECRR/RoR:

Expertise (please mark):

<input type="checkbox"/> Science	<input type="checkbox"/> management	<input type="checkbox"/> politics
<input type="checkbox"/> (religious) history	<input type="checkbox"/> volunteering	<input type="checkbox"/> marketing
<input type="checkbox"/> fundraising	<input type="checkbox"/> regional management	<input type="checkbox"/> tourism
<input type="checkbox"/> arts	<input type="checkbox"/> public & stakeholder participation	<input type="checkbox"/> facility management
<input type="checkbox"/> others (please fill in a short description):		

Contact data:

2. Specific situations in our region/our project that we would like to be reviewed:

A review by experienced colleagues would support us in following concerns (please mark):

<input type="checkbox"/> our project/situation in general	<input type="checkbox"/> management of our project and organisational issues
<input type="checkbox"/> marketing strategies and tools	<input type="checkbox"/> building up a network of stakeholders
<input type="checkbox"/> fundraising campaigns & financing	<input type="checkbox"/> involving politicians and public bodies
<input type="checkbox"/> enforce public participation and raise awareness	<input type="checkbox"/> involving church and its councils
<input type="checkbox"/> historical knowledge and background	<input type="checkbox"/> restoration of historical buildings
<input type="checkbox"/> others (please fill in a short description):	

Further remarks, comments or specifications:

Thank you for your support!

Annex 3: Preparation of Peer Review

PREPARATION OF THE PEER REVIEW

as part of the Peer Review Methodology (D.T2.5.3)

Short Checklist

Project index number and acronym	CE81, ECRR
Lead partner	Rural Association for Development ThLG
Responsible partner for D. T2.5.3	Upper Austrian Tourism Board (PP 12)

ECRR and Routes of Reformation: information on the status quo

- Information on regional (reformatory) history and geographical features as long as they are relevant for the peer review.
- Which goals had been developed as basis for the work and process within ECRR before the project started?
- Steps undertaken (milestones) in the frame of ECRR to implement the Route of Reformation (RoR) in the region?
- Stakeholders reached so far and ways of addressing them (stakeholder mapping, stakeholder management)? Who of them became members of The RoR?
- Actions of marketing and promotion performed so far.

Requirements for the peer review

The peer review should cover at least the following issues (provided by the hosts):

- Which results do we expect from the reviewing process?
- Which specific questions shall be examined within the peer review?
- Which challenges do we expect for the future and how to deal with them?
- Any other things we would like to tell the reviewing team beforehand?

Organisational issues

- Fix a date for the on-site review.
- Fix an agenda for the two-days-visit (meetings with relevant stakeholder, visits to sites, time for reflecting the reviewing process etc.).
- Book rooms and meeting venues.
- Care for meals and provisions.

Annex 4: D.T2.5.4 Template Peer Review Report

TEMPLATE

Peer Review Report (D.T2.5.4)

Project index number and acronym	CE81, ECRR
Lead partner	Rural Association for Development ThLG
Reviewed partner and region	Partner: Region: People present during the reviewing process:
Reviewing team	
Date of the peer review	xx.yy.zzzz

Summary description of the status quo concerning the regional project within ECRR.

Goals defined for the peer reviewing process.

Short description of the peer review's process and the progress achieved during the review.

Short description of different methods and settings applied.

Outline of future measures and tasks to enhance capacities as a result of the peer review.

Common impression and feedback of the peer review in general (Is the method useful and applicable? What should be improved?)