**QUINQUENNIAL REVIEW**

**Review Pa****nel Report Template**

**Introduction**The following guidance confirms the University’s expectations of the Review Panel and provides a template that should form the basis of the Review Panel Report. The Faculty Manager (or nominee) will decide when, where, and how to present information and reflections on the wider activities of the Department, which may not fit within this template..

The first draft of the Review Panel report should be circulated to Review Panel members within two weeks of the Review having taken place. Comments from the Review Panel members should be returned within a further two weeks. The final report should be circulated to the Department to check for factual accuracies and to provide an initial response via the Report of Action Taken in Response to Recommendations four weeks after the Review.

The rationale for these timings is to ensure that the memory of the Review Panel members is recent, to aid those contributing to the report, and to resolve any points of uncertainty with the Department within recent memory of the meetings that took place between the Review Panel and the Department Management Team. A fast turnaround of the Report also enables the Department to start working on their recommendations shortly after the Review and subsequently offers an opportunity for a demonstrable action plan to be presented to Faculty Academic Committees and Quality Assurance Committee.

**To enable the fast production of the report, Faculty Managers are asked to ensure that Panel Managers schedule their review activity for four days, therefore protecting time to produce the report shortly after the meeting and to allow time for review and reflection on the draft and discussion with the Panel Convener, before circulation to Panel Members.** The Panel Manager may also wish to consider introducing an observer to the meetings to provide additional support in preparing the report following the conclusion of the Panel Review meetings. This might also be helpful in considering contingency plans in the event of unforeseen absence and for succession planning.

Following completion of the Review Panel report, the *Report of Action Taken in Response to Recommendations* form, (see [Appendix G](#AppG)), must be partially completed and then sent to the Department for completion.

Both the Review Panel Report and the Report of Action Taken in Response to Recommendations form, must be submitted to Quality Assurance Committee **by 1 June each year, at the latest**.

**Template for the Learning & Teaching Section of Review Panel Report**

**Section A: Quinquennial Review Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Faculty** |  |
| **Department** |  |
| **List of Programmes[[1]](#footnote-1)** |  |
| **Date of Review** |  |
| **Date of Previous Review** |  |

**Section B: Review Panel Membership**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Name/Role/Department (if internal)** |
| **Panel Convener** |  |
| **External Panel Members** |  |
| **Student Member** |  |
| **Faculty Representatives[[2]](#footnote-2)** |  |
| **Representative from another Faculty** |  |
| **Representative from Professional Services** |  |
| **Panel Manager** |  |

**Section C: Documentation Submitted to the Review Panel[[3]](#footnote-3)**

|  |
| --- |
| **Document** |
|  |

**Section D: Overview of Findings**

The Review Panel is pleased to confirm to the Quality Assurance Committee that it has confidence in the quality and standards of the learning and teaching provision under review. The panel was pleased to confirm that the characteristics and learning outcomes for the programme were valid. Furthermore, they were confident that the learning outcomes were being met and appropriate standards being attained in light of external reference points such as QAA benchmarks and PSRBs (where appropriate). The Review Panel therefore recommends that those programmes are considered under validation, which should continue until revaluation at the next Quinquennial Review. Areas where the Review Panel has identified scope for improvement and enhancement are specified in the recommendations.

*Or (exceptionally)*

The Review Panel does not have confidence that the quality or standards of the provision meets acceptable levels for the University. Essential action is required to address significant shortfalls, as specified in the recommendations. The Review Panel recommends that Quality Assurance Committee establish measures to give urgent consideration to the outcomes of this review before the next intake of students.

**Section E: Main Report on Learning & Teaching**

Each section below includes embedded guidance in the form of questions, that Review Panels should consider when completing the report.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Programme Aims**   Are the aims and intended learning outcomes of the degree programmes:   * as stated in the programme specifications? * clear and appropriate? * fully communicated to students, staff, and examiners? * informed by the [Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework](https://scqf.org.uk/)? |
| **Commendations** |
| **Recommendations** |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Curriculum Design**   Are the degree programmes coherent, and of appropriate breadth and scope?  Is there evidence that content and design are informed by recent developments in teaching and learning, by up-to date scholarship in the discipline, and by relevant professional or occupational requirements?  What evidence is there that students are encouraged to engage in curriculum development discussions?  Does the curriculum provide all students with the opportunity to achieve, and to demonstrate achievement of the intended learning outcomes in terms of:   * knowledge and understanding * intellectual skills * practical skills * transferable skills and to experience an inclusive and supportive learning environment? |
| **Commendations** |
| **Recommendations** |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Information Provided to Students**   Are programme regulations up to date?  Are there effective arrangements for admission and induction, which are generally understood by staff and applicants?  How effective is the communication of information to students generally within the Department? How well do students think communication is working?  Is there effective liaison between the academic staff and professional services? |
| **Commendations:** |
| **Recommendations:** |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Learning Support for Students**   Is there appropriate academic support for students, including written guidance, which is consistent with the student profile and the overall aims of the degree programmes?  Is the collective expertise of the academic staff suitable for effective delivery of the curricula and for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes?  Are there suitable resources in terms of teaching accommodation, equipment, library stocks and IT facilities, and are these deployed in an effective manner? |
| **Commendations** |
| **Recommendations** |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Assessment**   Are assessment strategies clear?  Are assessment criteria effectively communicated to students?  Does the assessment design and process enable students to demonstrate achievement of the intended learning outcomes?  Does the Department offer a suitable mix of assessment types to balance programmes? How does the Department avoid students being over-assessed? How innovative is the Department in its approach to assessing students?  How satisfied are students with the timeliness and quality of feedback on assessment? If there are challenges, what is the Department doing to address these?  If appropriate, the Review Panel may want to consider whether it would be helpful to recommend that the Department undertakes a TESTA activity. |
| **Commendations** |
| **Recommendations** |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Quality and Standards**   How effective are the Department/School’s procedures for monitoring and evaluating the programme, and for identifying risks and maintaining standards?  Does the Department make appropriate use of management information (statistical data, External Examiners’ reports, student evaluations, student representation, student surveys including the National Student Survey where relevant)?  How effective are the arrangements for reacting to the views of External Examiners and of employers/professional bodies?  What are the potential risks to the quality of programme provision over the next five-year period (e.g., trends in demand, competitor programmes, changes in professional expectations, funding priorities)?  NB: If the programme is subject to accreditation by a professional accrediting body, then additional criteria and questions may be incorporated into the Review process, provided that the core areas specified by the University are covered, and the additional criteria are made clear to the Panel in advance. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Student Engagement**   How is student feedback and evaluation collected and used by the Department?  How effective are the Staff Student Liaison Committees and the student representative systems operating within the Department?  What evidence is there to suggest that the Department updates students on its responses to their feedback and actions taken?  What evidence is there that the Department works in partnership with students to resolve challenges and develop its academic provision, i.e., through curriculum development in partnership? |
| **Commendations:** |
| **Recommendations** |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Additional Reflections**     Use this section for any additional reflections and findings relating to learning & teaching that are not covered by the categories above. |
| **Commendations:** |
| **Recommendations** |

1. If there are a significant number of programmes within the Department append this information to the Review Panel Report [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. From within the Faculty but situated in a different Department [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. If the list of documents is long, append this information to the Review Panel Report [↑](#footnote-ref-3)