

INTERNAL REVIEW: POLICY, PROCEDURE AND GUIDELINES

| Version No. | Description | Author | Approval | Effective Date |
|-------------|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1.1 | Internal Review: Policy, Procedure and Guidelines | Education Enhancement, SEES | Senate (14 September 2015) | 15 September 2015 |
| 1.2 | Internal Review: Policy, Procedure and Guidelines | Education Enhancement, SEES | Senate (November 2018) | September 2018-19 |

13/9/2018

Version 1.2

the place of useful learning

The University of Strathclyde is a charitable body, registered in Scotland, number SC015263

University of Strathclyde

Internal Review: Policy, Procedure and Guidelines

Introduction

The key purpose of the University of Strathclyde's Internal Review process is to provide a mechanism for the review of a Department, School or Faculty's learning and teaching, in the context of complementary aspects such as research and knowledge exchange, management and resources with the aim of producing a report which is a balanced account of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, including commendations and recommendations.

The review process is consistent with, and meets the requirements of, Scottish Funding Council guidance, as detailed in the QAA Handbook for Enhancement-led Institutional Review. Given the primary responsibility of Departments/Schools/Faculties for the quality of provision and the maintenance of academic standards, the rolling programme of internal (subject area) reviews is a major element of the University's quality assurance and enhancement strategy. Each Review includes scrutiny of all credit-bearing provision at undergraduate and postgraduate level for all modes of study, including any collaborative provision in those areas, CPD and continuing education provision, as well as supervision of postgraduate research students.

The University of Strathclyde has, to date, adopted an holistic approach to Reviews, in order to ensure that Learning and Teaching, Research, Knowledge Exchange, Organisation and Management, Resources and Strategic Planning and the intrinsic links between each are given full consideration. The University will retain this approach for the foreseeable future; however, the latest revisions to the policy and procedure have been introduced to:

- (i) ensure alignment with the UK Quality Code for HE to reflect revisions to [Chapter B8: Programme Monitoring and Review](#) which was updated in October 2013;
- (ii) strengthen the scrutiny of Learning and Teaching across the institution in the context of holistic review;
- (iii) reflect internal and external drivers as well as statutory requirements;
- (iv) provide Departments/Schools with additional help in understanding students' experiences of assessment and feedback through the TESTA process.

In order to strengthen the existing approach, a revised documentation set will be provided to Internal Review Panels to enable them to:

- assess the quality assurance and enhancement of the Department/School's academic provision;
- assess the extent of engagement with appropriate learning and teaching, professional and research networks.
- understand the structure of the department and how it is managed;
- as context, gain an understanding of resource distribution;
- assess the alignment of the Department/School's strategy with the University's Strategic Plan and with supporting the Faculty and Departmental plans;
- test the strength and validity of decisions taken by the Department/School on targets and priorities;
- assess the extent of collaboration in both research and learning and teaching at all levels;
- assess departmental performance against that of benchmark departments and institutions;
- question how the Department/School has responded to issues raised by external bodies;
- assess the Department/School's contribution to Knowledge Exchange;

Internal Review of Learning and Teaching is an essential pillar of our institutional quality assurance and enhancement activities. This policy underlines the priority of Learning and Teaching within our wider institutional context of holistic review.

INTERNAL REVIEWS

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| POLICY | 3 |
| 1. Process of Review | 3 |
| <i>Frequency</i> | 3 |
| <i>Scope and Coverage</i> | 3 |
| <i>Membership of the Review Panel</i> | 4 |
| <i>Timetable</i> | |
| <i>Duration</i> | 5 |
| <i>Reporting</i> | 6 |
| <i>Follow-up</i> | 6 |
| | |
| PROCEDURE AND GUIDELINES | 7 |
| | |
| 2. Documentation | |
| 3. Scope and content of the Self-Assessment Document | |
| 4. Reviewer Checklist | |
| | |
| GUIDANCE | 16 |
| | |
| 5. Briefing for Review Panel members including roles and responsibilities | |
| 6. Briefing of Departmental / School participants | |
| 7. Guidance for meetings with Student representatives | |
| 8. Guidance on how to complete the Self-Assessment Document | |
| 9. Selection of Student Panel Members | |
| 10. Contextual Elements of Teaching and Learning Review | |

INTERNAL REVIEW POLICY

1. Process of Review

Frequency

- 1.1 The University expects each Department / School to be reviewed by the appropriate Faculty at least once every five years.

Scope and Coverage

- 1.2 Faculties should take an holistic approach to Internal Review giving full consideration to the following:
- i. Learning and Teaching: to review the undergraduate and postgraduate teaching offered by the Department to ascertain that courses are being offered in appropriate areas and delivered to an acceptably high standard appropriate to their objectives and levels and provide assurance about the quality of educational provision and the standards of academic awards.
 - ii. Management and Organisation: to review the management and organisation of the Department, including communications and business structure (e.g. committees, management groups) and the leadership provided by that management, so as to identify its strengths and how it might be improved.
 - iii. Research: to review research performance and the management of research activity in the Department and confirm that good practices are being adopted for the supervision and career development of academic staff, research students and research assistants.
 - iv. Knowledge Exchange: to review the management of knowledge exchange activity in the Department and confirm that appropriate knowledge exchange opportunities are being pursued.
 - v. Resources: to review the resources of the Department, their management and their distribution, to see if they are sufficient and managed in such a way as to allow the Department to sustain its activities.
 - vi. Strategic Planning: to review with the Department progress towards the Department's Plan, its fit with the University Strategic Plan and Faculty Plan, likely developments during the next five years including succession planning, and attempt to identify issues that would benefit from being drawn to the University's attention at this time.

Membership of the Review Panel

- 1.3 The Panel will be chaired by a Dean of Faculty or nominee and will comprise the following members:
- i. Two Faculty representatives from outwith the Department under review (one professorial, one non-professorial);

- ii. At least two assessors external to the University, including one assessor from outside Scotland;
- iii. At least one member (but not normally more than two members) from another Faculty and, where relevant, one senior member (APS 7 or above) of Professional Services. The choice of areas will be determined by the Department's links (past and present) and will vary according to the Department being reviewed;
- iv. One student member from another Department within the University (details of selection and training arranged in conjunction with USSA are appended);
- v. Panel Secretary – typically the relevant Faculty Officer.

The student member will be an equal member of the review panel, but it may be necessary for some issues where sensitive matters relating to particular individuals are to be discussed to be dealt with as Reserved Business. The student member would not be present for discussion of Reserved Business.

Timetable for the Review

- 1.4 It is anticipated that all internal reviews should reflect the following indicative timetable as far as possible:

| | |
|---|--|
| TESTA participation (see below) | Prior academic year (~12 months before review) |
| Schedule approximate review date | At least 6 months in advance to be confirmed by final meeting of QAC in the preceding academic year |
| Preparation of preliminary documentation | should start at least three months before submission date |
| Submission of preliminary documentation for panel circulation | six weeks before the date of the review |
| Structured preliminary Meeting | three weeks before the date of the Review |
| Pre-Review Meeting to share initial findings re targeted reading and finalise areas for exploration | evening prior to or morning of Review |
| Review Programme | At least one full or two half days, or more (depending on the scale of the Review) including a tour of the Department if appropriate |
| Post-Review Meeting | Mid-afternoon of final day of Review for Panel to consider and record findings |
| Post-Review Meeting to agree findings and initial feedback to Department | Immediately or shortly following Review |
| Draft report | within 4 weeks of the Review |
| Response from HoD / HoS | within 2 weeks |
| Final Report | should be submitted to next Faculty Board of Study and submitted to QAC by first meeting of the next academic year. |
| Report on how re-commendations have been met | should be submitted to appropriate Faculty committee within 6 months of the Review |
| Further reports on progress | annually to the appropriate Faculty committee until all of the recommendations have been overtaken. |

Duration of the Review

1.5 TESTA

In the academic year prior to the review, a programme within the Department/School will participate in TESTA (Transforming the Experience of Students Through Assessment). TESTA involves staff from Education Enhancement collecting and analyzing data about students' experiences of assessment and feedback and assisting the programme teaching team to consider possible improvements. The programme will be selected by the Department/School in discussion with the relevant Vice-Dean Academic, and the default programme will be the largest undergraduate programme. The TESTA report, including recommendations, will be provided in January or June of the academic year prior to review, to allow Departments/Schools time for reflection and action in advance of the review. More information about TESTA is included in the Annex.

1.6 Preliminary Meeting

Once documentation has been provided, Panel members should meet (either physically or remotely) to assess the documentation, to agree focus and specify expected inputs and outputs, targeted reading, and assign roles or areas for panel questioning and request additional data if required. There should be an open invitation for the student panel member to feed in a list of questions in advance or otherwise direct the Panel. Further documentation should be gathered by an agreed date and distributed to the Panel well in advance of the main review meeting(s).

1.7 Main Review Meeting(s)

A pre-review meeting or working meal should be arranged to enable the Panel to share findings regarding the targeted reading of the documentation supplied and finalise areas for exploration.

1.8 Programme

The Review Programme should span *at least* one full day or two half days, depending on the breadth and depth of the learning provision to ensure the quality of learning and teaching at subject level is thoroughly scrutinized. The agenda and programme should be flexible and include opportunities for the Review Panel to meet formally with:

- i. the Head of the Department / School
- ii. the senior management team
- iii. other staff as appropriate, for example:
 - the other academic staff without either the Head or the senior management team present;
 - research staff including postgraduate research students;
 - the course co-ordinator(s) and teaching support staff;
 - other support staff;
- iv. postgraduate taught students;
- v. undergraduate students; and including
- vi. international students, full-time and part-time students and Student-Staff Liaison Committee / class / Faculty student representatives

Space should be preserved within the programme to allow opportunities for the Review Panel to meet privately to take stock, reflect on discussions and re-direct focus where appropriate

It is recommended that the panel should meet informally with students over coffee or lunch before meeting with them formally. Consideration should be given to the timing of the Review visit to optimize opportunities for a wide cross-section or representative group of students to either meet with the Panel or provide comments remotely.

The Department/School is responsible for inviting members or staff and students to the appropriate sessions.

Post-Review Findings and Initial Feedback

Sufficient time should be allocated shortly after the Review for the Panel to agree the findings of the Review, record recommendations and provide initial feedback to Department / School.

Reporting

1.9 The Review Panel will prepare a report as follows:

- i. the Secretary to the Review Panel (normally the Faculty Officer) will prepare the draft report in consultation with the Convenor using similar headings to those suggested below for the Head of Department's self-assessment;
- ii. the report must be evaluative as well as formative and provide a balanced account of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats with a focus on commendations and recommendations. Any issues identified by the Panel must be noted together with the follow up actions required of the Department and arrangements for Faculty monitoring of these actions;
- iii. the draft report will be agreed by the Panel;
- iv. the draft report will be issued to the Head of Department under review for comment on any factual inaccuracies; the Head of Department will be given the opportunity to add an accompanying statement;
- v. the report will be finalised and forwarded to appropriate Faculty committees, the Board of Study and the Quality Assurance Committee;
- vi. A collective checklist completed by the Panel will be appended to the Review Report
- vii. a summary of the outcomes and follow up will be included in the annual Faculty Academic Report: Quality Assurance and Enhancement, highlighting any University issues or risks so that these can be taken forward by the University.

Follow-up

1.10 The University expects that:

- i. Faculties will take responsibility for initiating any follow up actions required;
- ii. Departments will make a formal report on how the recommendations have been progressed to the appropriate Faculty committee(s) within 6 months of the acceptance by the Faculty Board of the recommendations from the review and at regular intervals thereafter until all the recommendations have been overtaken; and
- iii. Departments will have a clear plan for sharing content and communicating feedback from the Review to staff and students.

PROCEDURE AND GUIDELINES

Documentation

- 2.1 The documentation provided to Internal Review Panels should enable them to:
- i. assess the quality assurance and enhancement of the learning, teaching and assessment in the Department /School;
 - ii. assess the extent of collaboration in both research and learning and teaching at all levels: within the Faculty, the University, the UK, the EU and internationally;
 - iii. assess as far as is possible departmental performance in research, learning and teaching and knowledge exchange against that of benchmark departments and institutions identified by the Department/School;
 - iv. question how departments have responded to learning and teaching issues raised by Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) in the course of accreditation visits and by External Examiners;
 - v. assess how the Department/School is complying with the requirements of equality and diversity legislation;
 - vi. assess the extent of engagement with internal seminars and workshops with the national Enhancement Themes.
 - vii. understand the structure of the department and how all aspects of its functions are managed;
 - viii. as context, gain an understanding of resource distribution;
 - ix. assess how the Department / School's strategy aligns with the Faculty Plan and with the KPIs and targets set out in the University's Strategic Plan;
 - x. test the strength and validity of decisions taken by the Department / School on targets and priorities, including admissions requirements and intake targets and retention and progression;
 - xi. assess the Department/School's contribution to Knowledge Exchange;
 - xii. question the measures the Department/School has in place for career and succession planning;

In preparing the self- assessment document Department / Schools should also bear in mind the possible information requirements of external audits and reviews by SFC/QAA and PSRBs / Professional Accreditation Bodies. These documents should address strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. They must be evaluative and evidence-based and provide review teams with appropriate management information. They should also highlight good practice and innovation within the areas of management, strategic planning, learning and teaching, research, knowledge exchange, and resources.

The self-assessment document should include reflection on the findings from the TESTA process. While the TESTA report provided to Departments/Schools by Education Enhancement is confidential, Departments/Schools should share what they consider to be the key lessons learned, and how TESTA has informed assessment and feedback practices, processes and strategies.

- 2.2 Documentation may include (this list is not prescriptive or exhaustive and requirements should be agreed by the Convener of the Review Panel and Head of Department/School at an early stage):
- i. an evaluative, evidence based self-assessment document which signposts and addresses strengths and weaknesses, opportunities, threats and

- ii. challenges in each of the key areas;
- ii. the Department / School's Strategy Statement / Plan and any implementation updates;
- iii. the most recent Internal Review Report;
- iv. the most recent reports from accreditation visits by Professional and Statutory Bodies;
- v. a diagram showing the Departmental / School management structure (including committees and sub-committees);
- vi. a set of management information for the department, prepared by the Strategy and Policy and Human Resources Directorates in consultation with the Faculty and Department, including details of: staff names and grades (including research staff and funding sources); numbers of postgraduate research students and funding sources; and trend data for key performance indicators;
- vii. Minutes of Departmental / School committee/sub-committee/student-staff liaison committee meetings (for the academic year immediately before the review and for the period of the current academic year up to submission of the Self-Assessment Document);
- viii. External Examiners' reports and the Departmental / School responses thereto (again, for the academic year immediately before the review);
- ix. Course review documents;
- x. Summaries of student feedback gathered by or available to the department;
- xi. the University's Strategic Plan and Outcome Agreement (particularly for external panel members);
- xii. additional contextual information for external panel members;
- xiii. any other material that the Department /School considers essential in allowing the Panel to form its views and recommendations.

Where relevant the Review Panel should be provided with temporary access to departmental information provided through any VLE. If material is not accessible through the web but is made available to students in hard copy, up-to-date samples of these documents should be made available on the day to the Panel in the room that it will use for its meetings and deliberations.

Self-Assessment Document

- 2.3 The Head of Department/School will prepare a succinct, evaluative, evidence-based assessment of the Department for the Review Panel. The Faculty Manager and Officers should be consulted as to the appropriate length of the documentation and will provide guidance on the sources of the data for the relevant sections. This will normally include, but not necessarily be limited to, statements on the following topics, (for which data sources are signposted separately).

1. INTRODUCTION

Preparation of the self-assessment document
 Who prepared it
 Consultation Process
 Brief contextual background regarding the Department/School to set the scene

2. LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT

Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy - based on University Strategy

- and, in particular, addressing objectives around Outstanding Student Experience
- Undergraduate and Postgraduate programmes
 - Curriculum
 - Programme Specifications for all courses
- Collaborations
 - Within Faculty Within University
 - With UK/EU/International Partners
 - Off Campus Teaching / Transnational Education
- Examples of innovation and best practice
- Recruitment
 - Admissions Requirements and targets
 - Diversification of student intake
 - International Recruitment and Opportunities
- Student Progress and Retention
- Student Support
- Opportunities for overseas study
 - Student Exchanges
 - ERASMUS Plus
- Opportunities for placements/internships
- Graduate Employment

3. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF TEACHING, LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT

- Course Review
- Class Review
- External Examiners Reports
- External Reviews and Accreditation reports
- Student Feedback
 - Course and class monitoring questionnaires
 - Focus groups
 - Student Surveys (internal and external)
- Reflection on TESTA findings
- Staff-Student Liaison Committees
- Engagement with Learning Enhancement activities and other University fora, eg LEC agenda re innovation, flexible learning, data analytics etc
- Engagement with University initiatives to enhance the student experience
 - First Year Experience
 - Employability
 - Assessment
 - Principles Student
 - Representation
- Engagement with current and previous QAA Enhancement Themes

4. WIDER CONTEXT

a) RESOURCES AND PLANNING

- Priorities and Targets
- Complete Staffing
- Profile
 - Identifying and nurturing talent/Mentoring Career progression

Staff development - including rationale/decision-making process for attending specific courses and how this is of benefit to the Department / School as a whole
Succession Planning
Physical Resources and any planned developments
Financial Position

b) MANAGEMENT AND ORGANISATION

Faculty structure diagram and Departmental / School diagram including membership of committees and groups, and posts of responsibility including equality and diversity and disability compliance
Workload Model – Faculty / Departmental / School workload model

c) RESEARCH

Research Strategy
Research
Organisation
 Research Groups
The Portfolio REF documentation
Collaborations
 Within Faculty
 Within University
 With UK/EU/International Partners
Research Pooling Activity
Comparison with Benchmark Departments and Institutions
 UK
 EU
 International
Indicators of Esteem
Contract Researchers
 Identifying and Nurturing Talent/Mentoring
 Skills Training (including Roberts initiatives)
 Career Development
Research Students
 Supervision
 Research Skills Training Opportunities (including Roberts' initiatives)
 External Scholarships/studentships
 Success Rate (applications to awards)
 Completion data
 Numbers supervised by individual member of academic staff
Research Funding
 Research Councils
 Industry/business
 Public Sector
 EU funding
 Success Rate (applications to awards) if available
Facilities

d) KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE

Commercialisation

Spin out companies
Licences
Intellectual Property
Knowledge Transfer Grants
Internal Funding Opportunities
Engagement in Agenda Setting
Government
Policy Makers/Advisory Bodies
KTPs
Community
Consultancy
CPD
Outreach/Press Coverage

5. SUMMARY

Strengths,
Examples of Best Practice
Challenges,
Areas for improvement

6. USEFUL LINKS

University's Strategic Plan

<http://www.strath.ac.uk/whystrathclyde/strategicplan/>

Planning Data Sharepoint Site

<https://moss.strath.ac.uk/stratpolicy/planning/SitePages/Home.aspx>

The Strathclyde University Business Intelligence Reports and Dashboards system, SUNBIRD via Pegasus

https://sunbird.strath.ac.uk/QvAJAXZfc/opendoc.htm?document=Dashboards/home.qvw&menuNameParam=P2_SUNBIRD_ITEM

University Governance

<http://www.strath.ac.uk/governance/>

University Policies, Procedures and Guidelines

<http://www.strath.ac.uk/staff/policies/>

Equality and Diversity Policies

<http://www.strath.ac.uk/staff/policies/eqdiv/>

UK Quality Code for HE

<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality/the-quality-code>

SFC Guidance to HE Institutions on Quality

http://www.sfc.ac.uk/news_events_circulars/Circulars/2012/SFC1412.aspx

Any queries about this policy, procedure and guidelines should be addressed to the relevant Faculty Officer or the Education Enhancement Team (educationenhancement@strath.ac.uk)

University of Strathclyde

Internal Review Checklist: Summary Profile Against Self-Assessment Criteria

Department:

Name of Panel Member:

Date of Review:

The items listed in this document follow the guidance for the coverage of the Self-Assessment Document.

The completion of this table by each Panel Member will form a summary of Reviewers' initial pre-review assessment and will inform the agenda for the Reviewers Pre-Meeting and identify areas for further investigation/discussion and also of best practice.

Reviewers should evaluate each section of the Self-Assessment Document using the following grading, At the end of the Review, a collective checklist will be appended to the Review Report.

| Evaluation | Description |
|-------------------|---|
| 3 | The Department demonstrates overall strength in this aspect with examples of excellence/best practice. |
| 2 | The Department meets expectations in this aspect. (Most positive assessments are expected to fall in this broad category. It is not to be interpreted as meaning that the Department is mediocre or that it barely qualifies at a minimum level.) |
| 1 | The Department is judged to be below the expected threshold in this aspect, and this requires further investigation/documentation/discussion. |
| 0 | Not considered applicable and/or relevant to the Department concerned. |

| Self-Assessment Headings | | Overall Evaluation | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| OVERALL SUMMARY SCORES FOR EACH SECTION | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | Introduction | | | | |
| 2 | Learning, Teaching and Assessment | | | | |
| 2.1 | Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy, as it reflects the University's Strategic Plan | | | | |
| 2.2 | UG and PG Programmes: portfolio and curricula, coherence within context of strategy | | | | |
| 2.3 | Collaborations - internal and external | | | | |
| 2.4 | Off Campus Teaching / Transnational Education | | | | |
| 2.5 | Examples of innovation and best practice | | | | |
| 2.6 | Recruitment: admissions standards/targets/intakes | | | | |
| 2.7 | Student progression and retention | | | | |
| 2.8 | Student support | | | | |
| 2.9 | Opportunities for and uptake of overseas study, study abroad/Erasmus + exchanges | | | | |
| 2.10 | Opportunities and uptake of internships/placements | | | | |
| 2.11 | Graduate Employment | | | | |
| 3 | Quality Assurance and Enhancement of Teaching, Learning and Assessment | | | | |
| 3.1 | Course review | | | | |
| 3.2 | Class review | | | | |
| 3.3 | External Examiner reports and External Reviews | | | | |

Any other comments/observations Reviewers may wish to record/highlight:

Briefing for Review Panel members including roles and responsibilities

Members of the Review Panel are charged with the responsibility to conduct a thorough and fair analysis of each Department / School and related subject area and to confirm that the documentation provided reflects the reality of the student experience.

- i. Members of staff from the Department / School under review may be anxious about the Review exercise, and efforts should be made to ensure that they are at ease when meeting with the Panel and feel comfortable to be candid, avoiding a confrontational approach;
- ii. Since there will be a significant amount of documentation associated with the review, every effort will be made that this is circulated to Panel members at least five full weeks in advance of the Review date (and two weeks prior to the preliminary meeting to allow sufficient time for review and preparation. In some instances, supplementary information may be made available to the Panel during the Review visit, but every effort will be made to ensure that all primary documentation is circulated in advance;
- iii. Panel members will be required to complete an Internal Review Checklist table, evaluating each section of the Self-Assessment Document which will form a summary of Reviewers' initial pre-review assessment and will inform the agenda for the Reviewers Preliminary Meeting, identifying areas for further investigation/ discussion and also of best practice.
- iv. One selected programme will have participated in TESTA (Transforming the Experience of Students Through Assessment) in the academic year and ideally 12 months prior to the review. TESTA provides detailed evidence to the Department/School about the experience of assessment and feedback of students on that particular programme, and recommendations for action. The full TESTA report is confidential to the Department/School, but they can be expected to share the key lessons learned and how they are responding. More information about TESTA is included in the Annex.
- v. Review Panel members will be provided with limited access accounts to enable them to access information available via Sharepoint or on the University's VLE.
- vi. External (subject area) members will be expected and encouraged to make a substantial contribution to ensuring that provision is subject to informed scrutiny from outside the University.
- vi. During the Review Visit, at the end of each session, all Panel members will be asked to agree the main matters to be included in the final report in terms of
 - a. Perceptions on areas of the Department/School's activities which require particular attention;
 - b. Possible scope for cross-department/school collaboration in teaching and learning; and
 - c. Identification of good practice for wider dissemination.
- vii. Panel members are asked to submit comments or notes on the Review as soon as possible thereafter and within one week of the event to inform the content of the Review Report.
- viii. Panel members will receive a copy of the draft report for final comment before this is circulated to the Head of Department/School. Once the report has been finalised and approved for factual accuracy, it will be circulated to Panel members for information.
- ix. A copy of the Head of Department/School's response to the Review Report (due within six months) will also be circulated to Panel members.

Briefing for Departmental Participants

It is intended that the Review be approached in a positive manner by all parties concerned. Wherever appropriate, members of staff should be afforded the opportunity to contribute to the review process, including at the preparatory stages, to raise issues, to share examples of good practice which they have found to be beneficial, and to discuss the operation of their Department/School in an open and frank manner. Individual comments will not be personally attributed in the final report.

Reviews should be viewed as a dialogue between the Department / School and the Review Panel. The Panel will wish to find out as much as possible about the operation of the Department / School; the Department / School will wish to demonstrate areas of strength, as well as identifying particular issues, and may also want to seek clarification on aspects of University policy or Faculty organisation.

Guidance for meetings with Student Representatives

Contributions from student representatives from the Department/School are fundamental to the Review process, enabling the Review Panel to form an accurate picture of the Department/School's interaction with students. Individual comments will not be personally attributed in the final report. Those in attendance should be encouraged to familiarise themselves with the University's Policy, Procedures and Guidelines on Internal Review or extracts thereof in preparation. The following represents a set of key issues and questions to guide discussion in the meetings with student representatives (collectively or individually) which are directly related to Learning and Teaching and the Student Experience:

1. *Adequacy and Quality of Information provided to Students*

How does your experience of being a student at Strathclyde compare with the information provided prior to admission, in the prospectus and leaflets or on the web. How did you find the induction process? How useful do you find the course handbook? Do you know where to go or who to contact for advice on personal or welfare matters?

2. *Assessment and Feedback*

Is the assessment process and the criteria for assessment and marking clear? Do you consider the assessment process (arrangements and marking) to be fair and consistent? How satisfied are you with the usefulness, detail and timing of feedback on coursework? Do you perceive that the assessment relates to the intended learning outcomes?

3. *Quality of Learning Resources*

How good is the library provision, in terms of opening hours, access, user support, availability of books and journals? How good are the computer labs in terms of opening hours and access? Is the equipment reliable? Is there adequate IT support available, in the event of queries, or in the event of technical failure? Are there sufficient workstations available and is the software appropriate? What are your views of the quality of teaching spaces (classrooms and lecture theatres) and their equipment?

4. *Learning and Teaching*

How do you perceive the quality of teaching? How effective are the lectures, seminars, tutorial classes, groupwork activities and placements? How satisfied are you with the structure and content of the curriculum, and the teaching methods employed? Do you perceive that the curriculum encourages the development of knowledge and skills? How satisfied are you with timetables and workload? In general, does your programme of study meet your expectations? Are tutors and advisors available to provide support and guidance, when academic problems and queries arise?

5. *Responsiveness to Student Feedback*

How effective is the Student-Staff Liaison Committee? Are you represented on any other Departmental/School/Faculty committees? Is your feedback taken into account in terms of teaching delivery, curriculum structure and assessment?

6. *Quality of Learning Support*

Are you able to access specific learning support, if required? Is effective support provided for work experience, placements, study abroad and other off-campus experiences? How effective do you find the academic advising system?

7. *Employability*

Do you perceive that you are gaining skills relevant to further study and prospective employment to fulfil your aspirations? How effective do you find the Careers Service?

Guidance on how to complete the Self-Assessment Document (signposting relevant data sources). Subject to finalization following trial, this section will be separated from the main policy document to optimise shelf-life and facilitate more regular update and refinement.

1. INTRODUCTION

Preparation of the self-assessment document
Who prepared it
Consultation Process
Contextual background regarding the Department/School - eg brief history, summary of current operations etc to set the scene

2. LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT

Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy - based on University Strategy and, in particular, addressing objectives around Outstanding Student Experience Undergraduate and PG Programmes – list of courses from Pegasus and load and representative FTEs from SUnBIRD
Curriculum -developments in curriculum from courses input to FAR documents over the period
Programme Specifications for all courses - from CCAP
Collaborations – from planning documents and from course input to FAR
 Within Faculty
 Within University
 With UK/EU/International Partners - from Internationalization Portal Off Campus Teaching / Transnational Education
Examples of innovation and best practice - from FAR
Recruitment
 Admissions Requirements and targets - from prospectus and website
 Diversification of student intake – from SUnBIRD Student Profile datamart / Personal Characteristics report
 International Recruitment and Opportunities – from annual planning documents and SUnBIRD Student Profile datamart / Applications tracker
Student Progress and Retention -SUnBIRD Retention and Progression datamart
Student Support – from course input to FAR
Opportunities for overseas study - from course input to FAR
 Student Exchanges - from Internationalisation Portal
 ERASMUS Plus - from Internationalisation Portal
Opportunities for placements/internships - from course input to FAR
Graduate Employment – from Student Surveys DHLE report

3. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF TEACHING, LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT

Course Review – from CCAP and course input to FAR
Class Review – from course input to FAR, departmental class/ module survey summaries, internal reviews conducted on classes/modules
External Examiners Reports and External Reviews - from EE System on Sharepoint and Accreditation reports
Student Feedback
 Course and class monitoring questionnaires - from course input to FARs and internal and external Student Survey results including departmental records of collated results from their own student questionnaires

- Focus groups
- Student Surveys (internal and external)
- Reflection on TESTA findings – key lessons learned, recommendations, actions taken in response, actions planned
- Staff-Student Liaison Committees – from Faculty Academic Committees
- Engagement with Learning Enhancement activities and other University fora, eg LEC agenda re innovation, data analytics etc
- Engagement with University initiatives to enhance the student experience
 - First Year Experience – from Survey and course input to FAR
 - Employability - from DHLE
 - Assessment Principles
 - Student Representation – organizational chart at Dept / School and Faculty
- Engagement with current and previous QAA Enhancement Themes eg Transitions, Employability, Graduate Attributes, Assessment and Feedback - from Dept / School input to FAR,

4. WIDER CONTEXT

a) RESOURCES AND PLANNING

- Priorities and Targets – latest annual planning documents and annual and projected student numbers from planning rounds including home/EU, RUK and non-EU students both core and non-core programmes as well as trend data for the department against Strategic Plan targets where these are disaggregated.
- Complete Staffing Profile
 - Identifying and nurturing talent/Mentoring
 - Staff development - including rationale/decision-making process for attending specific courses and how this is of benefit to the Department / School as a whole - uptake of OSDU and external courses
 - Career progression – promotions and contributions
- Succession Planning - staffing profile and fit with research strategy and course delivery
- Physical Resources and any planned developments– Estates space data
- Financial Position – financial out turn from most recent year including trend analysis and income sources (to show proportion of funding from SFC, research councils etc).

b) MANAGEMENT AND ORGANISATION

- Faculty structure diagram and Departmental / School diagram including membership of committees and groups, and posts of responsibility including equality and diversity and disability compliance.
- Workload Model – Faculty / Departmental / School workload model

c) RESEARCH

- Research Strategy - annual plans
- Research Organisation
 - Research Groups
- The Portfolio REF documentation - REF submission Collaborations
 - Within Faculty
 - Within University
 - With UK/EU/International
- Partners Research Pooling Activity

- Comparison with Benchmark Departments and
 - Institutions UK
 - EU
 - International
- Indicators of Esteem
- Contract Researchers
 - Identifying and Nurturing Talent/Mentoring
 - Skills Training (including Roberts' initiatives)
 - Career Development
- Research Students
 - Supervision – currently via NEPTUNE
 - Research Skills Training Opportunities (including Roberts initiatives)
 - External Scholarships/studentships
 - Success Rate (applications to awards)
 - Completion data – SUnBIRD Retention datamart
 - Numbers supervised by individual member of academic staff
- Research Funding – all from SUnBIRD Research Grants and Contracts datamart
 - Research Councils
 - Industry/business
 - Public Sector
 - EU funding
 - Success Rate (applications to awards) if available
- Facilities

d) KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE

- Commercialisation
 - Spin out companies - RKES
 - Licences - RKES
 - Intellectual Property - RKES
- Knowledge Transfer Grants
- Internal Funding Opportunities
- Engagement in Agenda Setting
 - Government
 - Policy Makers/Advisory Bodies
 - KTPs
 - Community
- Consultancy – annual plans and financial out turns and trends
- CPD – annual plans and financial out turns and trends
- Outreach/Press Coverage

Selection and Briefing of Student Panel Members

What is the role of student members of Internal Review Teams?

Student members will be full members of Internal Review Panels with equal status to the other members. Like the other members of Internal Review Panels, student reviewers will be expected to

- i. read and analyse the Department's self-assessment document and any other documentation provided to the Panel;
- ii. participate in the review visits;
- iii. form conclusions on the basis of the information before the Review Panel; and
- iv. contribute to and comment on the draft Review Report.

As the student reviewers bring a learner perspective to the review, their responsibilities will focus on lines of enquiry relating to the management of the student learning experience by the Department/School and the effectiveness of its approach to engaging students.

Given the holistic nature of Internal Review at Strathclyde which includes management, organisation and resources as well as learning and teaching, research, knowledge exchange and strategic planning, it may be necessary for sensitive issues relating to particular individuals, such as retirements, salaries or interpersonal relations, to be dealt with as Reserved Business. The timetable for Review meetings would have to take account of the fact that student members would not be present for discussion of Reserved Business. It might therefore be appropriate for these issues to be discussed at the end of the review visit.

Who can be a student member of an Internal Review Team?

- v. Current students of the University of Strathclyde in good academic standing;
- vi. Former students of the University of Strathclyde who graduated no more than two years prior to the date of the initial review meeting; and
- vii. Members of the Student Executive of the University of Strathclyde Students' Association (USSA).

Nobody who is or was a student of the Department/School under review, or who has any contact with the Department which might lead to a conflict of interest, can be a student member of an Internal Review Team.

All student reviewers must undertake the agreed training programme before they can join an Internal Review Panel.

Student reviewers will be eligible to undertake reviews for as long as they continue to meet the selection criteria.

How will student members of Internal Review Teams be identified?

In any one year ~5 Internal Reviews are undertaken. A requirement for at least 15 student reviewers each year is anticipated in order to allow for the fact that any one individual student may not be available at the time of any one review. Each Faculty is therefore required to nominate at least three student reviewers each year.

As early as possible in each academic session, Departments/Schools should seek possible student reviewers from amongst their current students. In seeking nominations, consideration should be given to the requirement for student reviewers to be fully representative of the profile of the student body as a whole.

Heads of Department/School should forward nominations to the Faculty Office where a list of eligible Faculty nominees will be collated. The final selection of Departmental Reviewers from each Faculty will be made by the appropriate Faculty officers in discussion with the President of the Students' Association or other nominated individual from the Student Executive.

Once the new Student Executive has taken up office in July, the appropriate individual in the Education Enhancement Team will consult with the President of USSA to identify possible student reviewers from amongst the members of the student executive.

The student reviewer should not be a member of the Department/School under review and, mindful of the exigencies of their own timetable and other activities, participation in a review within the current year cannot be guaranteed.

A consolidated list of student reviewers from across the University will be maintained by USSA and the Education Enhancement Team.

How will student members of particular Internal Review Teams be appointed?

Student members of particular Internal Review Teams will be selected from the consolidated list of student reviewers by the relevant Faculty Office and Dean and will be appointed in the same way as other Review Team members.

What training/briefing will student members of Internal Review Teams receive?

All student members of Internal Review Teams will receive generic training from Sparqs, Strathclyde-specific training involving the Education Enhancement Team and will also have a one-to-one briefing meeting with the appropriate person from the relevant Faculty Office.

In addition, student members will attend the various briefing and preparatory meetings for their Internal Reviews in the same way as the other internal review team members.

Once a body of experienced student reviewers has been built up, the Education Enhancement Team will facilitate meetings between new and experienced student reviewers to discuss their experience of the process and their role within it.

Will student members of Internal Review Teams be paid?

All student members of Internal Review Teams other than Sabbatical Officers will be paid for each review undertaken at an amount to be determined (£400 in 2014-15). In addition they will be paid expenses to attend any external (e.g Sparqs) training event as required for all student reviewers.

Contextual Elements of Learning and Teaching Review

Since 2003-04, the approach to the quality assurance of higher education in Scotland has been through reviews at the subject level, to be run by the institutions themselves. At Strathclyde, this is taken forward through the quinquennial reviews of each department/school, undertaken by the Faculties.

Through the process of the QAA Enhancement-led Institutional Review, institutions are judged on their ability to manage the standards of their academic awards and the quality of the learning opportunities provided to students. These judgements are made by a review team, appointed by the QAA, which evaluates the effectiveness of the institution's own quality assurance processes. Evidence from the internal reviews of Departments/Schools and the annual Faculty Annual Reports: Quality Assurance and Enhancement play an important part in this process as does evidence of regular monitoring and review at course level.

The University's process for internal review of learning and teaching comprises the following regular, interlinked activities:

1. Internal Reviews of Departments/Schools

Each Faculty carries out a review of each of its departments at least once every five years. This is an holistic look at learning and teaching, management and organisation, research, knowledge exchange, resources and strategic planning in the Department/Schools and at the interaction between these functions.

2. Annual Course and Class Monitoring/Review

For each of the University's award bearing courses, the Course Team prepares an **annual course report** that is reviewed by the relevant Faculty on an annual basis. This process may be initiated through annual discussions involving Faculty Teams led by the Vice-Dean Academic, Heads of Department and Directors of Teaching. Outcomes of this process are also taken into account during Internal Reviews of Departments/Schools and inform the Faculty Annual Report: Quality Assurance and Enhancement.

The Course Team for each award-bearing undergraduate and postgraduate taught course (or the Departmental Teaching Committee) monitors the effectiveness of the course and produces an annual course report that is reviewed by the relevant faculty on an annual or biannual basis.

The detailed processes used by Departments and Faculties for producing and reviewing the annual course report may differ but the University expects that the review will be based on proper consideration of relevant performance statistics, student and staff feedback, external examiners' comments and any other relevant feedback, for example, from accreditation events. The many common features across the University include:

- for undergraduate courses, the Course Team and/or a Departmental Teaching Committee normally produces the annual report
- for postgraduate courses, the Course Director and/or a Course Committee normally produce the annual self-evaluation report.
- the report includes consideration of student feedback, external examiners reports, accreditation reports and input from other stakeholders together with an account of follow-up actions resulting from these inputs
- an academic committee of the Faculty Board of Study reviews all course reports on an annual or biannual basis and summary paperwork is held in the Faculty Office
- Departments or the Course Team hold the detailed paperwork associated with annual course monitoring/review

- outcomes of the process are taken into account in the quinquennial reviews of Departments.

In preparing the annual self-evaluation report, the Course Director/Course Team considers the effectiveness of the course in terms of:

- i. learning, teaching and assessment strategies
- ii. student recruitment and completion rates
- iii. student employability, professional and careers education
- iv. key skills and progress files
- v. the University's Equality and Diversity and Widening Access policies
- vi. provision for disabled students

Evidence reviewed by Course Teams in producing the annual course report includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the following:

- Programme Specification
- Course/Department /Student Handbooks, curriculum, examination papers
- Student intake: number, quality, balance (e.g. age, gender, equality and diversity and disability data)
- Student progress and completion rates for the total student population and, where appropriate, cohort analysis balance (e.g. age, gender, equality and diversity and disability data)
- Information on subsequent employment of students
- Student feedback (class/course evaluation questionnaires, student/staff committees, other)
- External Examiners' reports and any Departmental Responses
- Outcomes of any external reviews by QAA, Professional Bodies etc
- Statistical information is provided to Departments/Schools and Faculties from the central student record.

In addition to Faculty level monitoring, the University's Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) monitors course performance through consideration of the following reports:

- retention rates for undergraduate courses
- completion rates for postgraduate taught courses and research students
- Honours degree classifications and integrated masters results
- summaries of External Examiners' annual reports and departmental responses.

A number of University mechanisms are in place for **class monitoring and review**. Most of these are managed by the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) which monitors pass rates for individual undergraduate and postgraduate taught classes annually. The relevant Vice Dean takes up any issues with the relevant staff and reports back on action taken to the next QAC meeting.

An important part of the regular review and monitoring of the University's quality and standards takes place through class evaluations completed by students in response to set questionnaires. The questionnaire may be supplemented by a discussion at class about how well students believe the class objectives have been met.

The annual class review process is conducted by the Department/School, and leads to the production of an annual course review report. Typically, the Class Co-ordinator and the team responsible for delivering the class consider statistics on admissions and entry standards, on progression and completion. They will also consider the above class evaluations and any other sources of feedback, such as business raised at the relevant staff-student committee. The External Examiners' reports and any accreditation reports will be noted, as well as any input provided by, for example, through Advisory Boards. They will reflect on the continued relevance of the content of the class, the overall quality of delivery, and the extent to which students have achieved the specified learning outcomes.

3. Monitoring of Research Student Progress and Supervision

Regular monitoring of research student progress and supervision is carried out at departmental / school and/or faculty level in accordance with the University's Policy and Code of Practice for Postgraduate Research Programmes, available at:
<http://www.strath.ac.uk/staff/policies/academic/>

The outcomes are scrutinised by the University's Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee (RKEC) and monitored by the Quality Assurance Committee. The Researcher Development Team supports the RKEC in maintaining its oversight of postgraduate research student progression and supervision. Outcomes of this process are also taken into account in the Internal Reviews of Departments/Schools.

4. Faculty Annual Reports: Quality Assurance and Enhancement

The annual report from the Faculties provides information for the University's Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) and Learning Enhancement Committee (LEC) on learning enhancement activities and confirmation that appropriate quality assurance is in place in each of the four Faculties. As well as a reflective analysis of the previous academic session, there is be a renewed focus on how each Faculty's enhancement activities contribute to the delivery of overall strategic priorities. The reports also form a valuable source of good practice, which is widely disseminated.

These regular activities may be supplemented from time to time by in-depth reviews of courses or subject pathways carried out by departments/schools or faculties in response to changing needs and circumstances.

The report is intended to provide a self-evaluative account of strengths and weaknesses; significant issues (if there are any) must be noted together with any follow up actions required by Departments / School and arrangements for Faculty monitoring of these actions.

The timing of report submission is agreed by QAC each year with submission expected normally in late February / early March.

A process of internal peer review has been developed so that a Vice-Dean (Academic) and Faculty Officer (from another Faculty) as well as a member of the Education Enhancement Team act as critical friends and provide comments and feedback on a report from another Faculty before the report is submitted to QAC/LEC. The critical friend is responsible for introducing the report to QAC/LEC before the Vice-Dean (Academic) of the Faculty submitting the report provides his or her own commentary.

A copy of the Executive Summary and recommendations from Internal Reviews undertaken in the previous session should be attached to the annual report.

The template for the Faculty Annual Report: Quality Assurance and Enhancement is updated on a regular basis to reflect changes in the internal and external operating environment. The template can be downloaded from the QAC Sharepoint site at
<https://moss.strath.ac.uk/corpservices/committees/qac/Pages/home.aspx>