Key dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School submission of Reflective Analysis and supporting documentation</td>
<td>&lt;Date&gt; 4 weeks prior to review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review team’s provision of key themes emerging from the advance documentation</td>
<td>&lt;Date&gt; 10 days prior to review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of key themes to School</td>
<td>&lt;Date&gt; 7 days prior to review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review team requests for submission of extra information or suggestions of specific meetings</td>
<td>&lt;Date&gt; 10 days prior to review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review team’s submission of evaluative report to the School</td>
<td>&lt;Date&gt; 25 working days from review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review team

1. External 1 (from a Scottish institution)
2. External 2 (from an institution elsewhere in the UK)
3. Dean of Science or Dean of Arts and Divinity
4. Member of University staff from a cognate area
5. Director of Education, Students’ Association
6. Postgraduate Research Representative
7. Nicola Milton, Head of Education Policy and Quality OR Rosalind Campbell, Academic Policy Officer (Quality)

Why do we have University-led reviews of learning and teaching?

University-led Reviews of Learning and Teaching (URLTs) form one of the five elements of Scotland’s Quality Enhancement Framework. They ensure that standards and quality of learning and teaching are being maintained, alert senior management to areas of concern and identify positive practice that deserves commendation and dissemination. Each School and student-facing Professional Services Unit associated with learning and teaching is reviewed on a six year cycle.

URLTs are supplemented by an Annual Academic Monitoring process, where each School produces a short report on the previous year’s learning and teaching, attends dialogues with Academic Monitoring Group on a three-year cycle, and participates in the annual dissemination event.
**Review team membership**

The review team typically comprises:

1. **Dean of Faculty**: As Chair of the review team, the Dean sets the tone for the review meetings with the team and School, facilitates welcome and introductions, leads the dialogue and ensures discussion is kept on track. The Dean has a particular interest in learning, teaching and assessment practice and the student experience. He/she has final sign-off of the review report.

2. **External subject experts**: Normally there are two external subject experts for each review, chosen to cover all aspects of the discipline. One external member will be from the Scottish sector and one from elsewhere in the UK. Their role is focused on the curriculum and learning aims and outcomes. They are asked to collaborate in providing a summary of their views for these sections of the evaluative report and to contribute a view on other aspects of learning and teaching.

3. **Head of Education Policy and Quality or Academic Policy Officer (Quality)**: Responsibility lies with these role-holders to facilitate reviews from set up to action plan and follow-up. The Head of Education Policy or Academic Policy Officer will attend each review, take notes and draft the evaluative report drawing on the review team’s views.

4. **Member of academic staff from the University**: A senior role-holder from a cognate area in the University whose participation provides an opportunity to share experience and to learn from other Schools. He/she will contribute their view in production of the review report.

5. **Director of Education**: The elected sabbatical officer who represents taught students at the review. He/she will have an awareness of current issues and good practice, and will incorporate discussion of these during the review. He/she will contribute their view in production of the review report. He/she will share the evaluative report with relevant School President.

6. **Postgraduate research (PGR) representative**: A PGR student from a cognate discipline who represents research students at the review. He/she will have an awareness of current student issues and will incorporate discussion of these during the review. He/she will contribute their view in production of the review report.

* Recommending appropriate external participants (for selection by the Dean) is of utmost importance in light of the critical role they play in the review process, and the impact they have on the review report. They should be well-respected colleagues in their discipline and active in teaching. They should not be current or recent External Examiners, research partners or close friends of colleagues in the School.

**What should the School consider when preparing for University-led review?**

The following key factors should be taken into consideration when preparing for the review:

- The review should address the quality of the learning opportunities, and the management of quality, standards and enhancement
- The key document is a Reflective Analysis, which sets out the broad aims of provision and reflects on the extent to which they are being achieved
- The Reflective Analysis is supported by Programme Specifications, setting out the intended learning outcomes
- Key external reference points for standards, i.e. the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF), subject Benchmark Statement(s), and the UK Quality Code
- Consideration should also be given to the University’s strategy and supporting strategies, particularly the Quality Enhancement and Learning & Teaching strategies.
The review will seek to establish that:

- there are clear learning outcomes for the programme(s) which reflect appropriately the level of the award
- the content and design of the curriculum are effective in achieving the intended programme outcomes
- the curriculum content is appropriate to each stage of the programme, and to the level of the award
- assessment is designed appropriately to measure achievement of the intended outcomes
- student achievement matches the intended outcomes and level of the award
- progression is clearly visible
- there is a regular process of feedback, review and enhancement in relation to teaching programmes within the School, as well as School support for innovative approaches to learning, teaching and assessment.

Documentation to be provided by the School in advance of the review

Schools will be asked to produce the following documentation four weeks in advance of the review:

- Reflective Analysis
- Draft programme with an indication of staff in attendance. (Student names can be added nearer the time of the review day)
- School Handbook
- Student-Staff Consultative Committee meeting minutes (for previous 2 years)
- Selection of Module Handbooks
- Staff list including teaching and administrative duties
- Accreditation letter(s)/report(s) from relevant professional, statutory or regulatory bodies (PSRBs) if appropriate.

The following will be provided by the Proctor’s Office:

- External Examiner reports
- Programme Specifications
- Annual Academic Monitoring report from the previous year
- NSS results for the last two years
- Teaching Factsheet
- Action plan from previous URLT.

Reflective Analysis

The Reflective Analysis should be written to the following core headings:

1. Introduction
2. Aims and outcomes of the teaching provision
3. Curricula
4. Assessment and feedback
5. Enhancement and innovation
6. Learning and teaching
7. Student progression
8. Professional development of teaching staff
9. Learning resources
10. Conclusion
This should be a reflective document. As such, Schools are asked to balance description and analysis so that the former does not outweigh the latter, and highlight strengths and weaknesses in the provision.

The School President is responsible for gathering a ‘Student View’ on what is working well in the School together with suggested areas for improvement. This is submitted directly to the Proctor’s Office and forms part of the supporting documentation for the review team. The Proctor’s Office issues a guidance document to the School President. The student view will be shared with the School at the discretion of the School President.

For reviews held in Academic Year 2019-20, Schools are asked to consider the following areas when preparing their Reflective Analysis:

- Diversity in the curriculum. (A Universities Scotland publication, Race Equality Toolkit: Learning and Teaching, may be useful, and Athena Swan where applicable)
- Quality Enhancement
- The UK Quality Code
- Collaborations (both cross-institutional and within the University)
- Employability and professional skills
- Student surveys
- Current issues e.g. professional development of staff, feedback to students and grade descriptors, and making full use of the marking scale
- The reports/requirements of any relevant PSRBs (to reflect on the outcome of such external accreditation).

Reflective Analyses for reviews held in previous academic years are available via: https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/staff/teaching/monitoring/irlt/documentation/​

Review team preparation in advance of the review

The review team is asked to provide key themes emerging from the advance documentation 10 days in advance of the review, which will be issued to the School 7 days prior to the review. Identification of good practice and lines of enquiry the review team would like to pursue will:

- inform discussion at the review team dinner
- help to apply questions to the correct meeting in advance of the review
- help to ensure the team is meeting with the correct personnel.

The review team is also asked to submit any requests for extra information, or advise if there are any additional groups of staff/students they wish to meet on the review day. Requests should be submitted to the Proctor’s Office at least 10 days prior to the review to facilitate production of the programme.

The review team will meet for a working dinner on the evening prior to the review day and will discuss topics to be covered during the visit the next day. This is an integral part of the review process.

On the day of the review

The review will last for one full day (typically 0830-1730) in the School. Aspects evidenced as routinely going well may not be discussed during the review day but will feature in the review team’s evaluative report. The review team will focus on innovative activities, topics identified in the key themes document, and other areas of interest.

The overview meeting will commence with a brief (10 minute) presentation from the Head of School and/or Director of Teaching. This should include a brief overview of the School (e.g. student and staff
numbers, management structure, current status of School and future plans/strategy) as well as what the School would like to get out of the day.

At the end of the day, the review team will draft commendations and recommendations and agree key topics for inclusion in the evaluative report.

**After the review**

1. **Evaluative report**

   The evaluative report will incorporate a summary of the principal strengths and weaknesses of the provision, as judged by the review team. The report will be written to the same core headings as the Reflective Analysis and will conclude with a series of commendations and recommendations for action, as well as a confidence statement (‘confidence’, ‘limited confidence’ or ‘no confidence’).

   The Head of Education Policy and Quality or Academic Policy Officer (Quality) will circulate the template report with draft commendations and recommendations within a week of the review. Review team members will be asked to comment on the wording and provide supplementary commentary where required. The external subject experts on the review team are invited to draft sections two and three of the evaluative report: the curricula and the aims and outcomes of the teaching provision.

   All members of the review team will be asked to provide their contribution to the report within two weeks of the visit. The Head of Education Policy and Quality or Academic Policy Officer (Quality) will collate the review team’s views and produce a draft report.

   The report will normally be provided to the School within 25 working days of the review. This will be in final draft form to allow correction of any factual errors. Once agreed with the Head of Education Policy and Quality or Academic Policy Officer (Quality), the report will be produced in its final form and submitted to the School and then to the Academic Monitoring Group.

   The School should feel free to use any details of a successful URLT in their marketing materials or on the School website.

2. **Follow-up to the review**

   On receipt of the evaluative report, the Academic Monitoring Group will request a response from the School by way of an action plan. This response should outline intended actions and timescales as a consequence of the review team’s recommendations. (A template will be provided). The action plan should be discussed with the School’s Learning & Teaching Committee and Student Staff Consultative Committee prior to submission, and actions should be clearly understood by students.

   The School will be asked to provide a progress update on the action plan one year after the review, which will be considered by Academic Monitoring Group.

Nicola Milton
Head of Education Policy and Quality
August 2019
Summary of University-led review

1. Planning and preparation by the Proctor’s Office and Schools/Departments
2. Reflective Analysis submitted 4 weeks prior to review
3. Review team to submit key themes 10 days prior to review
4. Key themes identified by the review team via the advance documentation issued to the School 7 days prior to review
5. Review team working dinner
6. One-day review held in School/Department
7. Report drafted and circulated to review team for comment and approval. Externals to draft sections on the curricula and aims and outcomes of the teaching provision
8. Draft report issued to School/Department within 25 working days of the review. (Opportunity to correct any factual errors)
9. Report finalised and issued to School/Department/Unit

**Academic Monitoring Group**
Reports considered at next AMG meeting. Any serious issues referred to the relevant Dean and progress tracked by AMG.

**School**
Report discussed at School’s Learning & Teaching Committee. Response to recommendations produced by way of an action plan. Recommendations considered and progressed in consultation with students via the School’s LTC and SSCC.

School submits a progress update on the action plan one year from the URLT. Progress reported at subsequent AMG meeting.

Annual analysis of report outcomes conducted by the Head of Education Policy and Quality and the Academic Policy Officer (Quality). Any points for action reported to the Deans and/or AMG.