Guideline for Schools

University-led Review of Learning and Teaching:
<School/Department>

<Date>

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. Name tbc, Dean of Science or Prof Paul Hibbard, Dean of Arts and Divinity
4. Member of University staff from a cognate area
5. Zach Davis, Director of Education, Students’ Association
6. Postgraduate Research Representative
7. Carol Morris, Director of CAPOD and Quality Monitoring or Ros Campbell, Academic Monitoring/Development Adviser, CAPOD
Why do we have a programme of University-led Review of Learning and Teaching?

In 2003, a national Quality Enhancement Framework (QEF) was collectively devised by the Scottish Funding Council, Universities Scotland, the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education Scotland (QAA Scotland), the Higher Education Academy and student representative bodies. It aims to support higher education institutions (HEIs) in Scotland in managing the quality of the student learning experience, and to provide public confidence in the quality and standards of higher education.

University-led Reviews of Learning and Teaching (URLTs) form one of the five elements of the QEF:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Enhancement Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At an institutional level we work in accordance with the QEF in our quality monitoring and review processes. However, the reviews are first and foremost by and for the University to ensure that standards and quality of learning and teaching are being maintained, to alert senior management to areas of concern and to identify positive practice that deserves commendation and dissemination.

How is quality monitoring and review managed at the University of St Andrews?

The Academic Monitoring Group (AMG) has responsibility for the oversight of quality, and for the implementation, management and monitoring of the University's quality enhancement strategy. Managed by the Carol Morris (Director of the Centre for Academic, Professional and Organisational Development [CAPOD] and Quality Monitoring), this includes:

a) **An annual check** by the Director of CAPOD and Quality Monitoring to ensure that University practice conforms to the national guidelines issued by QAA Scotland.

b) **Annual Academic Monitoring**: Each School produces a report of the previous year’s learning and teaching. Heads of Schools, Directors of Teaching and School Presidents are called for dialogue on a 3-year rotating basis and a dissemination event is held in October to share information and disseminate positive practice identified in AAM reports and dialogues.

c) **University-led Reviews of Learning and Teaching**: Each School and student-facing Professional Services Unit associated with learning and teaching is reviewed on a 5-6 year cycle.

d) **Special reviews** of individual programmes initiated following requests from the Proctor’s Office.
e) **Review of collaborative agreements**: A structured review of collaborative agreements takes place under the 5-stage process. Further information is available via [https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/studyabroad/staff/typesofprovisionproposalandapproval/academicmonitoring/](https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/studyabroad/staff/typesofprovisionproposalandapproval/academicmonitoring/)

f) **Module evaluation**: The centralised service coordinated by CAPOD for the production and analysis of module evaluation questionnaires.

### Review team membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team member</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dean</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External subject experts</strong>*</td>
<td>Normally there are 2 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 further afield in the UK. Their role is focussed mainly 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 the remainder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director of CAPOD &amp; Quality Monitoring or CAPOD’s Academic Monitoring/Development Adviser (AMDA)</strong></td>
<td>Responsibility lies with these role-holders to facilitate reviews from set up to action plan and follow-up. Either the Director or the AMDA will attend each review, take notes and draft the evaluative report drawing on the review team’s views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member of academic staff from the University</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director of Education</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postgraduate research representative</strong></td>
<td>A postgraduate research 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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?**
**Key factors**

The following key factors should be taken into consideration when preparing for a University-led 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
- The key external reference points for standards are the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF), the 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.

**Academic standards**

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 **4 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 CAPOD:

- External Examiner reports
- Programme Specifications
- School’s Annual Academic Monitoring report from the previous year
- NSS results
- Teaching Quality Factsheet.

Reflective Analysis

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

1. **Introduction** In addition to a general overview, this section should include any specific areas the School would like the team to explore and what the School would like to gain from the process
2. **Aims and outcomes of the teaching provision**
3. **Curricula**
4. **Assessment and feedback**
5. **Enhancement and innovation** This should include, but not be limited to, the current Enhancement Theme, changes implemented in response to student feedback, and new learning, teaching and assessment methods.
6. **Learning and teaching**
   a) UG
   b) PGT
   c) PGR
   d) Collaborations and work placements
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.

Please note: A student view on the above areas should also feed into the Reflective Analysis. The School President is responsible for gathering this feedback and submitting it directly to CAPOD. A guidance document on their role in the review process is provided by CAPOD, who will liaise directly with the School President prior to submission.

For reviews held in Academic Year 2017-18, 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 is available via: [www.universities-scotland.ac.uk/raceequalitytoolkit/](http://www.universities-scotland.ac.uk/raceequalitytoolkit/)), 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).
**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 CAPOD 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 0845-1800) 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 Director of CAPOD and Quality Monitoring or AMDA 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 2 and 3 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 Director of CAPOD & Quality Monitoring or AMDA 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 Director of CAPOD & Quality Monitoring or Academic Monitoring & Development Adviser, 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. 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 Director of CAPOD and Quality Monitoring will follow up on progress on actions and report back to the Academic Monitoring Group within a suitable timeframe agreed with the School.

Carol Morris
Director of CAPOD and Quality Monitoring
June 2017
Summary of University-led review

Planning and preparation by CAPOD and Schools/Departments under review

Reflective Analysis submitted 4 weeks prior to review

Review team to submit key themes 10 days prior to review

Key themes identified by the review team via the advance documentation issued to the School 7 days prior to review

Review team working dinner

One-day review held in School/Department

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

Draft report issued to School/Department within 25 working days of the review. (Opportunity to correct any factual errors)

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

Director of CAPOD and Quality Monitoring meets with School/Department at an appropriate interval after review to discuss progress with recommendations. Progress reported at subsequent AMG meeting

Annual analysis of report outcomes conducted by the Director of CAPOD and Quality Monitoring and the Academic Monitoring/Development Adviser, and passed to AMG, who will determine any further action.