Guideline for student-facing professional services Units

University-led Review of Learning and Teaching:
<Name of Unit>

<Date>

Key dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 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 Unit</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 Unit</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. Professional Services Units participate in an annual planning programme led by the Quaester and Factor.
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><strong>Dean:</strong> Chair of the review team. The Dean sets the tone for the review meetings with the team and Unit, facilitates welcome and introductions, leads the dialogue and ensures discussion is kept on track. The Dean has a particular interest in the student experience and the Unit’s contribution to this. 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 activity of the Unit. One external member will be from the Scottish sector and one from further afield in the UK. Their role is to apply their specialist knowledge and experience to the service the Unit provides and benchmark against similar Units in the sector. They are asked to collaborate in providing a summary of their views for the evaluative report.</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 staff from the University</strong></td>
<td>A senior role-holder from elsewhere in the University whose participation provides an opportunity to share experience and to learn more about professional services. 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 student 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 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 profession. They should not be close friends of colleagues in the Unit.

**What should the Unit consider when preparing for university review?**

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.

The purpose of the review is to assure and enhance the quality of the student experience by:

- encouraging reflection on the strategic and operational role of the Unit in relation to its impact on the student experience and support for learning and teaching
- promoting reflection on the ways in which the Unit engages with students and other stakeholders to monitor and enhance the quality of its services
- supporting reflection on the ways in which the Unit promotes and supports high quality learning and continuous quality enhancement
- taking account of professional, statutory or regulatory bodies (PSRBs) where appropriate
- providing an opportunity to discuss promising practice with external counterparts and senior colleagues.

**Documentation to be provided by the Unit in advance of the review**

Units 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)
- Organisation chart
- Staff list including positions held
- Operational and strategic plans
- Minutes of management group and Unit meetings (if appropriate)
- PSRB Accreditation letter/report (if appropriate)
- Survey feedback relating to services provided by the Unit (including NSS and iGrad) if applicable
- Samples of promotional/guidance materials if applicable
- Any other supporting documentation agreed with the Unit that will help provide an overview of the Unit’s activities.
Reflective Analysis

In light of the varied remits of Units, a degree of flexibility is exercised in terms of the structure of the Reflective Analysis. However, Units are asked to ensure the following areas feature:

- Introduction - In addition to a general overview, this section should include any specific areas the Unit would like the team to explore and what the Unit would like to gain from the process
- Brief overview of provision/structure of Unit
- Notable achievements and developments since the last review
- Engagement with students and other internal and external stakeholders
- Unit’s impact on the student learning experience and ways in which the Unit supports high quality learning and teaching and continuous quality enhancement
- Professional development of staff
- Space and resources (for Unit staff and students)
- Evaluation of provision (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats)
- Points of focus for further development/ambitions
- Consideration of the values of appropriate strategies, including the Quality Enhancement, Learning & Teaching and Student Experience strategies (throughout the RA)
- Conclusion

Please note: A student view on the above areas should also feed into the Reflective Analysis. Units may wish to involve School Presidents in gathering this feedback.

Units 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/), and Athena Swan where applicable
- Quality Enhancement
- The UK Quality Code
- Employability and professional skills
- Student surveys
- The reports/requirements of any relevant PSRBs (to reflect on the outcome of such external accreditation).

RAs for reviews held during previous academic years are available on the following staff password-protected page: 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 Unit 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 Unit. 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 Director and/or Deputy Director. This should include a brief overview of the Unit (e.g. staff numbers, management structure, current status of Unit and future plans/strategy) as well as what the Unit 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 subject experts on the review team will be asked to provide some commentary (on the provision in comparison to best practice in the sector) for the evaluative report.

   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 Unit 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 Unit 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 Unit. 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, and approved by, the Unit’s management group. 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 Unit.

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

Planning and preparation by CAPOD and Units 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 Unit 7 days prior to review

Review team working dinner

One-day review held in Unit

Report drafted and circulated to review team for comment and approval

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

Report finalised and issued to Unit

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

Unit
Report discussed at Unit meetings as appropriate. Response to recommendations produced by way of an action plan. Recommendations considered and progressed in consultation with students as appropriate

Director of CAPOD and Quality Monitoring meets with Unit 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 and Development Adviser, and passed to AMG, who will determine any further action