



University of
St Andrews

Handbook: Agreement renewal review for collaborative programmes

Document type	Policy
Scope (applies to)	All staff
Applicability date	24/10/2023
Review / Expiry date	31/07/2024
Approved date	19/02/2024
Approver	Academic Policy Officer
Document owner	Administrator
School / unit	Education and Student Experience
Document status	Published
Information classification	Public
EDI review/Equality impact assessment	None
Key terms	Academic policies/Quality and standards
Purpose	Guideline for Schools/department on Agreement renewal review for collaborative programmes

Version number	Purpose / changes	Document status	Author of changes, role and school / unit	Date
1.2	Addition of Section 10 to the handbook and update to the template Programme		Administrator, ESE	05/02/2024

Handbook: Agreement renewal review for collaborative programmes

January 2024

1. Introduction

The University is responsible for the academic standards of awards irrespective of whether delivered entirely in St Andrews or in collaboration with another institution. To ensure that the quality assurance arrangements for collaborative degrees are as rigorous as those for internal provision, the University operates a five-stage review process as follows:

1. [Approval](#)
2. [Implementation](#)
3. [First review](#)
4. [Annual monitoring and review](#)
5. [Agreement renewal review](#)

The approval process ensures thorough review of collaborative proposals and due diligence at the outset. This covers, for example, existing links with the partner, status of partner, arrangements for partnership operation including lead institution (for rules and regulations), partner's procedures for module approval and review, partner's strategies for enhancement, and agreeing to a structure and membership of the programme's Joint Board.

The implementation stage involves a light-touch and relatively informal review at the commencement of the programme. It primarily involves the School/Department, Global Office, and Registry, and is intended to iron out any issues with the initial programme establishment. A summary report of implementation reviews is collated annually by the Global Office for consideration by the Academic Monitoring Group (Collaborations and Partnerships).

The first review provides an early opportunity to monitor progress, and ensure any problems are identified and resolved at an early stage in the life cycle of the programme. This comprehensive initial review normally takes place in the academic year after the first cohort of students has been admitted (irrespective of location of study in the first year). First review reports are submitted to Academic Monitoring Group (Collaborations and Partnerships) for consideration.

The Joint Board, via the Academic Co-ordinator at St Andrews, provides an annual report to Academic Monitoring Group (Collaborations and Partnerships) on programme matters, issues, trends, and student feedback.

The agreement renewal review is a full review of all aspects of the collaborative programme, including strategic direction and finances, and takes place around 15-18 months prior to the end of the agreement period. This ensures sufficient time to review the programme and secure approval to renew the arrangement prior to the agreement lapsing. The review provides an opportunity for the University, School/Department, collaborative partner, and review team to reflect on the operation, management, development, and future of the partnership. Review reports are submitted to Academic Monitoring Group (Collaborations & Partnerships) for consideration. Thereafter, an institutional decision is made as to whether to renew, modify or discontinue the collaboration.

2. Scope of the agreement renewal review

The agreement renewal review comprises two elements: academic and business.

The academic component will focus on the overarching systematic arrangements which the School has in place for evaluating the strengths of the programme, as well as identifying and addressing potential risks to academic standards and the student learning experience. Areas for discussion will include the curriculum, student performance, assessment and feedback, the student experience, the relationship with the partner and any third parties, and details of any issues with credit and grade transfer. The review is not a mechanism for discussion on detailed aspects of the programme but rather a process by which the School/Department demonstrates that it meets the University's expectations for managing the provision it delivers in collaboration with its partner(s).

The business component will focus on the strategic aspects of the collaborative programme and revisit the business rationale for maintaining and/or developing the relationship. Discussion will also cover: resources, recruitment; fees and financial projections; the relationship with the partner and any third parties; the overall context of the programme (for example regulations and issues in the partner country); and any key areas of the agreement which may have arisen as needing consideration during the programme.

3. Involvement of the partner institution in the agreement renewal review

Partner institutions should be involved in all stages of the review process, as appropriate for the type and level of collaboration. A summary of review outcomes should be sent by the School/Department to the partner institution as a matter of routine.

4. Review team

The review team will act as 'critical friends' to those involved in the programme being reviewed and will bring a range of experience and perspectives to the review. The team typically comprises:

- **Senior member of the Principal's Office:** The Chair of the review team sets the tone for the review meetings, facilitates the welcome and introductions, leads the dialogue and ensures discussion stays on track. The Chair has a particular interest in learning, teaching and assessment practice, quality and standards and the student experience. They have final sign-off of the evaluative report.
- **Director of the Global Office:** The Director of the Global Office is responsible for the negotiation, delivery, and renewal of partnership agreements for collaborative programmes and the central co-ordination and support of these programmes. They are responsible for making a recommendation to the Principal's office on the renewal of a collaborative agreement.
- **External subject expert:** An external subject expert covers all aspects of the discipline, focusing on the curriculum and learning aims and outcomes. They will collaborate to provide a summary of their views on these areas and other aspects of the learning and teaching provision.

- **Internal staff member:** A senior colleague in the University provides an opportunity to share experience and to learn from other Schools/Departments. They will contribute their view in production of the review report.
- **Director of Education:** The elected sabbatical officer who represents taught students will have an awareness of current issues and good practice and will incorporate discussion of these during the review. They will contribute their view in production of the review report.
- **Academic Policy Officer (Quality):** As Coordinator of the review, they will attend the review, take notes, and draft the evaluative report drawing on the review team's views.

Where required, the School/Department will nominate three external subject specialists (in order of preference) for selection by the Chair via their channel in Microsoft (MS) Teams, with links to their biographies and the rationale for each nomination. Schools/Departments typically nominate externals from Higher Education institutions.

A statement should be included indicating whether the person has had any previous involvement with the School/Department/programme. Previous involvement will not normally exclude a person from acting as an external. Former staff, students, and External Examiners of the University in the three years prior to the review will not be appointed as externals. Nor will those who are research partners or close friends of colleagues in the School/Department. Once the Chair has selected their preferred external, the Quality team will issue a formal invitation and notify the School/Department.

The external's fees, accommodation, travel costs and expenses are met by the Quality team's budget. Overnight accommodation arrangements for the external member of the review team are made by the Quality team. This will normally be for the night before the review but can be extended to a second night where appropriate.

The School/Department will also be asked to nominate internal staff members from a cognate area. These should be academics who have a key role in overseeing learning and teaching provision in their own Schools/Departments and have a strong understanding of the institution's learning and teaching priorities and agenda. The names of three internals (in order of preference) and a rationale for each nomination should be provided. The Chair will select from this list or appoint an alternative staff member.

5. Summary of the review process

The key stages of the process are summarised in the table below along with indicative timeframes.

Preparations for the review are led by the Programme Director with oversight from the Director of Teaching (DoT), in consultation with colleagues in the School/Department, and with input from the Teaching Committee. Please refer to the Programme Director checklist ([Appendix 1](#)) for further information. The Quality team Administrator will act as the first point of contact for the Programme Director and provide support and guidance in the run up to the review.

Timescale	Prior to the review day
Academic year prior to review	Chair of the review team, Academic Policy Officer and Quality team Administrator hold initial meeting with DoT and Programme Director. School/ Department may wish to invite others, e.g. Head of School, Director of Postgraduate Studies, and a representative from the partner institution
	Quality team provides Programme Director/DoT with access to MS Teams
4 weeks prior to review	Programme Director submits Reflective Analysis and advance information set
	Documentation considered by review team. Some additional information may be requested by the team
2 weeks prior to review	Programme Director submits a final version of the programme for consideration at review team planning meeting. Quality team Administrator issues invites to attendees. Review team submits key themes
7-10 days prior to review	Review team attends a pre-meeting online to discuss key themes and programme
1 week prior to review	Collated themes shared with Programme Director for circulation to review participants
	The review day
	Review team meets with staff and students from the School/Department as well as colleagues from Admissions, Finance, the Global Office and Registry
	After the visit
within 1 week of the review	Academic Policy Officer circulates draft commendations and recommendations to review team for approval
2 weeks after review	Academic Policy Officer circulates a draft evaluative report to review team for input
6 weeks after review	Report shared with School/Department in final draft form to allow for any factual corrections. Once finalised, School/Department shares report outcomes with staff and students, and the Academic Policy Officer (Quality) shares report with AMG (Collaborations & Partnerships)
6-8 weeks after report finalised	School/Department produces action plan in response to recommendations. Action plan considered by AMG (Collaborations & Partnerships)
6 months after submission of action plan	School/Department provides an update for consideration by AMG (Collaborations & Partnerships)

6. Documentation to be submitted in advance of the review

a. Reflective Analysis

The key document produced by the School/Department is the Reflective Analysis (RA). This is accompanied by an advance information set (AIS). The RA and AIS are submitted via MS Teams four weeks in advance of the review day. The Quality team will arrange access to a private channel in MS Teams in the months preceding the review. A template RA and AIS in word format will be provided in the MS Teams channel.

The RA should be approximately 5-10 pages and prepared in consultation with the partner institution(s) and colleagues from Admissions, Registry, Finance, and the Global Office. Schools/Departments are encouraged to start drafting the RA at least three months prior to the submission date. Guidance on the format of the RA can be found in [Appendix 2](#).

b. Advance information set

The advance information set (AIS) comprises pre-existing documentation and will help the review team to identify specific areas for exploration during the review. The RA and AIS should function as an integrated suite of information. AIS guidance can be found in [Appendix 2](#).

c. Programme

Reviews normally follow a standard format, however, where appropriate, the format may be modified in consultation with the Quality team. A template programme can be found in [Appendix 3](#) and will be provided in word format in the MS Teams channel. The School/Department is responsible for providing the names of relevant colleagues to be invited to the staff and student meetings in line with the agreed programme. The Quality team is responsible for issuing invitations. Please refer to section 13 of the handbook for guidance on the student meetings.

7. Review of the documentation

The review team will be asked to provide key themes emerging from the RA and AIS ten days in advance of the review. These will be collated and shared with the review team and School/Department seven days prior to the review.

The review team is also asked to submit any requests for additional information and provide feedback on the programme to the Quality team (via academicmonitoring@st-andrews.ac.uk) at least ten days prior to the review.

A one-hour review team planning meeting will be scheduled a week before the review to run through the introductions, discuss key themes, and identify areas for discussion at each meeting.

8. The review day

The review will be held over one half day. Aspects evidenced as routinely going well may not be discussed during the review but will feature in the evaluative report. The review team will focus on topics identified in the key themes document, and other topics

of interest that arise during the course of the discussions on the day. In the final meeting of the day, the team will draft commendations and recommendations for inclusion in the evaluative report.

The review team should be mindful that colleagues in the School/Department may feel apprehensive about the review. Efforts should be made to ensure that those meeting with the team are made to feel as comfortable as possible. The Chair should ensure the meetings are conversational and that all colleagues are given an opportunity to share their views.

The team is encouraged to note examples of good practice and areas for development throughout the course of the day for easy retrieval at the final meeting of the day. The final meeting will be an opportunity for the review team to reflect on commendations and recommendations. These will be captured by the Coordinator and will form the basis of the evaluative report.

9. Outcome report

The outcomes of the review will be shared with the School/Department via an outcome report. The outcome report will incorporate a summary of findings by the review team and a series of commendations and recommendations for action including a recommendation on whether the collaborative programme should be continued.

All members of the review team will be asked to provide their contribution to the report within three weeks of the visit. The 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/Department within six weeks of the review. This will be in final draft form to allow correction of any factual errors. Once agreed, the report will be finalised and submitted to the School/Department and the Academic Monitoring Group (Collaborations & Partnerships) (AMG).

10. Renewal, modification or withdrawal of the collaborative programme

Following consideration by the AMG, the Director of the Global Office will submit the outcome report to the Master of the United College, Deputy Principal and Vice-Principal (International Strategy and External Relations), and Vice-Principal Education (Proctor) who will collectively make a final decision on whether the collaborative agreement should be renewed, modified or withdrawn. The Director of the Global Office will be responsible for communicating the decision to the School/Department and partner institution.

Renewal of the collaborative programme

The Global Office will be responsible for making appropriate arrangements for renewal of the collaborative agreement.

Modification of the collaborative programme

Where modifications to the collaborative programme or modules are recommended by a review panel, the Global Office will liaise with the School/Department and partner institution to reach agreement before renewal of the collaborative agreement. Actions taken in response to the recommendation will be detailed in the Action Plan and Six-month update referred to in sections 11 and 12 of this handbook. Modifications to the programme should also be discussed at the Joint Board and included in the annual report of the Joint Board submitted to Academic Monitoring Group (Collaborations and Partnerships).

If it is recommended that specific modules or the overall programme content is to be substantially modified the School/Department should follow the standard module and programme approval process.

Withdrawal of the collaborative programme

If a recommendation to withdraw the collaborative programme is made by a review panel, the Global Office will liaise with the School/Department and partner institution to agree arrangements for teaching-out any existing cohorts of students. Consideration should be given to whether the arrangements for teaching-out involve the partner institution, or alternative arrangements for existing students to complete their programme and be assessed for the award to which they are registered without the partner institution's involvement.

The following points should be considered as part of the process for withdrawing from a collaborative programme:

- a. Exit arrangements between the University and the partner institution.
- b. Management of administrative and academic aspects of the programme until the remaining students complete their studies.
- c. If the programme is accredited by any Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs).
- d. Change to the learning experience or qualification for students remaining on the programme.
- e. Communication plan to students on the programme or applicants.
- f. Internal communications to Professional Services units within the University.
- g. The wider implications for the partnership, if relevant, and impact on any other programmes delivered with that partner.

A programme withdrawal form must be submitted to the Curriculum Approvals Group and a report must be submitted to Academic Monitoring Group (Collaborations and Partnerships). The formal arrangements to terminate Agreements with partner institutions and liaison on implementation internally is the responsibility of the Global Office.

11. Action plan

The School/Department will be asked to submit an action plan ([Appendix 6](#)) to outline intended actions and timescales in response to the review team's recommendations.

The action plan should be discussed with the partner institution(s), the School/Department's Teaching Committee and Student Staff Consultative Committee prior to submission, and actions should be clearly understood by students.

12. Six-month update

The School/Department will be asked to submit a progress update ([Appendix 7](#)) on the action plan six months after the review. The update should highlight the outcome and impact of each action. This will be considered by Academic Monitoring Group (Collaborations & Partnerships) who will approve the update or recommend further actions.

13. How review data including outcomes are shared/used

Personal data will be shared in line with the statutory code for information sharing. When planning and conducting reviews, the University will only share personal data as necessary to meet the requirements set. Programme Directors are asked to take care when authoring the RA and compiling the AIS to ensure that individuals and their experiences are only identified where necessary to inform the review process. The Quality team and the University Data Protection Officer are available to provide advice and support.

The University reflects on strategic issues arising from reviews and other quality processes and makes use of this information as part of its strategic approach to quality enhancement.

The Quality team produces an annual summary of themes and feedback from the University-led reviews for the AMG (Collaborations and Partnerships) and the University's Learning and Teaching Committee.

14. Student engagement

Student engagement is a vital component of the review process. Students will be asked to engage during the review and following the review.

a. Prior to the review

The School/Department is encouraged to notify students of the review at an early stage, for example at the first tutorial/lecture of the academic year in which the review is taking place or by email early in the academic year. Schools/Departments are encouraged to use/adapt the student briefing note ([Appendix 4](#)). This outlines the purpose and format of the review and how students can contribute to the process.

The RA should include reflection on student feedback obtained via routine quality mechanisms such as Staff-Student Consultative Committees (SSCCs), module evaluation questionnaires (MEQs), and external national surveys.

The Programme Director will be responsible for identifying a cross-section of students to meet the review team who are representative of the cohort. A student briefing note ([Appendix 4](#)) explains the purpose of the review and how students can contribute to the process.

We ask that the Programme Director supplies a list of at least 12 students who are willing to participate in the review day. The Quality team will be responsible for sending out invitations to these meetings.

b. On the review day

The review team will ask students about their experiences, for example in relation to assessment and feedback, the availability and quality of learning resources and study space, and support services such as the Library and Careers. Students will be able to raise and discuss other topics. Students are encouraged to share any difficulties or shortcomings they have encountered. Whilst notes will be made during the discussions, no comments will be attributed to any individuals.

Students are also represented on the review team by way of the Director of Education from the Students' Association.

c. After the review

The Programme Director is asked to share the review outcomes with students as follows:

- Meet with the class rep to discuss the evaluative report and the proposed actions in response to the recommendations
- Prepare a summary for SSCC comprising: the commendations and recommendations arising from the review; the outcome of the review (confidence statement); the School/Department's proposed actions in response to the recommendations; and a formal note of thanks to those who participated in the process. The Programme Director may wish to provide SSCC with a progress update at a future meeting
- Share the summary with the School/Department's Teaching Committee
- Circulate the summary prepared for SSCC to all students on the programme.

Appendix 1: Checklist for Programme Directors

In advance of the review

- Attend an initial meeting with the Chair of the review team, the Academic Policy Officer (Quality) and Quality team Administrator to discuss the review process. The Director of Teaching and if appropriate, Programme Director from the partner institution will also be invited to this meeting.
- Provide three nominees in order of preference for the external subject specialist and the names of three colleagues from a cognate discipline in St Andrews for the internal review team member.
- Book a suitable venue in the School/Department to act as the base for the review team.
- Notify students of the review at an early stage in the academic session in which the review will be held.
- Draft the Reflective Analysis (RA) in collaboration with colleagues.
- Submit the RA and advanced information set (AIS) to the relevant channel in Teams.
- Create a programme for the review day in consultation with the Quality team. This includes:
 - Determining the sequencing of the meetings for the review day
 - Recruiting the relevant staff for each meeting
 - Working with the School President/nominated student representative to recruit students for the student meetings
 - For virtual reviews, nominate a lead for each meeting to field the questions asked by the team to the appropriate attendee.
 - Circulating the final programme to staff and students.

The Quality team will organise travel and accommodation for the review team, and catering for the review day. Further information on practical arrangements is available in [Appendix 5](#).

On the day of the review

- Provide a 10-minute (max) presentation or introduction at the first meeting of the day. This is delivered by the Head of School and/or DoT and/or Programme Director. This should include a brief overview of the programme (including student and staff numbers, management and status of the programme, and future plans/strategy) as well as what the School/Department would like to get out of the review.
- Attend other relevant meetings including the last meeting of the day. The review team would like to meet with a wide selection of staff, so it should not be necessary for the DoT or Programme Director to attend all meetings.

After the review

- Review the draft evaluative report produced by the review team and notify the Quality team of any factual corrections.

- Provide a response to the recommendations arising from the review by way of an action plan. A template is available *in [Appendix 6](#)*.
- Share the review outcomes with students and staff.
- Submit an update six months after submission of the action plan. This will be considered by AMG (Collaborations & Partnerships) who will approve the update or recommend further actions.

Appendix 2: Reflective Analysis and advance information set

This appendix provides guidance on the preparation, content, and structure of the Reflective Analysis (RA) and Advance Information Set (AIS). The RA and AIS should function as an integrated suite of information. Schools/Departments will be asked to produce the RA and AIS four weeks in advance of the review:

The RA should:

- include and clearly state all awards in the programme under review
- be open and honest, and strive to offer not just description, but also analysis and critical reflection with supporting evidence
- identify areas of good practice, areas prioritised for development and/or enhancement, and areas that continue to present a challenge
- be a collective and inclusive endeavour with content based on staff consultation, and evidence of shared ownership and contribution
- be easy to read, focused, succinct and of appropriate length (5-10 pages)
- be submitted as a PDF using Arial 12-point font
- follow the style of the Annual Academic Monitoring report i.e.
 - What is working well?
 - What issues have arisen and how have they been resolved?
 - What is considered a problem area?

The AIS should comprise pre-existing documentation, and it should help the team to identify specific areas for exploration. The information should be presented in an easy-to-use format with an overall summary document to explain the contents.

The AIS should contain the following documentation and all documents should be converted into PDFs:

- Contents list
- Current pattern of student recruitment, retention, progression, and achievement
- Programme and module handbooks (one sample of each)
- Student-Staff Consultative Committee meeting minutes (two samples)
- Staff list including teaching and administrative duties
- Accreditation reports from relevant professional, statutory, or regulatory bodies (PSRBs)
- External Examiner reports for previous two years
- MEQ feedback (two academic session samples and feedback from the partner institution, where possible)
- Resubmission of the business case for the programme, highlighting:
 - any staffing matters that need to be brought to the attention of the review team, for example resources, capability, and commitment
 - the strategic business rationale for maintaining and/or developing the partnership.

Appendix 3: Programme

The review day follows a standard format. There is scope to make some adjustments where appropriate. Please discuss this with the Quality team.

Stage 5 Agreement Renewal Review

<Programme>

<Date of review>

<Venue>

Programme

0900	Review team convene (coffee)
0905	<p>Meeting with the management team <i>This will include a 5-10 minute (max) presentation or introduction by the school - brief overview of the programme (e.g. student and staff numbers, how it is managed, current status and future plans/strategy) as well as what the school would like to get out of the review</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Head of School, University of St Andrews 2. Director of Postgraduate Studies, University of St Andrews 3. Programme Director, University of St Andrews
0945	Review team reconvene
1000	<p>Meeting with partner institution <i>The school recruits the relevant colleague for this meeting. Once confirmed, the Quality team will issue a meeting invite via Outlook with a Teams link to be used to join the session remotely.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Name and job title in relation to the programme
1030	<p>Meeting with students on the programme <i>The school recruits students for this meeting. Once confirmed, the Quality team will issue a meeting invite via Outlook with a Teams link to be used by those joining the session remotely.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Name and year of study 2. Name and year of study 3. Name and year of study 4. Name and year of study 5. Name and year of study 6. Name and year of study
1100	Review team reconvene (coffee)
1115	<p>Meeting with staff teaching on the programme <i>The school recruits staff for this meeting. Once confirmed, the Quality team will issue a meeting invite via Outlook.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Name and involvement/job title in relation to the programme

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Name and involvement/job title in relation to the programme 3. Name and involvement/job title in relation to the programme 4. Name and involvement/job title in relation to the programme 5. Name and involvement/job title in relation to the programme 6. Name and involvement/job title in relation to the programme
1145	Review team reconvene
1200	<p>Business component of the programme <i>The Quality team will liaise directly with these members of staff and invite them to the review – no action required by the school.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Member of staff from the Global Office, University of St Andrews 2. Member of staff from Admissions, University of St Andrews 3. Member of staff from Registry, University of St Andrews 4. Member of staff from Finance, University of St Andrews
1230	Review team convene
1245	Brief meeting with management team
1300	Review team convene (lunch and first thoughts on review outcomes)
1330	End of review

Appendix 4: Communication with students regarding the review and student meetings

The School/Department is encouraged to adapt the information below when notifying students of the forthcoming review and recruiting and briefing them in preparation for the review day.

1. Suggested text for circulation to all students on the programme

The <programme name> is scheduled for an internal review by the University on <date>. Programmes delivered with collaborative partners are subject to an agreement renewal review 12 months prior to the end of its current agreement. These reviews allow the University to explore all aspects of the programme with the aim of enhancing the quality of academic provision and the student experience.

Student participation in the review process is very much valued and provides an opportunity for students to contribute to the process and have their views heard. On the review day, we ask a group of students to attend a short meeting to chat with the review team about their experiences at St Andrews. Following the review, a summary of the review outcomes will be circulated to all students studying on the programme.

Should you be interested in participating in the student meeting with the review team, please contact <name of contact>.

2. Briefing note for students who have agreed to participate in a review meeting

A review of <Programme name> is being carried out on <date>. Reviews allow the University to explore all aspects of learning and teaching of the programme to enhance the quality of academic provision and the student experience. Students play an important role in the review process and their contribution is very much valued.

A group of students are asked to attend a short meeting on the review day to chat with the review team about their experiences at St Andrews. Following the review, a summary of the review outcomes will be circulated to all students on the programme.

The review is carried out by a senior staff member from the Principal's Office, a senior member of University of St Andrews staff from a related discipline, the Director of the Global Office, the Director of Education from the Students' Association, an Academic Policy Officer (Quality) and an external subject specialist from another UK University.

The review team will ask about your experience of the programme, for example in relation to: your introduction to the School/Department; your learning experience; assessment and feedback on your work; opportunities for you to provide feedback on your experience; the availability and quality of learning resources and study space; and support services, e.g. Library and Careers.

You will also be able to raise and discuss other topics. The reviewers wish to explore commendable aspects of the teaching you receive and the learning opportunities you are given. You are also encouraged to tell the team about any difficulties or shortcomings you have encountered, as one of the aims of this review is to improve the quality of provision and the student experience.

Notes will be taken at the meeting; however comments will be anonymised. No members of staff from the <School/Department> are present during the student meetings, so please feel free to speak frankly. A meeting invite will be emailed to you advising you of the location of the meeting. Your participation and feedback in the review process is very much valued and appreciated.

Appendix 5: Practical arrangements for reviews

MS Teams is used as a portal for review-related communication and documentation for all reviews (agreement renewal reviews of collaborative programmes as well as University-led reviews of learning and teaching for academic schools and student-facing professional services units). A review Teams channel has been set up in MS Teams with a private channel within this team for each School/Department/programme scheduled for review.

All DoTs and Programme Directors will be invited to join the review team and relevant private channel for the programme. Additional colleagues such as the Head of School, Director of Postgraduate Studies or Programme Director can also be added to this online space upon request of the DoT. The Quality team Administrator will upload the Reflective Analysis and programme templates to the private channel. Schools/Departments should upload their own review documentation into their private channel when ready to do so.

The Quality team will post a list of key dates for the review process (including the submission deadline for the Reflective Analysis and evaluative report) in the School/Department/programme channel.

Requirements for the review day

The review team will require a private meeting room within the School/Department to use as their main base on the review day. This should be arranged by the School/Department. The meeting room should be large enough to accommodate the review team as well as colleagues invited to the meetings.

Access to power sockets for charging laptops throughout the day will be required. Extension cables should be supplied if there is an insufficient number of power sockets in the room.

Refreshments for the review team will be arranged by the Quality team through University catering.

Appendix 6: Action plan

Schools/Departments are asked to submit an action plan in the format below upon receipt of the evaluative report. The Quality team will add the recommendations from the evaluative report and the School/Department should summarise their intended actions in response to the recommendations in the 'Response/action' column. The Quality team will complete this column for any University recommendations made when agreed by the AMG (Collaborations and Partnerships). Timeframes for the completion of actions should also be provided. These should be as specific as possible, for example March 2024.

Stage 5 Agreement Renewal Review <Programme> <Date>

Action plan in response to recommendations

Recommendation	Response/action
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	

Plan produced in consultation with the School/Department's Learning and Teaching Committee

Statement on the steps taken to share with staff and students the review outcomes and proposed actions:

Appendix 7: Action plan update

Schools/Departments are asked to submit a progress update in the format below six months from the submission of the action plan. The action plan can be used as a starting point. The short six-month updates should be provided in red, and the title of the document should be updated to clearly indicate that is it a six-month update. The updates should highlight the outcome and impact for each action.

Stage 5 Agreement Renewal Review <Programme>

<Date of review>

Year-on update

Recommendation	Response/action and year-on update in red
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	

Update produced in consultation with the School/Department's Learning and Teaching Committee

Statement on the steps taken to share with staff and students an update on actions in response to the review recommendations:

Version number	Purpose / changes	Document status	Author of changes, role and school / unit	Date
1.1	Changes to submission timeframes		Administrator, ESE	01/11/23