URLT Handbook for units

Document type	Guidance
Scope (applies to)	Professional staff
Applicability date	02/07/2024
Review / Expiry date	30/07/2025
Approved date	30/08/2024
Approver	Proctor's Office
Document owner	Administrator
School / unit	Education and Student Experience
Document status	Published
Information classification	Public
Equality impact assessment	None
Key terms	Academic policies/Quality and standards/University-led review of learning and teaching - guideline for Units
Purpose	Guidance for units regarding the University-led reviews of learning and teaching.

Handbook for University-led reviews of Professional Service Units

July 2024

Version number	Purpose / changes	Document status	Author of changes, role and school / unit	Date
1.4	Updated links to SFC		Quality team, Education and Student Experience	August 2024

1.   Introduction

This handbook provides guidance to professional service units preparing for a University-led review. The review process meets the requirements set out by the following external reference points:

- Scottish Funding Guidance to Colleges and Universities on quality for AY 2024-25 to 2030-31
- The UK Quality Code
- Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European HE area

2.   Purpose and scope of a review

Unit reviews aim to assure and enhance the quality of the student learning experience by:

- encouraging reflection on the strategic and operational role of the unit in relation to its impact on the student experience.
- 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 a high-quality learning environment and continuous quality enhancement.
- providing an opportunity to discuss good practice with externals and senior colleagues.

3.   Frequency and timing of a review

Student-facing units are reviewed systematically and rigorously on a six-year cycle approved by Academic Monitoring Group (AMG). The schedule, available via the URLT webpage, includes School/Department reviews, reviews of collaborative programmes under the University's five-stage review process for collaborative provision, and reviews of new PGT programmes.

The Quality team will contact the Unit Director in the academic year prior to the review. They will be invited to attend an initial meeting with the Chair of the review team, the Academic Policy Officer (Quality) and the Quality team Administrator to discuss the review process. Thereafter, the Administrator will act as the first point of contact for the Director. At this stage, a mutually suitable date for the review will be agreed. Reviews are not normally held at the beginning of semester one or during Independent Learning Week, spring vacation, revision periods and examination periods. For this reason, the reviews are typically held in October, November, February, March, and April when students are available to meet with the review team.

Preparations for the review are led by the Director in consultation with colleagues in the unit. Please refer to the Director checklist (*Appendix 1)* for further information.

4.   Review team

The review team will act as 'critical friends' to the unit and bring a range of experience and perspectives. 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 introductions, leads the dialogue, and ensures discussion is kept on track. They have final sign-off of the evaluative report.
- **External subject experts:** Two external specialists – one from the Scottish sector and one from elsewhere in the UK – will apply their specialist knowledge and experience to the services provided by the unit and benchmark against similar units in the sector. Externals will collaborate to provide a summary of their views for the evaluative report.
- **Internal staff member:** A senior role holder from a cognate area in the University will share their experience and learn from the unit. They will contribute their view in the evaluative report.
- **Director of Education (or delegate):** The elected sabbatical officer who represents UG and PGT 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 the evaluative report.
- **Postgraduate (PGR) representative:** A PGR student will represent research students. They will have an awareness of current student issues and incorporate discussion of these during the review. They will contribute their view in the evaluative report.
- **Academic Policy Officer (Quality):** As Coordinator for the review, they will attend the review, take notes, and draft the evaluative report drawing on the review team's views.

The unit will nominate external subject specialists for selection by the Chair via their channel in Microsoft (MS) Teams in the following format:

- The names of three externals (in order of preference) from the Scottish sector, links to their biographies and the rationale for each nomination.
- The names of three externals (in order of preference) who work elsewhere in the UK, links to their biographies and the rationale for each nomination.

External reviewers may come from industry, professional practice or may have wider international experience. Externals should be well-respected colleagues in their area of professional services expertise.

A statement should also be included indicating whether the person has had any previous involvement with the unit. Previous involvement will not normally exclude a person from acting as an external. Exceptions to this are where the suggested person has been a member of staff, a student, or an External Examiner of the University in the three years prior to the review. In addition, externals will not be appointed if they are research partners or close friends of colleagues in the unit.

Once the Chair has selected their preferred externals, the Quality team will issue a formal invitation and notify the unit.

The externals' fees, accommodation, travel costs and expenses are met by the Quality team's budget. Overnight accommodation arrangements for the external members of the review team are made by the Quality team. This will normally be for the night before the review and for the first night of the review.

The unit will also be asked to nominate internal staff members from a cognate area. Units may wish to appoint an academic or a colleague from another unit. 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.

The Quality team will appoint a PGR student who is currently undertaking (or has recently completed) the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice offered by the Centre for Educational Enhancement and Development. The inclusion of a PGR student member on the team will encourage a greater focus on the PGR student experience.

5. Summary of the review process

A summary of key stages, and indicative timeframes, involved in the review process is available in *Appendix 2*.

6. Documentation to be submitted in advance of the review

a. Reflective Analysis

The key document produced by the unit is the Reflective Analysis (RA). This is accompanied by an Advance Information Set (AIS). The RA and AIS are submitted via MS Teams six 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.

The RA is normally prepared by the Director with input from colleagues. Directors are strongly encouraged to begin drafting the RA at least three months prior to the submission date. A template RA in word format will be provided in the MS Teams channel.

An effective Reflective Analysis:

- follows the headings in *Appendix 3.*
- is open and honest and offers analysis and critical reflection with supporting evidence.
- includes reflection on student feedback obtained via routine quality mechanisms such as surveys.
- identifies good practice, areas prioritised for development and/or enhancement, and areas that continue to present a challenge.
- is a collective and inclusive endeavour with content based on staff consultation, and evidence of shared ownership and contribution.

- is easy to read and navigate, focused, succinct and of appropriate length (15-20 pages). Bullet points are encouraged when highlighting a number of areas within sections of the RA.
- is submitted as a PDF using Arial 12-point font.

b. Advance information set

The 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 4*.

c. Programme

Programmes vary depending on the themes and format suggested by the unit. However, all reviews will include an introductory overview meeting at the start of the day and a final meeting with the Director at the end of the review day. A sample programme from a recent unit review is available in *Appendix 5*. The Quality team is responsible for inviting relevant colleagues to the staff and student meetings in line with the agreed programme. A list of those the unit wish to invite should be provided to the Quality team four weeks in advance of the review day. Please refer to section 13 of the handbook for guidance on the student meetings.

d. Student voice

A nominated student representative will gather feedback from students from all levels of study to produce a 'Student Voice'. This will summarise what is working well and areas for development for exploration on the review day. With the permission of the student representative, this feedback will be shared with the Director in advance of the review. Further information on the student voice document can be found in *Appendix 7*.

7.   Review of the documentation

The review team will be asked to provide the following reflections based on their analysis of the RA, AIS and student voice:

- areas of good practice
- areas of interest to explore on the review days

These areas will be collated to produce key themes and will act as a guide for discussion on the review days. The key themes will be shared with the review team and with the unit in advance of the review. The review team may request additional information up to ten days prior to the review.

8.   The review day

The review will be held over one and a half days. The review is intended to be a positive and valuable process for the Unit. It aims to recognise and commend good

practice and support the enhancement of provision and the student experience. The review team will meet with colleagues and students during the visit. Colleagues are encouraged to discuss the operation of their unit, reflect on issues and challenges, highlight examples of good practice, and to contribute as fully and openly as possible in meetings. Due to time constraints, aspects evidenced as routinely positive may not be discussed during the review but may feature in the evaluative report. The review team will focus on innovative activities and areas of interest identified in the key themes document. Other discussion topics may emerge during the review day. Practical arrangements for reviews can be found in *Appendix 8*.

The student meetings may be conducted via parallel sessions to ensure the views for each level of study are represented and captured. If this approach is taken, the review team will split into two groups; one half of the team will meet with sub-honours and PGT students, and one half will meet with Honours and PGR students.

The review team should be mindful that colleagues and students may feel apprehensive about the review and should be 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 review 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 on day two. The final meeting will be an opportunity for the review team to reflect on commendations and recommendations. These will be captured by the Academic Policy Officer (Quality) and will form the basis of the evaluative report.

9.   Evaluative report

The evaluative report (*Appendix 9*) will provide a summary of main findings and conclude with a series of commendations and recommendations for action, as well as a confidence statement ('confidence', 'limited confidence' or 'no confidence').

The Academic Policy Officer (Quality) will share a list of commendations and recommendations with the review team within one week of the review. Feedback from the final meeting of the review day will form the basis of the commendations and recommendations. The review team will be asked to provide feedback via tracked changes. The externals will be invited to provide commentary for the main findings section of the report within four weeks of the review day. This commentary will include context for the commendations and recommendations.

The Academic Policy Officer (Quality) will circulate a draft report to the review team for feedback within five weeks of the review. Once approved by the team, the report will be provided to the unit within six weeks of the review. This will be in final draft form to allow for correction of factual errors. A final version of the report will be submitted to AMG. Recommendations that pertain to other areas of the University will be forwarded to the appropriate colleague/committee/unit.

The unit should prepare a summary comprising: the commendations and recommendations arising from the review; the outcome of the review (confidence statement); the unit's proposed actions in response to the recommendations; and a

formal note of thanks to those who participated in the process. This summary should be shared with all the staff within the unit, all the staff and students who participated in the process, and users of the service through the unit's usual communication channels. Review outcomes can also be shared in marketing materials and on the unit website.

To assist the Quality team to identify enhancements that can be made to their internal processes, the review team, nominated student representative, and Director will be asked to complete a short survey.

10.   Action plan

The unit will be asked to submit an action plan (*Appendix 10*) to outline intended actions and timescales in response to the review team's recommendations. The action plan should be discussed with colleagues in the unit prior to submission. The action plan should include a statement on the steps taken to share with staff and students the review outcomes and related actions.

AMG will review the plan to ensure that the recommendations have been adequately addressed, and that staff received feedback on the outcomes of the review and were consulted on the production of the plan. AMG may request further follow-up reports , for example where the plan indicates the setting up of a working group, pilot, or initiative.

11.   Year-on update

The unit will be asked to provide a progress update on the action plan (*Appendix 10*) one year from the submission of the action plan. This will require the Director to revisit the action plan and provide a short update highlighting the outcome and impact of each action. AMG will consider the update and either approve or request additional information to complete the review process.

12.   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 of the review process. 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 and the University's Learning and Teaching Committee.

Review documentation is uploaded to the Education SharePoint site which is accessible to all staff in the University. A notification of the documentation having been uploaded is shared with colleagues via the Education Updates issued by the Education and Student Experience team.

13. Student engagement

Student engagement is a vital part of the review process and influences the areas for exploration on the review day and the review outcomes.

a. Prior to the review

As noted in section 6, the nominated student representative will gather feedback from students from all levels of study to produce a 'Student Voice'. This will summarise what is working well and areas for development for exploration on the review day. Further information on this document can be found in *Appendix 7*.

The RA produced by the unit should include reflection on student feedback obtained via routine quality mechanisms such as surveys.

The Director and nominated student representative will be responsible for identifying a cross-section of students to meet the review team. The student meetings are conducted via parallel sessions to ensure that the views for each level of study are represented. Efforts should be made to ensure that the students are representative of as many different sections of the student body as possible. The student groups should include (but not limited to) class reps. Units are encouraged to use/adapt the student briefing note (*Appendix 6*). This outlines the purpose and format of the review and how students can contribute to each stage of the process.

b. On the review day

The review team will split into two groups; one half will meet with sub-honours and PGT students, and one half will meet with Honours and PGR students. The review team will ask students about their experience of the support services offered by the unit. 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 taken during the discussions, no comments will be attributed to any individuals. Staff members from the unit will not be present during the student meetings. Students are also represented on the review team by way of the Director of Education from the Students' Association and a PGR representative.

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

c. After the review

As noted in section 9, the unit should prepare a summary comprising: the commendations and recommendations arising from the review; the outcome of the review (confidence statement); the unit's proposed actions in response to the

recommendations; and a formal note of thanks to those who participated in the process. This summary should be shared with the students who participated in the process and users of the service through the unit's usual communication channels.

Appendix 1: Checklist for Directors of professional services units

In advance of the review

- Attend an initial meeting with the Chair of the review team, the Academic Policy Officer, and Quality team Administrator to discuss the review process.
- Provide nominees for two external subject specialists and a senior internal colleague either from an academic School/Department or another professional services unit.
- Book two suitable venues in the unit to act as the main base for the review team and for any parallel meetings. The main base must comfortably accommodate up to 16 people.
- 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 nominated student representative to recruit students for the student meetings
  - 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 8.

On the first day of the review

- Provide a 10-minute presentation or introduction at the first meeting of the day. This is usually delivered by the Director and should include a brief overview of the unit (e.g. number of students using the service, management structure, current status of unit and future plans/strategy) as well as what the unit would like to get out of the day.
- 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 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 10*.
- Share the review outcomes with students and staff.
- Submit a year-on update one year after submission of the action plan. A template is available in *Appendix 10*. This will be considered by AMG who will approve the update or recommend further actions.

Appendix 2: Summary of the review process

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

Timescale	Prior to the review day
Academic year prior to review	Chair of review team, Academic Policy Officer, and Quality team Administrator hold an initial meeting with Director to discuss review process
Academic year prior to review	Quality team provides access to URLT Team and unit specific channel in MS Teams
6 weeks prior to review	Director submits RA, AIS and draft programme, and student representative submits student voice
	Documentation considered by review team. Some additional information may be requested by the team
2 weeks prior to review	Director submits completed version of the programme for consideration at review team planning meeting. Quality team Administrator issues meeting MS Teams invites to attendees.
	Review team submits areas of good practice and areas for exploration on the review days and key themes are circulated to the review team
7-10 days prior to review	Review team attends pre-meeting to discuss key themes and programme
1 week prior to review	Key themes shared with Director for circulation to review participants
	The review day
	Review team meets with Director and groups of staff and students
	After the visit
1-2 weeks after review	Academic Policy Officer circulates draft commendations and recommendations to review team for approval
4 weeks after review	Externals submit commentary for inclusion in evaluative report
5 weeks after review	Academic Policy Officer circulates draft evaluative report to team for input
6 weeks after review	Report shared with unit in final draft form to allow for any factual corrections. Once finalised, unit shares report outcomes with staff and students, and Academic Policy Officer (Quality) shares report with AMG
6-8 weeks after report finalised	Unit produces action plan in response to recommendations. Action plan considered by AMG

One year after submission of action plan	Unit provides year-on update for consideration by AMG

Appendix 3: Reflective Analysis template

<div align="center">

REFLECTIVE ANALYSIS
<PROFESSIONAL SERVICES UNIT>
<DATE OF REVIEW>

</div>

1. Introduction (no more than 2 pages)

a) The development and approval process for the RA including student involvement and engagement in the process and writing of the RA.
b) What the unit would like to gain from the process and specific areas the unit would like the review team to explore.
c) A brief update on actions taken in response to the previous review and any significant developments since the last review.

2. Unit context and strategy (no more than 2 pages)

a) Brief overview of provision/structure of unit
b) Staffing
c) Strategic priorities and alignment with the [Education and Student Experience Strategy](#) themes, i.e. world-leading, diverse, digital, sustainable and entrepreneurial.

3. Engagement with students

Units are asked to provide brief commentary on the approach to and effectiveness of:

a) Engagement with students and other internal and external stakeholders.
b) Unit's impact on the student learning experience and ways in which the unit supports a high-quality learning environment and continuous quality enhancement.

4. Staff, resources, provision, and further development

Units are asked to provide brief commentary on the approach to and effectiveness of:

a) Professional development of staff
b) Space and resources (for unit staff and students)
c) Evaluation of provision (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats)
d) Points of focus for further development/ambitions

Appendix 4: Advance information set

For ease of reference documents should be converted into PDFs (unless otherwise stated), labelled as shown, and documents provided should be clearly described in the 'Requirements' column, for example, dates of the minutes provided should be clearly shown. If appropriate, additional context may be added.

File name	Requirements
AIS00 Contents list	Coversheet that briefly outlines contents of AIS
AIS01 Draft programme	Include names and job titles of staff. A final version with student names should be submitted two weeks before the review. **The programme should be submitted in Word format.**
AIS02 Organisation chart	
AIS03 Staff list	Staff list including positions held
AIS04 Plans	Operational and strategic plans as a PDF or a hyperlink to the plans on the unit website, if available
AIS05 Minutes	Minutes of management group and Unit meetings (if appropriate). Sample (2-3 sets of minutes) for each meeting from the last 12 months. Each meeting should be clearly titled, and minutes should be combined into a single PDF
AIS06 student feedback	Student feedback spanning the last 12 months relating to services provided by the Unit. This may be internal student feedback collected by the unit or external survey feedback, such as NSS, iGrad, PTES and PRES.
AIS07 Materials	Samples of promotional/guidance materials if applicable (no more than 5 samples)
AIS08 Year-on update	The Quality team will provide the action plan and year-on update from the previous review
AIS09 Miscellaneous	Any other supporting documentation agreed with the unit that will help provide an overview of the Unit's activities

Appendix 5: Sample programme for unit reviews

There is no template programme for unit reviews. Programmes vary depending on the themes and format suggested by the unit. However, all reviews will include an introductory overview meeting at the start of the day and a final meeting with the Director at the end of the review day. Please discuss your programme with the Quality team. There is scope to hold parallel sessions with students or the review team can meet with them as one or two larger groups.

University-led review of Professional Service Unit
<Unit>
<Date of review>

Main base: <name of room>
Parallel meetings: <Name of room>

Programme

DAY 1

0930	**Review team convenes**
0945	**Overview of Unit** *This will include a 10-minute (max) presentation or introduction by the Unit. 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* 1. Name, Director 2. Name, Deputy Director
1100	**Coffee**
1115	**Meeting e.g. with senior management team** 1. Name and job title 2. Name and job title Etc
1200	Review team reconvenes
1215	**Meeting e.g. with frontline services staff** 1. Name and job title 2. Name and job title Etc
1300	Lunch
1345	**Tour of Unit** Name and job title of tour guide
1415	Review team reconvene
1430	**Meeting with Postgraduate students** *Unit to recruit around 12 students* 1. Name, year, and degree programme 2. Name, year, and degree programme

	Etc.
1515	Review team reconvene
1530	**Meeting with UG students** *Unit to recruit around 12 students* 3. Name, year, and degree programme 4. Name, year, and degree programme Etc.
1615	**Review team reconvenes**
1630	**End of Day 1**

DAY 2

0930	**Review team convenes**
1000	**Meeting e.g. with recently appointed staff and trainees** 3. Name and capacity within which they are attending 4. Name and capacity within which they are attending Etc
1045	Review team reconvenes
1100	**Meeting e.g. With representatives from academic schools** 1. Name and capacity within which attending 2. Name and capacity within which attending Etc
1145	Coffee
1200	**Meeting e.g. with service delivery team leads** 1. Name and job title 2. Name and job title Etc
1245	**Review team reconvenes**
1300	**Brief meeting with Director and Deputy Director**
1315	**Lunch for review team and draft commendations/recommendations**
1400	**End of visit**

The unit is encouraged to adapt the information below when recruiting students and briefing them in preparation for the review day.

University of St Andrews
University-led Review of Professional Services Unit
<Professional services unit>
<Date of review>

Information for students

A University-led review of professional services is being carried out in the <unit> on <date>. Reviews of student-facing units are carried out on a six-year cycle and aim to assure and enhance the quality of the student experience. Students play an important role in the review process and their contribution is very much valued.

Groups of students from all levels of study are asked to attend a short meeting on the review day to chat with the review team about their experiences at St Andrews. Student feedback is gathered by a student representative from the Students' Association appointed to produce the 'Student Voice'. The Student Voice is circulated to the review team in advance of the review day.

The review is carried out by a senior member of the Principal's Office, two external specialists, an internal member of staff from a cognate area in the University, the Director of Education from the Students' Association (DoEd) or delegate, a Postgraduate Research (PGR) representative and an Academic Policy Officer (Quality) ('the review team').

Meeting with the review team on the review day

The review team will talk to representative groups of students and staff about their experience of the support services offered by the unit.

The reviewers wish to explore commendable aspects of the unit's services to reinforce good practice and disseminate this to other professional service units as appropriate. Students are also encouraged to share any difficulties or shortcomings they have encountered. This will help the unit identify areas of their service that can be enhanced.

Whilst notes will be taken during the discussions, no comments will be attributed to any individuals. Staff members from the unit will not be present during the student meetings, so please feel free to speak openly and freely. Students are also represented on the review team by way of the Director of Education from the Students' Association and a PGR representative.

Meeting times

The review team will divide for the parallel undergraduate sub-honours and Honours meetings and also for the postgraduate meetings. A meeting invite will be emailed to you advising you of the location and time of the meeting.

Your participation and feedback in the review process is very much valued and appreciated.

Appendix 7: Guidance for student voice coordinator

Student-facing professional services units (Careers, Libraries and Museums,) are reviewed on a six-year cycle. The review process encourages reflection on:

- the role of the unit in relation to the student experience and support for a high-quality learning experience.
- the unit's engagement with students and other stakeholders to promote and support a high-quality learning environment and enhance the quality of its services.
- good practice and areas for enhancement.

The review is carried out by a member of the Principal's Office, two externals, an internal member of staff from a School or unit, the Director of Education (DoEd) (or delegate) from the Students' Association, a postgraduate research representative, and an Academic Policy Officer (Quality) ('the review team').

At the beginning of the academic year, you will have the opportunity to meet with the Quality team to discuss your role in the review and ask any questions. A 'Student Voice' channel will be set up in MS Teams for students involved in reviews being held during the academic year and you will be invited to use this channel to contact the Quality team for advice/questions. The DoEd also has access to this channel and can offer support and guidance.

1. *In advance of the review*

The unit prepares and submits a Reflective Analysis and other supporting documentation in advance of the review which is shared with the review team. A 'Student Voice' document, produced by the nominated student coordinator, will also be shared with the review team. The student voice is a summary of student feedback on the unit's services. A sample Student Voice is provided. Student views are an important and valuable contribution to the review. It provides students with an opportunity to highlight to the review team areas that are working well, as well as any areas that could be enhanced. The student voice coordinator is encouraged to use an online survey to collect feedback from students at all levels of study (undergraduate, taught postgraduate and research students). A short simple survey comprising the following three questions is recommended.

- What is working well?
- Could anything be improved?
- Any additional comments?

The student voice should be uploaded to the 'Student Voice' Team in MS Teams six weeks prior to the review day. It is recommended that the survey is distributed to

students at least a month before the Student Voice is due to be submitted. For reviews being held in semester 2, feedback may be collected in semester 1.

2. On the day of the review

The meetings with students will be an opportunity for the review team to follow up on anything highlighted in the student voice document and to ask about the student experience. Students will also be able to raise and discuss other topics. Reviewers wish to explore commendable aspects of the unit and student experience. This will enable good practice to be reinforced and disseminated throughout the University, as appropriate. Students should also let the review team know about any difficulties or shortcomings they have encountered, as one of the aims of these reviews is to inform the unit of any enhancements that can be made.

Notes will be made on all discussions held during the review, but no comments will be attributed to any individuals. No members of staff from the unit will be present during the student meetings and students are encouraged to speak freely.

3. After the review

The review team will write an evaluative report, which will incorporate a summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the unit's provision, together with its commendations and recommendations. The report will normally be provided to the unit within six weeks of the review. Thereafter the unit will be asked to produce an action plan in response to the recommendations, and an update on actions within 12 months of the action plan. The unit is encouraged to share review outcomes and actions with staff and students.

If you would like to discuss the role further or if you have any queries, please contact the Quality team via the 'Student Voice' Team in MS Teams.

Student voice
University-led review of professional services unit
<Unit>

When gathering feedback from **undergraduate, taught postgraduate and research postgraduate students**, you may wish to ask for their opinion on aspects such as the curriculum, assessment, and feedback, learning and teaching provision, study abroad and work placements (if applicable), progression (for example the transition from junior honours to senior honours), and learning resources. Once you have collated this information, upload this form to the 'Student voice' team in MS Teams. If you need any advice or support, please contact us via the MS Teams channel.

1. How was the student voice gathered?

2. What is working well in the unit? *Please provide feedback at each level of study*
Undergraduate Taught Postgraduate Research Postgraduate

3. Could anything be improved in the unit?
Undergraduate Taught Postgraduate Research Postgraduate

4. Additional comments

☐ This feedback can be shared with the unit.

<Student representative's name>
<date>

Appendix 8: Practical arrangements for reviews

Communications and documentation

MS Teams is used as a platform/portal for review-related communication and documentation for all reviews. A general URLT team has been set up in MS Teams as well as a private channel within this team for each School/Department/unit scheduled for review.

All Directors will be invited to join the general URLT team and relevant private channel for their unit. Additional colleagues such as the Director's PA can be given access upon request of the Director. The Quality team Administrator will upload the Reflective Analysis (RA), evaluative report, action plan and programme from your unit's previous review into the unit's private channel for reference. A template RA and programme will also be uploaded.

The Quality team will also post a list of key dates for the review process (including the submission deadline for the RA and evaluative report) in the unit channel. A general team will be set up for student representatives to upload their 'Student voice'.

Requirements for the review day

The review team will require a meeting room within the unit to use as their main base on the review days. This should be arranged by the unit. The meeting room should be large enough to accommodate the review team as well as colleagues invited to the meetings (6 members of the review team and approx. 10 staff members/students). As lunch and refreshments will also be served in this room, please ensure there is an additional surface/table available for this use. A meeting room will also be required for the parallel sessions with students.

The review team will require access to the meeting room from 0830 until 1730. The unit is asked to ensure that the review team can enter and exit the building with ease at these times.

Access to power sockets for charging laptops throughout the day will also be required. If there is not a sufficient number of power sockets in the room, extension cables should be supplied.

Lunch and refreshments for the review team will be arranged by the Quality team through University catering. Dietary requirements will be requested in advance of the meeting.

Appendix 9: Evaluative report template for unit reviews

University of St Andrews
University-led Review of <Unit>
Date of review

1. Introduction

2. Scope of the review

3. Main findings

Section to be drafted by External Reviewer(s)
Provides context for the commendations and recommendations

4. Commendations

The <name of unit> is commended for:

   a) XXXX
   b) XXXX

5. Recommendations

It is recommended that the <name of unit>:

   a) XXXX
   b) XXXX

Expression of confidence

The Review Team is pleased to report **confidence** (the highest judgement) in the <name of unit>

Rosalind Campbell/Karen Murphy
Academic Policy Officer (Quality)
(Approved by the review team gathered for the purposes of this review)

Review team

Action	Date
Date of review	
Draft report to review team	
Planned submission date to the unit	
Final draft to the unit	
Final approved report to the unit	
AMG submission	

Appendix 10: Action plan and year-on update

Units are required 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 unit should summarise their intended actions in response to the recommendations. Timeframes for the completion of actions should also be provided. These should be as specific as possible, e.g. March 2024.

University-led Review of <unit>
<Date of review>
Action plan in response to recommendations

Recommendation	Response/action	Timeframe
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		

☐ Plan produced in consultation with members of staff in the unit

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

Units are also asked to submit a year-on update in the format below. The action plan can be used a starting point. The short year-on updates should be provided in red, and the title of the document should be updated to clearly indicate that it is a year-on update. The updates should include the outcome and impact for each action.

University-led Review of <unit>
<Date of review>
Year-on update

Recommendation	Response/action and year-on update in red	Timeframe
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		

☐ Update produced in consultation with members of staff in the Unit

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	Annual update		Quality team, Education and Student Experience	August 2023
1.2	Update to programme template		Quality team, Education and Student Experience	October 2023
1.3	Annual update		Quality team, Education and Student Experience	July 2024