

Periodic Review: School Review Operational Guidance

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of School Review is to provide University oversight of the efficacy of a School's approach in: (a) managing the standards and quality of its courses and (b) implementing measures agreed at UET in relation to student experience and student outcomes. This supplement sets out how the School Review works in practice.
- 1.2 Members of the panel for School Review engage with a range of evidence in order to support the School in reflecting on how it provides assurance to the University that the OfS B Conditions of Registration continue to be met¹. In summary this means that assurance of the following areas is considered:
 - The academic experience (B1)
 - Resources, student support and student engagement (B2)
 - Assessment (B4)
 - Standards (B5)
- 1.3 The panel draws on evidence from (a) outcomes of a CADQ desk-based review of School and course processes (b) a presentation provided by the School and (c) discussions with or insights provided by staff, students and stakeholders².
- 1.4 The documentation which is considered at the desk-based review is standard documentation that currently exists. Only documentation relating to the previous 12 months will be examined (unless a policy requires action to take place within a longer time period, in which case the most recent evidence relating to this area will be considered). There is no requirement for the School to produce anything solely for the purpose of the review event other than the presentation.

2. Criteria and evidence

- 2.1 Table 1 sets out the key questions that are used as the focus for review. These are mapped to the OfS B Conditions of Registration.

¹ The B3 student outcomes condition will be addressed through the revised Course Review process which is currently in development.

² The Panel will receive bespoke insights regarding external stakeholders relationship with the School through a short questionnaire disseminated through School Employability Managers. CADQ will provide the School with some generic questions and request that Schools provide feedback from at least five external stakeholders, 2 placement providers (where applicable) and 3 graduate employers.

OfS B condition	Overarching question(s) for review	Desk-based review will examine School-level activity that achieves:	Desk-based review will examine how this 'runs to ground' at course level by looking at evidence of:
B1	<p>How does the School and University know that courses are up-to-date, provides educational challenge, are coherent, are effectively delivered, requires students to develop relevant skills?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Are the quality management processes that the School has in place providing effective assurance of the academic experience? Does activity at course level reflect the School and University expectations with respect to ensuring a high quality academic experience. 	<p>Oversight of plans to support a high quality academic experience (for example S4A, employability, NSS)</p> <p>Oversight of teaching observation policy and impact</p> <p>Oversight of external examiner feedback</p> <p>Oversight of course changes</p> <p>Oversight of Periodic course review and periodic collaborative review</p> <p>Oversight of employer engagement</p> <p>Oversight of the course design and approval process</p>	<p>Actions taking place with respect to NSS, S4A, GOS plans</p> <p>PCRs taking place with the right people and the right evidence (in relation to quality of experience)</p> <p>Team engagement with external examiners</p> <p>Engagement with employers and collaborative partners (where appropriate)</p>
B2	<p>How does the School and University know that students receive the right kinds of resources and support to ensure success during and beyond their course?</p> <p>How does the School and University know that students are effectively engaged in decisions about their course and their experience?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Are the quality management processes that the School has in place providing effective assurance of (a) provisions of resources and support and (b) student engagement? Does activity at course level reflect the School and University expectations with respect to ensuring (a) students receive appropriate resources and support and (b) students are appropriately engaged? 	<p>Oversight of NSS, S4A, GOS plans</p> <p>Oversight of WLE</p> <p>Oversight of staff development within the School and at partners (where applicable)</p> <p>Oversight of PCRs (in relation to resources and support)</p> <p>Oversight of student feedback on courses</p> <p>Oversight of student support to prevent academic misconduct</p> <p>Oversight of careers support</p> <p>Oversight of personal tutoring</p>	<p>Periodic course reviews and collaborative reviews (where applicable) taking place with the right people and the right evidence (in relation to resources and support)</p> <p>Actions taking place with respect to NSS, S4A, GOS plans</p> <p>Staff development engagement (course level)</p> <p>Support for students in careers, academic misconduct, academic skills etc</p> <p>Use of student reps</p> <p>Use of module evaluation</p>
B4	<p>How does the School and University know that students are assessed effectively and that assessment is valid and reliable?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Are the quality management processes that the School has in place providing effective assurance of assessment? Does activity at course level reflect the School and 	<p>Oversight of moderation practice</p> <p>Oversight of assessment and feedback practice</p> <p>Oversight of staff training/induction on the NTU assessment framework</p> <p>Oversight of external examiner feedback on assessment</p>	<p>Moderation practice</p> <p>Assessment and feedback practice</p> <p>External examiner engagement with course team and partner (for collaborative courses)</p>

	University expectations with respect to assessment?	Oversight of academic misconduct outcomes Oversight of student feedback about assessment	
B5	<p>How does the School and University know that courses are designed at an appropriate sector-recognised standard and the awards reflect these standards?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are the quality management processes that the School has in place providing effective assurance of standards? 2. Does activity at course level reflect the School and University expectations with respect to standards? 	<p>Oversight of external examiner feedback on standards</p> <p>Oversight of operation of examination boards</p> <p>Oversight of academic misconduct outcomes</p>	<p>Alignment to benchmarks and PSRB requirements</p> <p>Operation of examination boards</p>

3. Desk based review

- 3.1 The purpose of the desk-based review is to provide the review panel with information about how the School's quality management processes assure the University that the B conditions of registration continue to be met. This is achieved by a set of reports:
- a. A report that considers School level oversight of those activities considered to be necessary for assuring quality and standards (see table above).
 - b. Reports for each of the courses selected for deep dive review. These course reports reflect on course-level activity.
- 3.2 The number of courses in the deep dive sample is commensurate with the size of the School and the outcome of the latest UET review. The courses are selected on the basis that they are broadly representative of the School's provision. They may also include a course highlighted by UET as requiring specific action, or a course put forward by the School as one that could potentially benefit from external scrutiny. At a minimum, the deep dive sample will include one undergraduate, one postgraduate, and a collaborative course where appropriate.

4. Review panel

- 4.1 Each panel member has a specific role as part of the review event, as follows:
- Review Chair and Review Manager: maintain oversight of all areas of review
 - External panel member: focus on academic experience, resources and support (B1 and B2)
 - **Two** internal panel members: focus upon assessment and standards (B4 and B5)
 - Student panel member: focus upon student engagement (B2)
- 4.2 In order to prepare for the review event itself, the panel will receive the desk-based review reports and the School's S4A and GOS plans. They will not routinely

have access to other source evidence, unless in a specific case and agreed by the Chair.

- 4.3 Panel members need to have undertaken their consideration of the documentation before the agenda setting meeting which usually takes place one week before the review event.

5. Timeframe

- 5.1 CADQ and the School confirm the term for the review in the year preceding the review. A panel is convened.

- 5.2 The timeframe is as follows:

Time	Activity
14 weeks prior to review event	CADQ confirms courses selected for 'deep dives'
10 weeks prior to review event	School makes documentation available to CADQ
10 weeks prior to review event	CADQ start desk-based review
3 weeks prior to review event	Panel receive outcomes of desk-based review
1 week prior to review event	Agenda setting meeting for panel
1 weeks prior to review event	Confirmation of required attendance of specific colleagues at review event
	Review event
Approx. 15 working days after review event	Draft report of observations shared with School to complete. This timeframe is subject to the working pattern of the Review Manager and any University closure days
Date agreed with Chair and School	Where required, action plan agreed
Next available ASQC	Final report and action plan submitted to ASQC

6. Agenda setting meeting

- 6.1 CADQ will arrange an agenda setting meeting for all panel members usually one week before the review event takes place. Attendance is important and panel members are asked to prioritise this meeting in their diaries. The meeting is chaired by the Review Chair.
- 6.2 Panel members need to have undertaken their consideration of the documentation before this meeting. Based on individual members' reading of the documentation,

the panel will begin to set out the broad areas that appear to require further exploration at the review event. Panel members should read all documentation and focus their particular attention on the areas for which they are responsible (see above 4.1).

6.3 The panel will receive responses to the external stakeholder questionnaire distributed by School Employability Managers in the lead up to the review. The short questionnaire complements documentary evidence provided by Schools that showcase their relationship with employers and placements providers.

6.4 In the period between the private panel meeting and the review event, panel members should begin to draft questions for the event based on the broad discussion areas agreed at the agenda setting meeting. These questions will then be confirmed at the private meetings of the panel during the review event itself.

7. Review event

7.1 There are two key features of the review event: the School presentation and meetings with staff and students.

School presentation

7.2 The purpose of the School presentation is to provide an overview of the School's approach, and the challenges associated with ensuring good outcomes for all students. This is an opportunity for the School to reflect on their Success for All action plan and their priorities with respect to improving student continuation, completion and progression.

7.3 Reference should be made to the outcomes of the most recent UET Autumn Review.

7.4 The presentation should be no longer than 20 minutes.

Meetings with staff and students

7.5 The purpose of these meetings is to triangulate outcomes from the desk-based review with evidence provided by staff and students. Areas of discussion will have been identified at the panel's agenda setting meeting.

7.6 The School is responsible for ensuring that appropriate students and staff are invited to the afternoon meetings of the review event day. The selection of students and staff will be first made by the School and then confirmed by the Panel during the agenda-setting meeting. Changes may be required after this point. The Review Day meetings should include:

- a. School Senior Colleagues – Executive Dean, Deputy Dean, School Quality Manager, Learning and Teaching Manager, Head of School Operations, School Employability Manager, Head of Department for courses chosen for deep dive, any other colleagues identified by the Review Manager and/or the School.
- b. Student meeting(s) – A student from L4, 5 and 6 from the courses chosen for deep dive to include a mixture of entry qualification e.g. BTEC, A levels. Where possible, the student attendees should also include a mixture of demographics, a course rep, international and mature.
- c. Staff meeting – Course leaders (from each deep dive course), Principal lecturers (where appropriate and from a selection of the deep dive courses), Senior lecturers (from a selection of the deep dive courses). It may be useful

to have a colleague who has personal tutoring as part of their role. Module leaders (from a selection of the deep dive courses), 1 Hourly Paid Lecturer (HPL) and 1 Technician (where appropriate).

If there are any issues with regards to identifying who from the above can attend on the day of the review then please reach out to the Review Manager at your earliest convenience.

- 7.7 The role of the School Lead is a significant one and allows for consistent communication between the School and CADQ throughout the 6-9 month Periodic Review process. It is anticipated that the School Lead be present at all milestones and discussions. This includes the Senior Colleague meeting on the day of the review. The attendance of the School Lead means that at least one colleague has engaged with each touchpoint which benefits the post-review day School response and action plan; through ASQC to operationalising and monitoring within the School.

- 7.8 An indicative timetable for the event is provided below:

Indicative event timetable	
9.00 – 9.55	Panel meeting
10.00 – 10.30	School presentation
10.30 – 11.30	Discussion with senior School colleagues
11.30 – 12.25	Panel meeting
1.30 – 2.30 (2 meetings in parallel)	Half the panel meet with undergraduate students, half with post graduate students
2.30 – 3.30	Panel meeting
3.30 – 5.00	The panel meet with School staff
5.05 – 6.00	Panel meeting
6.00-6.10	Informal meeting with the School PR contact usually the School Standards and Quality Manager and the CADQ Review Manager

8. Outcome of the review

- 8.1 The outcome of the review is articulated in a report drafted by CADQ and agreed by the panel. This report will be prepared within approximately 15 working days of the event taking place, this is subject to the Review Manager's working pattern and University closure days . The writing of the report will require contributions from the panel; therefore, panel members need to ensure that they set aside time to contribute to the preparation of the report in the weeks after the event
- 8.2 The report summarises the main observations made by the panel about the efficacy of the School's approach to assuring that the B Conditions continue to be

met. It will also provide a commentary on the panel's reflections on the efficacy of the actions being taken to ensure good outcomes (academic and professional) for all students.

- 8.3 The report will also set out actions that the School is required to address, and a timeframe for these actions.
- 8.4 The draft report is sent to the School, and key School colleagues are asked to respond to observations and complete the report with a) their reflections on having been through the process and what may have changed as a result and, b) how they plan to meet any required actions.
- 8.5 The School is expected to report on these actions at a meeting with the Review Chair and Review Manager at a mutually agreed date. The final report and action plan is considered at the next Academic Standards and Quality Committee.

Policy owner
CADQ

Change history			
Version:	Approval date:	Implementation date:	Nature of significant revisions:
May 2022	10.05.22	N/A	New policy
Sept 2022	22.09.22	1.10.22	None
Mar 2023	07.03.23	07.03.23	Timeframe amended
April 2023	N/A	26.04.23	Further details about Review Day meeting attendees added. Removal of references to stakeholders.
Sept 2023	14.09.23	01.10.23	Minor refinements including addition of second internal panel member and minor update to timings. Guidance for the School regarding the report.

Equality Analysis		
Version:	EA date:	Completed by:

--	--	--