



The University of
Nottingham

UNITED KINGDOM • CHINA • MALAYSIA

Teaching and Learning Review Handbook

**A Guide for Participants
during Academic Session
2015/2016**

**Produced by Academic Services
Division**

version 1 – 2015/16

Handbook Contents:

	About The Handbook	3
	Key Contacts	3
Section 1:	About Teaching and Learning Reviews	4
1.1	Context	4
1.2	Scope	5
1.3	Review Objectives	5
1.4	Compliance with the Quality Manual	6
Section 2:	Review Process	7
2.1	Review Panel	7
2.2	Review Visit	7
2.3	Review Report	7
2.4	Post-Visit Activity	8
Section 3:	Information for the School and information provision	9
3.1	The Review Evidence Pack	9
3.1a	School Document Checklist	9
3.1b	Additional Data and Information	11
3.1c		11
3.2	School documents including Programme Evaluation Documents	11
Section 4:	The Review Panel: Roles and Responsibilities	12
4.1	The Review Chair	12
4.2	The Deputy Review Chair	12
4.3	Senior Administrator	12
4.4	The Review Secretary	12
4.5	The External Panel Member	13
4.6	Academic Services Division: The Review Co-ordinator	13
Section 5:	Review Documentation and Activity Schedule	14
5.1	Review Evidence Pack (REP)	14
5.2	The Production of the Programme Evaluation Documents and Review Summary Document	14
Section 6:	Review Costs and Financial Support	15
Appendices		
Appendix A	Review Schedule	16
Appendix B	Example Review Agenda	19

About The Handbook

This handbook provides a single point of reference for anyone participating in Teaching and Learning Reviews at the University of Nottingham. Our aim is for the handbook to help you to understand the process, the roles and responsibilities of those involved in Reviews.

If you have any comments or questions about the process, please contact:

Georgia Thresh – Quality Assurance Manager, Academic Services Division (ASD)

georgia.thresh@nottingham.ac.uk

External: 0115 748 4621

Internal: 84621

Quality and Standards Administration
E Floor, Academic Services
Portland Building
University of Nottingham
University Park
Nottingham
NG7 2RD

Section 1: About Teaching and Learning Reviews

Teaching and Learning Review (TLR) is intended to facilitate the periodic review of academic provision in a manner informed by the Quality Code for Higher Education issued by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA).

1.1 Context

Teaching and Learning Reviews are the University of Nottingham's approach to undertaking periodic reviews to taught and research programmes delivered by individual Schools. The reviews are constructive exercises, and they should contribute to the following high-level goals:

- Reviewing teaching and learning activities and the effectiveness of the School's structure to ensure adherence to the University's Quality Manual;
- Improving overall School performance;
- Improving the student experience of teaching and learning;
- Quality enhancement (continuous improvement) by identifying good practice which can be disseminated across the University.

QAA Quality Code

The QAA Quality Code requires universities to meet the following Expectation with regard to monitoring and review of programmes:

Higher education providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective, regular and systematic processes for monitoring and for review of programmes.

QAA guidance is contained in Chapter B8 (available in full at <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Documents/B8.pdf>).

The Quality Code states:

"The purpose of programme monitoring or programme review is to consider the continuing currency and validity of programmes in light of developments in research, professional and industry practice and pedagogy (including the use of technology in learning and teaching), changes in the external environment such as requirements of professional, statutory and regulatory bodies, and continued alignment with the provider's strategy and mission. They also evaluate whether students are attaining the intended learning outcomes and whether the assessment regime enables this to be appropriately demonstrated ... Higher education providers ensure that processes are designed in such a way to enable this balance between assurance and enhancement to be achieved.

The processes highlight where improvements to provision are possible in order to enhance the student learning experience and encourage the development of more inclusive approaches to learning, teaching and assessment. Higher education providers use the processes of monitoring and review to consider the entitlements of students with protected characteristics, ensuring that all students have an equal opportunity to achieve the intended learning outcomes."

Higher education providers are expected to undertake programme review periodically and to an agreed cycle. This has a broader remit than programme monitoring (called the annual monitoring process at the University of Nottingham) and is informed by a view of trends over time.

The Quality Code itemises the following types of information to be considered as part of the programme monitoring and programme review processes:

- Data on student progression and achievement
- Information made publicly available or reported to external bodies including professional, regulatory and statutory bodies
- Reports from external examiners
- Other comparative data
- Feedback from students, alumni, staff and employers.

1.2 Scope

Reviews cover academic provision within schools. Supporting documentation for each area is provided to the Review Panel. The Review will focus on the continuing currency and validity of the School's curriculum and the systems and procedures in place within the School to support teaching and learning. Additionally attention will be paid to how a school has responded to issues and the implementation of subsequent necessary changes, whether this has been by a response to student demand and expectations, results from surveys such as the National Student Survey, Nottingham Student Experience Survey, Postgraduate Taught and Research Experience Surveys (PTES and PRES) and student feedback, developments in teaching and learning etc. The overriding objective is to ensure processes and systems within the School are as effective as possible in order to support the University's provision of high quality learning and teaching. The purpose of the review is not to 'catch out' a School, but to provide an opportunity to help identify any areas of strength or weakness, and offer support and guidance where appropriate.

Teaching and Learning – Campuses in Asia

The premise on which the University of Nottingham Malaysia and Ningbo campuses have been established is that teaching operations are structured and managed through the owning University of Nottingham School. The review must therefore encompass programmes, staff, students and procedures at the University of Nottingham Ningbo Campus (UNNC) and Malaysia Campus (UNMC) where appropriate.

The provisions of the Quality Manual and any other University regulations regarding the quality management of learning and teaching apply equally to the University's campuses in the UK and Asia. Across all campuses, primary responsibility for quality assurance and for the implementation of the Quality Manual (including module and programme ownership) rests with the Heads of Schools under the jurisdiction of Senate and its committees. Schools with provision on more than one campus are therefore regarded as multi-campus entities for the purpose of the Quality Manual. Schools with responsibility for provision at UNNC and/or UNMC must demonstrate that they follow policy and procedures laid out in the Quality Manual for provision at the international campuses in the same way as for provision on the Nottingham campus. Schools with these responsibilities should include references to provision of teaching and learning at the Malaysia and/or the Ningbo Campuses in their documentation where appropriate.

1.3 Review Objectives

The reviews will ensure that:

- The School's programmes continue to have currency and validity as expressed by the QAA Quality Code;

- Qualifications offered by the School are in line with the University of Nottingham Qualifications Framework (UNQF);
- The School's systems and procedures for dealing with staff and students are as effective as possible, and support the University's claims to provide high quality teaching and learning;
- Any areas of strength and weakness are identified, and support and guidance are offered to the School, where appropriate;
- Learning outcomes of programmes have an appropriate match to relevant QAA benchmark statements, and are taught and assessed in a satisfactory manner.

In addition, the reviews will:

- include School activities on all campuses;
- Identify strengths, achievements and good practice based on evidence which can be disseminated across the University;
- Focus on areas where improvements will achieve the greatest benefits; and
- Aim to be forward looking, helping schools to identify opportunities for enhancement in teaching and learning provision.

1.4 Compliance with the Quality Manual

The Review Panel will be particularly interested in compliance with the following entries in the Quality Manual:

The University of Nottingham Qualifications Framework at

<http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/academicservices/qualitymanual/curriculum/unqfindex.aspx>

University of Nottingham Admissions Policy at

<http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/academicservices/qualitymanual/admissions/universityofnottinghamadmissionspolicy.aspx>

Annual Monitoring of programmes at

<http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/academicservices/qualitymanual/curriculum/annual-monitoring.aspx> , including compliance with policies for approval of changes to Programme Specifications and Modules. This will also incorporate checking conformity with the External

Examining policy

(<http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/academicservices/qualitymanual/assessmentandawards/appointment-and-responsibilities-of-external-examiners.aspx>)

The Student Engagement policy at

<http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/academicservices/qualitymanual/student-engagement-and-complaints/index.aspx>

The Student Support and Development policy at

<http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/academicservices/qualitymanual/studentsupport/studentsupportanddevelopment.aspx>

Information which the School makes available to students and applicants :see

<http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/academicservices/qualitymanual/mappingagainsttheqaqualitycode/information-about-provision-of-higher-education.aspx>

Section 2: Review Process

2.1 Review Panel

The review will be carried out by a Review Panel that will include:

- A Chair: a member of Teaching & Learning Board (TLB)
- An external member from the relevant discipline (for some schools, more than one external member may be required)
- A senior academic member of staff from within the University (where possible from the same Faculty)
- A student representative
- A senior manager from a student-facing Professional Service (usually Level 5 or above).
- A review secretary (from a pool of APM staff, usually Level 4)

Support for the Review Panels, and for the Teaching & Learning Review process will come from the Review co-ordinator in Academic Services Division.

The Review Panel will be supplied with a Review Evidence Pack (REP) containing information about the School. This will be reviewed by the Panel, and their assessment will form the basis of the agenda for the Review Visit.

2.2 Review Visit

This will usually be a one-day visit, which may be spread over two days in some cases (a consecutive afternoon and morning) to the school by the Review Panel in order to facilitate arrangements for video-conference sessions with staff and students from the overseas campuses where these are appropriate. During the visit the Panel will meet with members of the School and students. In addition, input from international campuses may be necessary. The review days will usually cover the following agenda:

- Review of the School's programmes
- An assessment of teaching and learning
- Evaluation of student feedback.

The documents produced by the School will provide the Panel with questions to ask during the review visit. The Panel will investigate how the School's systems operate in theory and in practice. The details of the Review Evidence Pack will either close or open up lines of enquiry. The Panel will also assure themselves that the School has sufficient evidence on which to base the judgements made in the Programme Evaluation Documents and Summary (where this is supplied) and determine if the evidence of the visit supports the statements made.

In seeking to answer these questions the Panel will meet with different groups of School and student representatives and ensure that they are able to assess such things as the effectiveness of the structure, the robustness of the system and how widely it is promoted, by 'triangulating' the response of the interviewees. They will also be able to identify good practice.

At the end of the Review the Chair of the Panel will give verbal feedback to the School senior management team. The Panel will then produce a formal report within 4 weeks of the audit.

2.3 Review Report

Immediately following the review, the Review Panel will orally inform the Head of School of the key findings. The Review Panel will then produce the final report for Teaching and Learning Board to review the recommendations. *Before* submitting to TLB, the report will be shared with the Head of School to agree an action plan for delivering the recommendations. The Head of

School may also, if they wish, submit comments to accompany the report to TLB. The report will be presented to TLB at the next reasonable opportunity to do so.

2.4 Post-Visit Activity

It is the responsibility of TLB to decide whether or not a Review Follow-up needs to be carried out, which may be upon the recommendation of the Chair of the Panel. This will occur on a case by case basis and only if areas of particular concern are identified as a result of the initial review.

Section 3: Information for the School and Information Provision:

The Review Co-ordinator will contact the Head of School to arrange an introductory meeting in advance of the review. This meeting is an opportunity for the Review Coordinator to talk through the process and answer any questions that the School may have about the review process, documentation, how the review day is organised, and so on.

The Head of School and senior School staff are expected to support and enable the preparation of documentation for the review. They are also responsible for ensuring staff are aware of the review activities and are available to participate, if required. The Review Co-ordinator will provide the School with a list of the documents they are required to supply.

Before the review, the Head of School will be asked to:

- Nominate potential external panel members
- Provide a nominated person within the School to act as a liaison with the Review Co-ordinator (normally the School Manager and/or Director of Teaching)
- Provide the documentation requested by the Review Co-ordinator prior to the review and within the arranged time-frame.

For each information category below, professional services will be responsible for highlighting any notable items for consideration by the review panel. This input will be used by the panel to check the statements contained in the School's reports.

3.1 The Review Evidence Pack:

The Review Evidence Pack (REP) is the pack that the Panel will be provided with in order to carry out the review. This will contain a range of information on the Teaching and Learning provision and experience within a School. This information will be provided by the School and Professional Services, and also a Student Written Submission, the preparation of which will be supported by the Students' Union.

Schools will be required to submit a number of documents that contribute towards the REP.

3.1a School Document Checklist:

- ✓ Programme Evaluation Documents
- ✓ Account of Student Engagement
- ✓ School Tutoring Statements
- ✓ Research Degree Programmes
- ✓ Review Summary Document (optional)
- ✓ Response to Student Written Submission (optional)

Further information on each of these, where necessary, follows:

- *Programme Evaluation Document:*

Before the Review, the Review Co-ordinator will request Programme Evaluation Documents to be submitted by the School. A separate report should be provided for each of the School's taught courses. Programmes that are closely related and share a significant number of modules may be grouped together for this purpose and a single report submitted for the group of courses. It is not necessary to provide separate documentation for programmes run on overseas campuses where the programme is the same as the UK. However, if a programme is run only on UNMC and/or UNNC a separate document will be required. If you would like guidance on grouping together programmes please contact Georgia Thresh for guidance.

The document should consider whether:

- The changes to the course over the last five years have enhanced the design and operation of the course.
- Sufficient staff and physical resources are available for the effective delivery of the course.
- Course content adequately reflects current research and practice in the discipline.
- Delivery of the course has kept pace with developments in teaching and learning.
- The course is in line with University frameworks, QAA subject benchmarks, and PSRB requirements.
- The course has kept pace with changes in student demand, employer expectations, and employment opportunities.
- Data on student progression and achievement provide assurance on academic standards and the learning opportunities being offered to students to meet those standards.
- The content and delivery of the course meets student expectations as expressed in the NSS and other forms of student feedback.

Each report should indicate any changes to the course or its delivery that have been or will be implemented in order to be able to respond (more) positively to each of the above points.

- *Account of Student Engagement:*

A brief account of how the School engages students in its quality assurance processes, including examples and any best practice.

- *Research Degree Programmes:*

A separate report should also be provided on the adequacy of arrangements for supervising and supporting research students and any recent or planned changes in that regard.

- *Review Summary Document:*

Additionally, after the Review Evaluation Pack has been compiled (comprising the Programme Evaluation Documents and data/documents listed below), the School may wish to write a brief overview document for submission at the same time as the Programme Evaluation Documents. This should comment on any elements of the below data that may differ from institution or sector benchmarks and provide further explanation where necessary.

- *Response to Student Written Submission:*

The above documents, as well as the 'Additional Data and Information' outlined below will be shared with the Students' Union, who will facilitate the completion of the Student Written Submission. Once this has been submitted, the School will have the opportunity to respond if they wish. Either, the Review Summary Document (if submitted) can be updated to include a response, or an additional response document may be submitted. Submission of a response is at the School's discretion and is not a requirement.

3.1b Additional Data and Information:

The following documents and data will be provided by Professional Services for inclusion in the Review Evidence Pack:

- **Annual Monitoring reports:** examples of those available to be provided by Quality and Standards.
- **Key Information Set and Student Barometer data:**
- **National Student Survey data:** including open comments (where available)
- **PTES and PRES data**
- **PGR Submission Rates**
- **Student numbers and applications:** this information will be available on the MI Hub and additionally will be downloaded onto Workspace.
- **Qualifications of entrants**
- **Programme specifications:** student numbers and an audit report
- **Complaints and appeals statistics**
- **Quantitative Data Sets:** School Key Performance Indicators provided by SPP
- **External Examiner Reports and Responses**
- **LCF minutes**

Please note that whilst all of the information listed above, only a selection will be included in the hard copy of the REP.

3.1c The Student Written Submission:

The Students' Union will deliver training to the relevant representatives who will be involved in the document submission and, in conjunction with Academic Services, will prepare a list of key areas to address. The Student Representative will then be supported in preparing a written submission covering this list. To avoid any conflict of interest, the Education Network staff team will work alongside an elected Full-Time Officer, who would not be part of the panel, to support the student Reps.

Student representatives, with support from the Students' Union, will be invited to provide a submission to the Review Panel that covers whether:

- Students have particular issues about the School's courses or their delivery
- Student feedback has been listened to and acted upon
- Students have been sufficiently involved in decision making within the School
- The information provided to students by the School has been accurate and fit for purpose.

3.2 Sharing Information:

A Workspace will be set up for each Review in order to facilitate the sharing of information required for the review process.

Section 4: The Review Panel: Roles and Responsibilities

Support for the Review Panels, and for the Teaching & Learning Review process generally, will come from the Academic Services Division.

Before the review, the Review Panel will:

- Discuss and identify which areas the review will focus on, based on an analysis of the supporting documentation ;
- Collectively determine how best to address those areas, whether via single or group interviews, focus sessions, or by requesting additional documentation before, during, or after the review visit.

Following the review, the Review Panel will:

- Collaborate in the production of the review report, which is provided to Teaching and Learning Board by the Review Chair - within two months of the review visit.

4.1 The Review Chair

The Review Chair is the formal Head of the Review Panel and the principal author of the review report. They will ensure that the concerns addressed by the review are aligned with the University strategy and objectives, and that the review is conducted in accordance with the process agreed by Teaching and Learning Board. The Review Chair is a member of Teaching and Learning Board.

4.2 The Deputy Review Chair

The Review Deputy Chair supports the Review Chair during the review process and visit. The Deputy Chair should be a senior academic from within the University, and from the same Faculty as the School being reviewed if possible. The Deputy Chair will act as Chair in any instances where the Chair is unavailable or cannot act.

4.3 Senior Manager:

The Senior Administrator should be a Senior Manager (Level 5 or above) from a student-facing Professional Service or School.

4.4 The Review Secretary

The Review Secretary should be an APM member of staff (usually Level 4 and above). Responsibilities include:

Before the Review:

- Taking minutes of the pre-review panel meeting and ensuring there is a strong record of areas of particular importance to the Panel.
- Collating the views of the panel members and producing the review agenda with the Review Chair, taking into consideration particular areas of interest.

During the Review:

- Taking minutes throughout the duration of the Review and ensuring there is a clear and accurate record of discussion.
- Drafting, and subsequently supporting the panel in the preparation and sign-off of the review report to Teaching and Learning Board.

Following the Review:

- Acting as the link between the Review Panel and Review Co-ordinator in the initial stages of implementation of any Teaching and Learning Board approved recommendations;
- If a Review Follow-up is deemed to be necessary, the Review Secretary would have the responsibility of taking minutes for the meeting and drafting the subsequent report.

4.5 The External Panel Member:

The External Panel Member will give an independent and objective view during the review, drawing on their own experience of teaching provision, to counter any inward-looking tendency of the Panel. They are expected to provide subject expertise for the Panel, and the Review Chair may request that the External Panel Member concentrates on a particular area of questioning during the review visit.

The External Panel Member should not have any current links with the School, and should ideally have prior experience of undertaking a quality audit role.

The External Panel Member is not expected to attend any pre-review meetings, but will be invited by the Review Chair and/or Review Secretary to comment on the documentation provided, and share his/her views on the areas on which the review should focus.

All external panel members are required to sign and return a confidentiality agreement before taking part in any reviews at the University of Nottingham.

4.6 Academic Services Division: The Review Co-ordinator:

The Review Co-ordinator (a member of ASD), although not a panel member is the key liaison between the Review Panel, the School and Professional Services. They are responsible for supporting both the Review Chair and Deputy Chair in the fulfillment of responsibilities and facilitating all practical and logistical aspects of the review visit. Their responsibilities include, but are not limited to:

Before the review:

- Supporting the Review Chair/Deputy Chair in all communications, including to the external panel member(s) and the student representative;
- Ensuring availability of key individuals, and making necessary arrangements including room bookings and catering;
- Creating the Review Evidence Pack (REP);
- Facilitating any required pre-review panel meetings in line with the Review Chair/Deputy Chair;
- Preparing the agenda (in terms of timings and meeting different groups within the School), to be agreed by the Review Chair.

During the Review:

- Taking principal responsibility for all aspects of the review visit (logistics and arrangements);
- Maintaining a record of all costs associated with the review;

Following the Review:

- If a Follow-up Review is deemed necessary, to write and inform the School about the arrangements for this, together with the timescales.

Section 5: Review Documentation and Activity Schedule

5.1 Review Evidence Pack (REP)

The Review Panel will be supplied with a Review Evidence Pack containing all the information they need for the review. As a minimum this will include:

INPUTS FOR QAA COMPLIANCE	PROVIDED BY
Programme Evaluation Documents and Review Summary Document	Head of School
Teaching and Learning Executive Summary, comprising an assessment of the following documentation: Issues arising from annual monitoring as identified by ASD and the School; Programme Specification Audit (including an analysis by ASD of compliance with the University's Qualifications Framework); Information on changes to the programme since it was approved/last reviewed, provided by ASD and the School; External Examiners' reports and subsequent School responses.	Academic Services Division (ASD)
Governance structures, including details of committees, membership and remit	School Nominee (Usually the School Manager)
Data for the programme on student demand and graduate employment	Careers and Employability Service
Examples of School/Course handbooks	School Nominee (Usually the School Manager)
Annual Monitoring reports	ASD
Programme Specifications	ASD
Survey Results, including summary scores and open comments (eg NSS, PTES)	SPP

The Review Co-ordinator will oversee the request for and collation of all documents for inclusion in the REP.

5.2 The Production of the Programme Evaluation Documents and Review Overview Document:

Guidance to all REP Content Providers:

Anyone preparing material for the REP should be mindful of the intended audience, which consists of both the Review Panel and the Head of School.

Not all panel members will have a thorough familiarity with the School, so reports should be clear, not presume prior knowledge, and should not include confidential information

Section 6: Review Costs and Financial Support

Reviews incur some costs, which are covered by the University rather than the School. The main direct cost is the payment to the External Panel Member, who is paid £1000 per review visit, plus reasonable expenses (for example, travel and accommodation).

It is the responsibility of the Review Co-ordinator (who sits in the Academic Services Division), to oversee any necessary expenditure, to retain receipts and arrange reimbursement to the External Panel Member.

It is also the responsibility of the Review Co-ordinator to ensure catering for the review visit is organized, as appropriate.

External Panel Member Expenses

It is expected that the External Panel Member will incur some costs during their time at the University of Nottingham, during attendance at the review visit. Any costs incurred (within reasonable limits) will be reimbursed by the University of Nottingham via the submission of a non-staff expenses claim form. All relevant receipts must also be submitted.

Expenses that will be reimbursed by the University of Nottingham include:

- cost of travel to the University and return, including air, rail or taxi fares and vehicle mileage (vehicle mileage is reimbursed at a rate of 45ppm);
- accommodation costs – as most reviews will commence in the morning, External Panel Members may choose to stay overnight in Nottingham prior to the review, as well as during the evening between consecutive review visit days;
- the cost of any meals (e.g. breakfast; evening dinner) purchased during the review visit (lunch will be provided during the review visit day(s)).

This section details the typical timings of key stages in the review process. These activities will be coordinated by the Review Co-ordinator.

TIMING	TASK	RESPONSIBLE ROLE
	Communicate the schedule to the Head of School, and agree provisional review dates, in line with the Review Chair and School’s calendars.	Quality and Standards
	Schedule an introductory meeting with the Head of School to discuss the review process.	
	Identify nominees for the External Panel Member with the School, to be approved by the Panel Chair.	
	Send an invitation to the nominated Chair.	
	Contact potential External Panel Members with a formal invite, send invitations to internal panel members, and confirm the proposed review timetable with the School Contact.	
	Communicate the provisional review schedule to all Professional Service data providers.	
	Provide schools with key dates - e.g. deadlines for the submission of REP documentation.	
	Provisionally schedule any pre-review meetings of the Review Panel.	
3-4 months prior to review	Begin production of the supporting information (Review Evidence Pack)	Data Providers / Review Co-ordinator
2 months prior to review visit	Confirm the full panel membership, send confirmation invitations and re-affirm the timetable with the relevant Head of School, Dean and Review Chair	Review Co-ordinator
	School submit their PED(s) and other documentation (this deadline may be earlier to allow for Christmas, exams etc).	The School
	The Students’ Union facilitates the preparation of the Student Written Submission document.	The Students’ Union
	The School has the opportunity to respond to the SWS if it is deemed necessary.	The School
1 month prior to review visit	Distribute the Review Evidence Pack to the full Review Panel, including the External Panel Member(s).	Review Co-ordinator
	Evaluate the Review Evidence Pack to determine key issues and areas of focus. The aim should be to focus the review on the area(s) most in need of closer consideration and where change will achieve the greatest benefits (to be discussed during the pre-review panel meeting). The Panel will also determine any additional data requirements and information, including whether any written statements from key staff and/or students will assist the panel in their deliberations.	Review Panel
	Collate any additional data required by the Review Panel, including any written statements from key staff or students, and distribute these to the full Review Panel.	Review Co-ordinator

TIMING	TASK	RESPONSIBLE ROLE
	Confirm room bookings for the review and appointments with key staff and students to be seen during the review visit – obtain a full list of attendees for each agenda session from the School	Review Co-ordinator
	Confirm requirements for hotel bookings with External Panel Members, and ensure reservations are made.	Review Co-ordinator
2 weeks prior to the Review	Hold a pre-review meeting which will include all panel members, excluding the external, and the Review Co-ordinator. The Review Secretary should minute this meeting for the review records and to be shared with the external for comment.	Review co-ordinator
1 week prior to the review	Confirm dates, times, locations and agenda with key staff and students during the review visit	School Manager
	Confirm dates, times, locations and agenda with the Review Panel, ensuring External Panel Members are informed of hotel bookings and directions to the University.	Review Co-ordinator
	Order any required catering for the review visit day(s) and confirm details with the School so that they are aware of what will be delivered.	Review Co-ordinator
Review visit	Conduct the review visit, meeting with key staff and students from across the School. The review visit is expected to be completed during the course of two days.	Review Panel
	Identify the key issues raised during the review and for incorporation into the review report.	Review Panel
	Provide the Head of School with a brief overview of the review's findings.	Review Panel
	Collate all REPs and any additional supporting documentation from all Review Panel Members for confidential disposal by ASD..	Review Co-ordinator
(up to) 2 weeks following the review	Collate all notes from the review visit day(s) in preparation for drafting the review report.	Review Secretary
1-2 months following the review	Produce the draft report, ensuring contributions are collated from all Review Panel members	Review Secretary
	Invite the Head of School to comment or respond to the content of the review report, and request a schedule of timings against any recommendations outlined by the Review Panel.	Review Chair / Review Co-ordinator
	Produce the final review report, including the outcome of the evaluation of evidence, conclusions and recommendations, a plan of action and timetable, and a follow up schedule.	Review Chair / Review Co-ordinator
	Request and collate any feedback from the Review Panel Members on the review process to determine whether any changes to the process, documentation, templates or communications are warranted.	Review Secretary
2 months following the review	Deliver the final review report to Teaching and Learning Board, via the Review Chair.	Review Chair
	Accept/review/respond to the final review report and ensure any comments are fed back to the Review Chair for further action.	Teaching and Learning Board (via the relevant PVC)

TIMING	TASK	RESPONSIBLE ROLE
	Identify any report recommendations that will require support from other areas of the University in their implementation.	Teaching and Learning Board (via the relevant PVC) / Review Chair
	Deliver the final review report to the School and ensure the action plan is put into place within the School.	Review Chair / Review Secretary
Next available meeting	Report to be considered by Teaching and Learning Board and consideration given to whether any follow-up action is required.	Secretary to TLB

<p>DAY 1</p> <p>12.00 - 12.30</p> <p>12.30 - 13.00</p> <p>13.30 - 14.00</p> <p>14.00 - 14.45</p> <p>14.45 - 15.45</p> <p>15.45 - 16.45</p> <p>16.45 - 17.15</p>	<p>Private review panel meeting</p> <p>Meeting 1- Head of School</p> <p>Meeting 2 - Management Group</p> <p>Lunch break (may include a tour of the School)</p> <p>Meeting 3 - taught students (UG and PGT if appropriate)</p> <p>Meeting 4 - Research students</p> <p>Private review panel meeting</p>
<p>DAY 2</p> <p>8.00 - 8.30</p> <p>8.30 - 9.30</p> <p>9.30 - 10.15</p> <p>10.15 - 10.45</p> <p>11.15 - 11.30</p> <p>11.30 - 12.00</p> <p>12.00 - 12.45</p> <p>12.45 - 13.15</p> <p>13.15 - 13.45</p>	<p>Private panel meeting</p> <p>Meetings 5 & 6: Video conference with students and staff from overseas campuses+</p> <p>Meeting 7: Teaching and Learning Committee</p> <p>Meetings 8 & 9: meetings with academic staff Levels 4 & 5/ APM/Technical staff (including Tutors, Admissions Officers, DLOs) time split accordingly</p> <p>Break</p> <p>Meeting 10: School Manager</p> <p>Meeting 11: Research Committee</p> <p>Lunch and private panel meeting to prepare summary</p> <p>Meeting 12: Feedback to Head of School</p>

* If there is only one student rep on the panel, it may be preferable for these meetings to be separate so that the student rep can attend all meetings with students

+ Where the school has courses at the overseas campus(es)