



**University of  
Nottingham**  
UK | CHINA | MALAYSIA

# **Educational Enhancement and Assurance Review Handbook**

**2022/23 Academic Session**

## Contents:

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Section 1: Context, scope and objectives</b> .....                             | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>1.1 Context</b> .....  | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>1.2 Scope</b> .....  | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>1.3 Review Purpose</b> .....   | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>1.4 Quality Enhancement</b> .....  | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>1.5 Key Quality Manual Policies for consideration in 2022/23 Reviews</b> ..... | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Section 2: The Review</b> .....  | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>2.1 The Review Panel</b> .....   | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>2.2 Pre-review meetings</b> .....  | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>2.3 The Review Visit</b> .....   | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>2.4 The Review Report</b> .....  | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>2.5 Post-Visit Activity – School Action Plan</b> .....                         | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>2.6 School Follow- up meeting</b> .....  | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Section 3: Review Documentation, Data and Information</b> .....                | <b>11</b> |
| <b>3.1 The Review Evidence Pack</b> .....   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>3.2 Good Practice case study</b> .....   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>3.3 Sharing Information</b> .....  | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Section 4. Review Costs and Financial Support</b> .....                        | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Appendix A: Roles and Responsibilities of Review Panel members</b> .....       | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Appendix B: Schedule of Activities</b> .....                                   | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Appendix C: The Review Evidence Pack</b> .....                                 | <b>19</b> |

**Review Support and Contacts:**

The Educational Excellence team provide support to the Educational Enhancement and Assurance Review process.

This handbook should be used as a reference guide to all aspects of the process, including roles and responsibilities of panel members, what to expect from the review process and information on what Schools/ Departments and Faculties are expected to prepare.

Educational Excellence team:

[Periodic-review@nottingham.ac.uk](mailto:Periodic-review@nottingham.ac.uk)

## Section 1: Context, scope and objectives

The Educational Enhancement and Assurance Review 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

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

- Reviewing Quality Assurance activities, including compliance with the Quality Manual;
- Quality Enhancement, with specific reference to the Teaching Excellence Framework criteria
- Improving overall School performance;
- Improving the student experience of teaching and learning.

### 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.*

The outline of the process can be found in the QAA Advice and Guidance on Monitoring and Evaluation (available in full at <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/monitoring-and-evaluation>).

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 on a cyclical basis. This has a broader remit than programme monitoring and is informed by a view of trends over time.

The review process also aims to support the achievement of key enhancement objectives. The EEAR provides the opportunity for individual Schools and review panels to consider jointly the actions that are required for the School to achieve these objectives and in particular, the support and resources needed from the University and Faculty.

## **1.2 Scope**

The review will cover all academic provision within Schools. This will include reviewing all aspects relating Quality Assurance and Quality Enhancement, in line with internal drivers and requirements (such as the Quality Manual, related enhancement objectives and beyond), as well as external drivers and areas for compliance (including TEF, the Quality Code and NSS).

Reviews are intended to be supportive and to provide an opportunity to help identify any areas of strength or weakness, and offer guidance or additional support where appropriate.

## **UNNC and UNM**

The review will encompass programmes, staff, students and procedures at the University of Nottingham Ningbo Campus (UNNC) and Malaysia Campus (UNM) where a School has provision on either/both.

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 THREE campuses. 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 UNM 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.

## **1.3 Review Purpose**

The reviews will ensure that:

- The School's programmes continue to have currency and validity as expressed by the QAA Quality Code;
- The programme is in line with University frameworks (UNQF), QAA subject benchmarks, and PSRB requirements;
- The assessment practices in the School fully meet Quality Manual requirements and, in particular, protect academic standards and permit students to demonstrate the achievement of learning outcomes;
- The School is engaged with and actively taking steps to enhance the student experience;
- Any issues arising from annual monitoring have been resolved, and identify any that have not been resolved previously that require consideration;
- Any quality assurance issues identified by the student body are addressed;

- There are adequate arrangements for supervising and supporting research students and any recent or planned changes in that regard;
- The School's approach to teaching and learning is inclusive;
- Any areas for improvement are identified, and support and guidance are offered to the School, where appropriate;
- Any areas of best practice are identified, for dissemination to the wider University.

In addition, the reviews will:

- Include School activities;
- 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;
- Aim to be forward looking, helping schools to identify opportunities for enhancement in teaching and learning provision.

#### **1.4 Quality Enhancement**

Educational Enhancement and Assurance Reviews will provide an opportunity for the School, Faculty, and review panel to work jointly in identifying the support required to continually improve and enhance the educational journey of Students. As outlined in the University's [Strategic Delivery Plan for Education and Student Experience \(ESE\)](#), the University is committed to:

- High-quality teaching underpinned by robust and effective assessment and feedback.
- Promoting and engaging with the student voice through consultation and co-creation of our curricula and student experience.
- Tailored and personalised academic support, with the infrastructure this needs, across every stage of the student journey through our Schools and Professional Services.
- Outstanding learning resources via our physical and digital infrastructure and our international partners.
- Maintaining and enhancing our track record of excellent student outcomes and learning gain, both through transition to the workplace and through access to further study.
- Equality, diversity and inclusion for all our students and the staff who support them.
- Nurturing the professional development of our staff, and progressing work to reduce or rebalance administrative workloads, so that they may achieve their own aspirations and effectively support our students to do likewise.
- Building strong partnerships that cross departments and job families, thereby enabling effective use of our expertise, and facilitating spaces for creativity and innovation.

Educational Enhancement and Assurance Reviews will seek to consider a School's progress and efforts towards achieving the above highlighted commitments.

## 1.5 Key Quality Manual Policies for consideration in 2022/23 Reviews

The following Quality Manual entries are of particular interest to the review process. Where possible, the School's/ Faculty's compliance with them will be checked prior to the Review by the Educational Excellence team and reported to the Review panel. Any outstanding items will be followed-up during the review process.

The University of Nottingham Qualifications Framework:

<https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/qualitymanual/academic-regulations/unqf.aspx>

University of Nottingham Admissions Policy:

<https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/qualitymanual/admissions/index.aspx>

Programme monitoring and review

<https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/qualitymanual/governance/prog-monitoring-and-review.aspx>

Compliance with policies for approval of changes to Programme Specifications and Modules:

<https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/qualitymanual/prog-and-mod-design-and-approval/programmes.aspx>

This will also incorporate checking conformity with the External Examining policy:

<https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/qualitymanual/governance/appointment-responsibilities-external-examiners-for-taught-programmes.aspx>

The Student Engagement policy:

<https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/qualitymanual/student-engagement-and-representation/index.aspx>

The Student Support and Development policy:

<https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/qualitymanual/personal-tutoring-student-support-and-development/scope-support-development-tutoring.aspx>

Information which the School makes available to students and applicants:

<https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/qualitymanual/prog-and-mod-design-and-approval/info-about-the-provision-of-he.aspx>

## Section 2: The Review

### 2.1 The Review Panel

Support for the Review process and will come from the Education Excellence team. Reviews will be carried out by a Review Panel drawn from across the University and will include an External. A typical Panel will include:

- A Chair - each Review Panel will be chaired by the APVC for the Faculty\*;
- An external member from the relevant discipline (for some Schools, more than one external member may be required);
- A Quality Assurance lead;
- A Quality Enhancement lead;
- A student representative;
- A Review Secretary;
- Review Co-ordinator

Please refer to [Appendix A](#) for further details on the Review Panel.

### 2.2 Pre-review meetings

#### a) Panel pre-review meeting

This meeting will usually take place around 3-4 weeks ahead of the review. Upon access to the [Review Evidence Pack](#) the panel (excluding the external panel member) will meet to conduct an initial review of the information. This meeting has the following aims:

- Determine lines of enquiry;
- Divide areas of focus amongst the panel;
- Identify any additional information required from the School;
- Review the agenda and identify any changes that may be required and any specific School staff the panel want to ensure are in review meetings;
- Determine any necessary questions to be asked in the pre-meeting with the School.

Notes of this meeting will be taken and circulated to the panel (including the external panel member).

#### b) School pre-review meeting

This meeting will usually take place approximately two weeks ahead of the review. A selection of panel members will meet with key School staff (for example, the Head of School, Director of Teaching and Director of Operations). This meeting has the following aims:

- Inform the School of lines of enquiry;
- Ensure the School are organising for the appropriate people to be available for questioning during the review to enable lines of enquiry to be satisfied;



- Confirm the review agenda;
- Answer any questions the School may have;
- Request additional information that may be required.

Notes of this meeting will be taken and circulated to the panel.

### **c) Panel Chair and External Panel member meeting**

A Team's meeting will be arranged between the Panel Chair and the External panel member, with the aim of providing a quick briefing on the panel's initial thoughts and lines of enquiry, and which areas of the paperwork the External should focus on. This meeting can take place before or after the School pre-review meeting, as appropriate.

## **2.3 The Review Visit**

Reviews will usually be held over one day (which may be spread over a consecutive afternoon and morning) and comprise a visit to the School by the Review panel.

During the visit, the Review Panel will hold a range of meetings, including with Senior Management, the School Teaching and Learning committee, students and other relevant staff.

The panel will consider documentation supplied by the School, professional services and Students' Union, in the form of a Review Evidence Pack (REP), intended to either close or open up lines of enquiry.

The aim will be to form judgements based on the expectations in the QAA Quality Code, and from a quality enhancement perspective to be able to produce an action plan in relation to the EEAR Objectives, in addition to identifying any areas of best practice.

At the end of the review, the Chair of the Panel will give verbal feedback to the School senior management team.

## **2.4 The Review Report**

The Review Panel will be required to produce a Review Report, for which there is a template. The Review Report will provide recommendations and examples of good practice with regard to all areas within the scope of the review.

## **2.5 Post-Visit Activity – School Action Plan**

The School will be required to respond to the Review Report with feedback on any factual inaccuracies. Once a final version has been produced, the School will then need to respond to the report in the form of an Action Plan.

The Review Report and School Action Plan will be reported to the Education and Student Experience Committee by the APVC who chaired the review. The APVC will have responsibility for working with the School to ensure the Review Action Plan is implemented by the School.

Where good practice has been identified this will be reported on and fed back through the various mechanisms.

## **2.6 School Follow- up meeting**

The Faculty APVC and one member of the panel will meet with the School to follow-up on review recommendations 6 months after the review. Please refer to Appendix B for a detailed Schedule of Review Activities.

## **Section 3: Review Documentation, Data and Information**

The Educational Excellence team 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 and another panel member 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. This meeting would typically include the Head of School, Director of Teaching and Director of Operations (or equivalent), however the School can include whichever staff they wish.

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 Director of Operations and/or Director of Teaching);
- Provide the documentation requested by the Review Co-ordinator prior to the review and within the arranged time-frame;
- Ensure (or delegate responsibility for ensuring) that appropriate space in the School/Department is booked/ made available for the review meetings.

### **3.1 The Review Evidence Pack**

The Review Evidence Pack (REP) is the pack that the Panel will have access to in order to carry out the review and will contain a range of information on School provision and student 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. Please refer to [Appendix C](#) for a detailed REP documentation list.

### **3.2 Good Practice Case Study**

During the review, Schools are requested to present on an area of good practice which they perform strongly in. A 45-minute session will be dedicated during the review for Schools to present and for the Panel, including a guest panel member, to ask questions. The School must notify the Review Co-ordinator four weeks prior to the review on the area of good practice they will present on so an appropriate guest panel member can be identified and invited to the session.

### **3.3 Sharing Information**

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

## **Section 4. Review Costs and Financial Support**

Any costs incurred are covered by the University rather than the School. The main direct cost is the payment to the External Panel Member, including a fee for the review visit, plus reasonable expenses (for example, travel and accommodation).

It is the responsibility of the Review Co-ordinator, 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 organised, as appropriate.

## **Appendix A: Roles and Responsibilities of Review Panel members**

Support for the Review Panels, and for the EEAR process generally, will come from the Educational Excellence team.

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 the Education and Student Experience Committee by the Review Chair - within two months of the review visit.

### **Review Chair**

The Review will be chaired by the Faculty APVC, and 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 Education and Student Experience Committee.

### **Quality Assurance Lead**

The QA lead will take responsibility for aspects of the review relating to QA, ensuring the school is compliant with the Quality Manual, and making recommendations for improvements where necessary.

### **Quality Enhancement Lead**

The QE lead will take responsibility for areas of the review relating to Quality Enhancement, particularly those relating to the Enhancement and the School's performance in relation to the TEF criteria.

### **Review Secretary**

The Review Secretary should be an APM member of staff. Responsibilities include:

Before the Review:

- Taking minutes of the pre-review panel meeting and ensuring there is a 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 Chair in the preparation and sign-off of the Review Report and Action Plan.

### **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.

The External member of the Review Panel will have particular responsibility for assessing whether the School's programmes are in line with relevant QAA subject benchmark statements.

### **Student Representative**

The Student Representative will be supported by the Students' Union and/or the Educational Excellence Team to prepare for the Review.

### **Review Co-ordinator**

The Review Co-ordinator (a member of the Educational Excellence team), is the key liaison between the Review Panel, the School and Professional Services. They are responsible for supporting both the Review Chair and the panel in the fulfilment 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/panel 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/panel;
- 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:

- Ensuring the Review Report, and Action Plan are presented to Education and Student Experience Committee and 6-monthly review meetings are arranged.

## Appendix B - Schedule of Activities

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

| <b>TIMING*</b>                           | <b>TASK</b>   | <b>RESPONSIBLE ROLE</b> |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| 2-4 months prior to the review           | Communicate the schedule to the Head of School, and agree provisional review dates, in line with the Review Chair and School's calendars.                                     | Educational Excellence  |
|  | Schedule an introductory meeting with the Head of School and other nominated staff to discuss the review process.   |                         |
|  | Identify nominees for the External Panel Member with the School, to be approved by the Panel 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.   |                         |
|  | Begin production of the supporting information (Review Evidence Pack)   |                         |
| 2 months prior to review                 | Confirm the full panel membership, send confirmation invitations and re-affirm the timetable with the relevant Head of School/ School contact                                 | Review Co-ordinator     |
| 2 months – 6 weeks prior to review visit | School submit their PED(s) and other documentation (this deadline may differ to allow for University Holidays, exams etc).  | The School              |
|  | The Students' Union facilitates the preparation of the Student Written Submission document (this deadline may differ).  | The Students' Union     |
|  | Distribute the Review Evidence Pack to the full Review Panel, including the External Panel Member(s).   | Review Co-ordinator     |

| <b>TIMING*</b>              | <b>TASK</b>   | <b>RESPONSIBLE ROLE</b> |
|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 1 month – 2 weeks prior     | Panel Pre-Review meeting: 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. The Review Secretary will circulate notes of this meeting. | Review Co-ordinator     |
|                             | School Pre-Review meeting: Select panel members meeting with key School staff to highlight any areas of focus of the review and ask any necessary preliminary questions. The agenda should also be finalised, and any additional data (post review of the REP) requested. The Review Secretary will circulate notes of this meeting.  | Review Co-ordinator     |
|                             | 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 Panel            |
|                             | 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     |
|                             | Confirm dates, times, locations and agenda with school staff and students during the review visit   | School contact          |
|                             | 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     |
| 1 weeks prior to the Review | 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     |
|                             | Conduct the review visit, meeting with key staff and students from across the School. The review visit is   | Review Co-ordinator     |



| <b>TIMING*</b>                  | <b>TASK</b>   | <b>RESPONSIBLE ROLE</b>              |
|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Review visit                    | expected to be completed during the course of two days.   |                                      |
|                                 | 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.   | Review Co-ordinator                  |
| 1-4 weeks prior to the review   | Collate all notes from the review visit day(s) in preparation for drafting the review report.   | Review Secretary                     |
|                                 | Produce the draft Review Report ensuring contributions are collated from all Review Panel members. Invite the Head of School to comment or respond to the content of the Review Report and Action Plan with any factual inaccuracies.   |                                      |
| 4-6 weeks following review      | Review Report for factual inaccuracies  | School                               |
|                                 | Produce the final Review Report and Action Plan, including the outcome of the evaluation of evidence, conclusions and recommendation.<br><br>The School should produce an Action Plan in response to the Review Report, including a schedule of timings against any recommendations outlined by the Review Panel. | Review Secretary                     |
|                                 | The School should agree the panel Action Plan with the panel Chair.   |                                      |
| 1-2 months following the review | 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 Chair/<br>Review co-ordinator |
|                                 | The Review Chair (Faculty APVC) will present the Review Report, Review Action Plan to Education and Student Experience Committee.   | Review Chair                         |
| Next available meeting          | The relevant Faculty APVC and panel member to meet with the School to follow-up on review   | Review Chair                         |

| <b>TIMING*</b> | <b>TASK</b>   | <b>RESPONSIBLE ROLE</b> |
|----------------|---|-------------------------|
|                | recommendations and evaluate progress in relation to the Action Plans                                       |                         |
| 6 months       | A follow-up meeting with the School, Review Chair and Review Co-ordinator to update on actions post review. | Review co-ordinator     |

\*Timings are subject to change and will be agreed on a case by case basis for each review.

## Appendix C: The Review Evidence Pack

The following documents will form the Review Evidence Pack to be reviewed by Panel members. Some documents will need to be developed while others can be provided 'off the shelf' as required. The Educational Excellence Team will provide support and guidance as needed to help the School develop the required documentation and also coordinate the collection of any documents and commentary provided by Professional Services.

| <b>Documentation provided by the School</b> |                                  |   |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| 1.  | Overview Document                | <p>The Overview document should provide an introduction to the School for the Review Panel. Specifically, the Overview should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A brief summary of the School structure – including staff and student numbers</li> <li>• Information of the School Strategy relating to teaching and learning activities and student experience</li> <li>• Key QA processes;</li> <li>• A summary of actions since the last review</li> <li>• Any areas of good practice and challenges.</li> </ul> <p>Where there is provision at UNM and/ or UNNC, a statement should be provided detailing this. This can be incorporated into the overview, or can be provided as a separate document (this may reflect the maturity and scale of provision). This should be completed by staff at the overseas campuses.</p> <p>The Overview document is the School's opportunity to draw the panel's attention to any areas of strength, areas the School are working to strengthen and possibly issues that the Review Panel can help to resolve.</p> <p><b>Indicative word count: 2000 - 3000</b></p> |
| 2.  | An Account of Student Engagement | <p>A brief account of how the School engages students in its quality assurance and decision-making processes, including examples and any good practice.</p> <p><b>Indicative word count: 1000 - 1500</b></p>  |

|    |                                     |  |
|----|-------------------------------------|--|
| 3. | Programme Evaluation Document (PED) | <p>A PED template is available and should be utilised to provide a report for 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 UNM and/or UNNC a separate document will be required. If you would like guidance on grouping together programmes please contact the Review Co-ordinator for guidance.</p> <p>The PED should consider whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The changes to the programme since the last review have enhanced the design and operation of the programme;</li> <li>• The ways in which the delivery of the programme has kept pace with developments in teaching and learning, e.g. use of technology, innovations in course design and assessment, improving availability of resources for students;</li> <li>• Course content adequately reflects current research and practice in the discipline;</li> <li>• The course is in line with University frameworks, QAA subject benchmarks, and PSRB requirements;</li> <li>• The course has kept pace with changes in student demand, employer expectations, and employment opportunities;</li> <li>• Data on student progression and achievement provide assurance on academic standards and the learning opportunities being offered to students to meet those standards;</li> <li>• The content and delivery of the course meets student expectations as expressed in the NSS and other forms of student feedback.</li> </ul> <p>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.</p> <p><b>Indicative word count: 1000 - 2000</b></p> |
|----|-------------------------------------|--|

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| 4.  | Research Degree Evaluation Document         | 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.<br><br><b>Indicative word count: 2000 - 3000</b> |
| 5.  | Student Disability Action Plan Checklist    | The Disability Action Plan will be reviewed by the Accessibility team ahead of the review and comments fed back to the panel.<br><br><b>Indicative word count: 2000 - 3000</b>  |
| 6.  | Professional Competencies Benchmarking Form | A template is provided including agreed Institutional professional competencies.<br><br><b>Indicative word count: 1500 - 2000</b>   |
| 7.  | School Compliance with CMA Guidance         | A template is provided to check that information provided to prospective, current and existing students is in line with CMA guidance.<br><br><b>Indicative word count: 500 - 750</b>  |
| 8.  | School Handbooks                            | These documents should be readily available and should not need to be produced specifically for the Review.   |
| 9.  | School Tutoring Statements                  | These documents should be readily available and should not need to be produced specifically for the Review.   |
| 10.   | Enhancement Plans                           | These documents should be readily available and should not need to be produced specifically for the Review.   |
| <b>Documentation provided by the Students' Union and Professional Services:</b> |   |   |
|   | A 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 the Educational Excellence team, will prepare a list of key                |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>areas to addressed. The Student Representatives 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.</p> <p>Student representatives, with support from the Students' Union, will be invited to provide a submission to the Review Panel that covers whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students have particular issues about the School's courses or their delivery;</li> <li>• Student feedback has been listened to and acted upon;</li> <li>• Students have been sufficiently involved in decision making within the School;</li> <li>• The information provided to students by the School has been accurate and fit for purpose.</li> </ul> |
|  | <p>Date and commentary<br/>Provided by Professional<br/>Services collated by the<br/>Educational Excellence<br/>Team</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring reports</li> <li>• External Examiner Reports and Responses</li> <li>• Quantitative Data Sets: key performance indicators</li> <li>• Documentation relating to APP</li> <li>• National Student Survey data: including open comments (where available)</li> <li>• Statements of Responsibility</li> <li>• Athena SWAN data</li> <li>• NSES data</li> <li>• SEL data</li> <li>• Nottingham Advantage Award participation data</li> <li>• Teaching qualifications of staff (where available)</li> <li>• PTES and PRES data</li> <li>• PGR Submission Rates</li> <li>• Curriculum report</li> <li>• Complaints and appeals statistics</li> <li>• LCF minutes</li> <li>• Collaborative Provision - a report will be provided</li> <li>• Accreditation - accreditation reports will be made available to the panel</li> </ul>           |