
Quality Enhancement
Support Team
(QuEST)
Institution-Led
Review
Session 2019/20



CHAPTER 2 INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW

1	INSTITUTION-LED INTERNAL REVIEW CONTEXT	2
2	CORPORATE STRATEGY AND ENABLING PLANS	5
3	AREAS TO BE ADDRESSED BY INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW	6
4	ONGOING PROGRAMME APPROVAL	10
5	STUDENT ENGAGEMENT IN INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW	11
6	SUPPORT SERVICE ENGAGEMENT IN INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW	12
7	SELF-EVALUATION DOCUMENT (SED)	13
8	MODULE DESCRIPTORS AND PROGRAMME SPECIFICATIONS	16
9	PLANNING & PREPARATION	17
10	THE REVIEW PANEL	18
11	THE EVENTS: PHASE 1 AND 2	19
12	REPORTING & FOLLOW-UP ACTION	21
APPENDICES		
APPENDIX 1	SCHEDULE OF INSTITUTION LED REVIEWS 2019/20 – 2024/25	24
APPENDIX 2	SELF EVALUATION DOCUMENT GUIDANCE	25
APPENDIX 3	PROMPT QUESTIONS TO ASSIST THE SUBJECT TEAM TO PREPARE THE SELF-EVALUATION DOCUMENT	30
APPENDIX 4	RETENTION OF ASSESSED WORK	33
APPENDIX 5	DOCUMENTATION 2019/20	34
APPENDIX 6	ILR CONFIRMATION FORM 2019/20	38
APPENDIX 7	SCHEDULE AND TIMELINE DOCUMENT 2019/20	39
APPENDIX 8	NOMINATION FORM FOR APPROVAL OF EXTERNAL MEMBERS OF INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW PANELS	40
APPENDIX 9	EXTERNAL PANEL NOMINATION CRITERIA 2019/20	42
APPENDIX 10	UWS RESEARCH PORTAL – STAFF PROFILE LINK	44
APPENDIX 11	FOLLOW-UP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE	45
APPENDIX 12	FOLLOW-UP PROCESS CHART	47
APPENDIX 13	GLOSSARY	48

ANY QUERIES CONCERNING THIS BOOKLET SHOULD BE RAISED IN THE FIRST INSTANCE WITH QUEST. THIS BOOKLET CAN BE PROVIDED IN OTHER FORMATS ON REQUEST.

THE PROCEDURES DESCRIBED WITHIN THIS BOOKLET HAVE BEEN ASSESSED FOR EQUALITY IMPACT AND CONFIRMED AS BEING AT LOW RISK OF HAVING ANY NEGATIVE IMPACT ON DIFFERENT GROUPS OF PEOPLE.

CHAPTER 2 INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW

1 INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW CONTEXT

All University credit bearing provision will be subject to periodic internal review in line with Scottish Funding Council (SFC) guidance and within a cycle of not more than 6 years.

Institution-Led Review (ILR) – formerly referred to at UWS as ‘Subject Health Review’ - is defined as the internal and external peer review of the academic health of the total taught and research provision in a subject delivered by the University. The review forms an integral element of the University’s quality assurance system and is intended to provide an opportunity to focus on and to review quality enhancement, learning and teaching, the wider research and scholarship in the subject area and the interactions and interrelations between subjects together with their future development. The student experience is at the heart of ILR.

ILR is located within an enhancement-led approach to quality. The process is intended to be robust and holistic but one that is useful to the subject team and the School in providing a periodic juncture for reflection, evaluation and focus on future plans and opportunities. The Education Advisory Committee (EAC) is committed to ensuring that the process is supportive and developmental in nature. The Academic Quality Committee (AQC) shall assist EAC in taking forward ILR. EAC shall continue to take an institutional overview of the outcomes of ILR.

ILR provides an opportunity for good practice to be validated by peers and more widely disseminated. The panel will seek to evaluate how the subject and programme team plans for enhancement and takes deliberate steps to bring this about.

All areas of the University’s credit-bearing provision will undergo ILR on a cycle not exceeding six years ([APPENDIX 1](#)). Schools have flexibility to aggregate programmes and subjects in ways which provide coherence and fit the organisational structure, mode of delivery and enhancement-led approach, as long as all modules and programmes are covered within the six year cycle.

Programme review is an important and integral part of ILR. As part of the ongoing focus of ILR, Schools are responsible for ensuring programme structures/documentation are reviewed regularly, normally in the year preceding ILR. ILR will confirm the ongoing re-approval of programmes.

A **two-phase approach** is adopted at UWS; this requires genuine engagement by panel members during Phase 1 (written input) as well as active participation/attendance during Phase 2 (face to face component/main event). It also brings additional responsibility to the role of the Chair.

Details of Phase 1 and Phase 2 are provided in section 11.1.

The **Scottish Funding Council (SFC)** publishes guidance on the nature and scope of institution-led internal review within its guidance to HEIs on quality (*SFC Guidance – July 2017 circular*)¹. These guidelines state that institution-led quality reviews should include the following characteristics:

¹<http://www.sfc.ac.uk/communications/Guidance/2017/SFCGD112017.aspx>

²<https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/monitoring-and-evaluation>

- ILR should consider the effectiveness of annual monitoring arrangements and the effectiveness of the follow-up actions arising from annual monitoring. Reporting at programme or subject level should identify actions to address any issues and activity to promote areas of strength for consideration at institutional level. The ILR method should be designed to allow constructive reflection on the effectiveness of the annual monitoring and reporting procedures.
- All aspects of provision are expected to be reviewed systematically and rigorously on a cycle of not more than six years to demonstrate that institutions meet the expectations for standards set out in the UK Quality Code²(revised Nov 2018), and the standards set out in the European Standards and Guidelines (part 1).
- ILRs must continue to produce robust, comprehensive and credible evidence that the academic standards of awards are secure and that provision is of high quality and being enhanced. ILR should be designed to promote and support critical reflection on policy and practice. The method used should ensure that any shortcomings are addressed and it should give a central role to quality enhancement by promoting dialogue on areas in which quality could be improved and identifying good practice for dissemination within the institution and beyond.
- All credit bearing provision should be reviewed, including undergraduate and taught postgraduate awards, supervision of research students, provision delivered in collaboration with others, transnational education, work-based provision and placements, online and distance learning, and provision which provides only small volumes of credit.
- The unit of review should have sufficient granularity to allow adequate scrutiny of programmes and disciplines including ensuring there is adequate external scrutiny at the discipline level by the external panel member(s). Excessive aggregation should be avoided if it means the process cannot examine the 'fine structure' of provision and doesn't facilitate the identification of specific issues affecting particular programmes.
- Reviews should provide an objective review of provision based on an understanding of national and international good practice. Each review team should include a student and at least one member external to the institution with a relevant background.
- ILR should include an element of reflection on national and international good practice.
- Institutions are expected to continue extending student engagement and participation in quality in line with the Student Engagement Framework for Scotland. Students should be engaged at all stages of the ILR process including the development of the self-evaluation, as full members of ILR teams, and in follow-up activity. This is emphasised further in the QAA Quality Code guidance.
- Additional specific information should be gathered from students as part of the evidence base for reviews. The ILR should include student views of provision and learning experience, differentiate between views from different categories of students, identify distinctive characteristics of provision, and take account of graduates' views on the relevance of provision for employability.
- Reviews should take full account of subject benchmarks and establish that programme design and learning outcomes are consistent with relevant benchmarks;

- Reviews should take account of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education², in particular the ‘Monitoring and Evaluation Chapter’ within the revised 2018 edition – “*Monitoring and evaluation of higher education is an essential process within providers, forming a fundamental part of the academic cycle*”;
- Reviews should take full account of the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF). Quality Code core practices state: “*The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications framework*”;
- Both annual monitoring and ILR are likely to consider: themes arising from and responses to external examiner reports; internal and external student survey data; performance data on recruitment, progression and achievement; and data trends. Data is likely to be benchmarked against other areas of the institution's activities as well as equivalent provision in other institutions;
- The role of support services is of crucial importance in determining the overall quality of the student learning experience. Reviews should enable the University to be satisfied about the contribution made by support services to the quality culture of the University and the ways in which services engage with students to monitor and improve the quality of services and the ways in which the services promote high quality learning and continuous quality enhancement;
- ILR should reflect on the outcomes of relevant PSRB accreditations. Institutions are encouraged to engage with PSRBs to explore appropriate ways of aligning PSRB activity with ILR.

The operation, outcomes and impact of internal ILR is one of the key elements on which the ‘confidence’ judgement in the **Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR)** report rests. QAA meets annually with senior officers in the University to discuss engagement with the enhancement-led approach to quality. Furthermore, institutions are also required to provide an annual statement of assurance to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) to complement the annual report which the governing body endorses. (*SFC Guidance – July 2017 circular, para 56 – 63*)

Every four to five years an institutional review (ELIR) takes place with an external panel visiting the University on two separate occasions for up to a week. UWS was last reviewed during session 2014/15. An analysis of the outcomes from ILRs forms part of the University’s submission for ELIR. UWS’s next ELIR will take place during session 2019/20.

A particular focus of the annual discussions and ELIR is the approach to internal review (ILR) and **what the University is learning from the outcomes of each review**. To inform this discussion and as evidence of the effectiveness and robustness of the internal review arrangements, the University will forward the report of each ILR to QAA. A summary of the key actions/issues is also submitted annually to Senate, Court and SFC.

During the last ELIR, the University was praised for its integrated quality assurance and enhancement procedures (*QAA ELIR Outcome report – UWS December 2014*). The report stated that “the University continues to have a comprehensive and robust approach to self-evaluation using a number of review methods including institution-wide holistic review, **subject health review**, policy review and thematic reviews.” Furthermore, “The outcomes of **institution-led quality reviews**, including annual

monitoring processes are effectively disseminated to staff and students, with students having a leading role in the conduct of reviews.”

The University seeks to demonstrate the articulation between ILR and the annual monitoring process by using similar themes in both processes.

At UWS, the Quality Enhancement Support Team (QuEST), co-ordinates both internal review/ILR and institutional reviews centrally.

2 CORPORATE STRATEGY AND ENABLING PLANS

The institutional ILR process provides an opportunity for subject teams to reflect on progress towards the ambitious targets of the UWS Corporate Strategy, via the three recently refreshed Enabling Plans below:

- Education Enabling Plan 2018
- Global Engagement Enabling Plan 2018
- Research & Enterprise Enabling Plan 2018

Some key principle statements within the current Corporate Strategy 2017/20 correlate to Institution-Led Review (ILR) including:

- *“We are here for our students”.*
- *“We plan to ensure our students and colleagues are provided with a contemporary, innovative and sustainable 21st century learning environment, including high-quality digital provision”.*
- *“We operate in a supportive, disciplined and demanding environment where staff develop and contribute through self-motivation and inspiration and a shared drive for success and development”.*

The Self Evaluation Document will be expected to outline how the subject and programme teams are addressing the themes of the Corporate Strategy and Enabling Plans.

The **Education Enabling Plan 2018** (*approved June 2018*) states:

- “A Student-centred, personalised and distinctive Learning and Teaching environment underpinned by leading research, knowledge exchange and enterprise”;
- “Continual enhancement of the student learning experience, improving academic quality and changing student lives towards making positive impacts on societies, economies and industries at national and global levels”.
- “Highly employable, globally engaged and successful graduates, with professional and vocational skills and attributes”.

The **Global Engagement Enabling Plan 2018** (*approved June 2018*) works towards promoting UWS as an international University which “provides a springboard for all its learners to contribute globally”. ILR considers many elements relating to global reach including international student experiences and equity, continual promotion of an international culture and supporting the development of strong strategic partnerships. The process of internal review considers internationalisation in the curriculum as well as supporting staff and student global aspirations.

The **Research and Enterprise Enabling Plan** (*approved June 2018*) considers UWS strategy to provide “A global University of choice known for creating a supporting and rewarding Research and Enterprise environment, flourishing leading edge graduates

and motivating outstanding staff beyond their expectations”. This plan seeks principally to provide “A Research and Enterprising infrastructure attracting significant awards and income with global, national and regional impact and attracting a critical mass of world-leading and early career researchers” and by consideration of all these aspects within the ILR process, this supports targets to increase Doctoral-level staff, expand partnerships, and promote a culture which embeds research in the life of the University as well as embracing opportunities to capitalise on innovation and business opportunities.

3 AREAS TO BE ADDRESSED BY INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW AND IN THE SELF EVALUATION DOCUMENT (SED)

The University’s EAC has confirmed that the following areas should be addressed by ILR and in the Self-Evaluation Document (SED) prepared by the ILR team.

SED HEADINGS -:

- **Provision**
- **Learning, Teaching and Enhancement**
- **Research and Knowledge Exchange**
- **Student Assessment and Feedback**
- **Progression and Achievement**
- **Student Support and Guidance for Learning**
- **Quality Enhancement and Assurance**
- **Strategic Development/Five Year Vision**

3.1 Provision

The ILR provides an unparalleled forum for review of curriculum in discussion with subject experts. It will consider the academic development of the subject with regard to the effectiveness and currency of design, content and organisation of provision with reference to the outcomes of provision and the development of knowledge and understanding, cognitive skills, subject specific skills, employability skills and Personal Development Planning (PDP) in the context of national and international developments. The impact of placement experience and work-based and related learning on the student experience will also be considered.

The review will explore how the subject team has embedded employability skills across their programmes. The review will explore how graduate attributes, “I am UWS”, including those relating to employability are effectively incorporated into the programmes and promoted to students.

Reviews should take full account of subject benchmarks, Professional, Statutory, & Regulatory Body (PSRB) reports, the UK Quality Code for Higher Education and the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF). The module descriptors and programme specifications will be considered against these frameworks and benchmarks with the expectation they will be re-approved through the ILR process. The panel will wish to understand how the subject/programme team uses external reference points in developing its provision.

The SED should articulate how the provision is kept up to date with the leading academic developments in the subject both nationally and internationally, taking into account the Corporate Strategy and relevant Enabling Plans. It should present an objective review of the provision based on an understanding of national and international good practice and employer expectations. The SED should include a reflective statement on how provision compares with practice in other countries.

ILR will consider the strategy and approach for recognition of prior learning and any articulation arrangements with colleges.

Collaborative Provision

Quality Code states: “Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them”.

Collaborative provision in the subject area will be considered in terms of the approach taken to managing the student learning experience on collaborative programmes. This relates predominantly to franchise collaborative provision where a UWS award is offered at a delivery location out with a UWS campus so it is important the student experience at these locations is captured during the ILR. The University has a separate process for collaborative review, though, for franchise, this focuses more on institutional arrangements to manage the collaborative partnership and the student experience rather than the module/programme content.

For validated collaborative provision, whilst these should be referenced within the SED in the context of the strategic direction of the subject, the ILR will not scrutinise these awards; collaborative review will be the main forum for periodic monitoring of quality and standards for validated awards and for the re-approval of the modules/programmes.

The panel will engage with the subject/programme teams on the distinctiveness of the University provision in the area under review.

Equality & Diversity

As a public authority the University has a general responsibility not to discriminate in employment or in providing goods, services and facilities to students. There are specific duties to advance equality of opportunity and to foster good relations with people who have characteristics protected under legislation.

These protected characteristics are:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Age▪ Disability▪ Gender reassignment▪ Marriage and civil partnership▪ Pregnancy and maternity	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Race▪ Religion and belief▪ Sex▪ Sexual orientation

In addition, the ILR should explore how students from widening participation backgrounds (20% lowest in SIMD - Scottish Index Multiple Deprivation; those articulating from FE and returners to HE) have been recruited, supported and how they are progressing.

The ILR will explore and report on the inclusiveness of the curriculum and approaches to learning, teaching and assessment with specific regard to how these address issues of diversity. UWS is committed to achieving equality of access to higher education at all levels and recognises that discrimination of any kind has a detrimental effect on learners, their relationship with University staff, their learning activities and their achievement. Staff should be aware of and make use of the available resources, which provide advice and guidance on developing inclusive learning, teaching and assessment.

ILR will explore how staff in the subject area are engaging with inclusive learning, teaching and assessment practices within the curriculum and also in its handbooks and other communications with students.

3.2 Learning, Teaching and Enhancement

The review will consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the learning and teaching approaches within the subject area and how these foster independent learning and critical thinking. The panel will wish to understand how the University's Education Enabling Plan 2018 is impacting on this subject area.

The quality of the learning environment, its equivalence across all campuses and sites of delivery and how effective learning is supported across all campuses will be of interest to the panel.

The panel will seek clarity on the strategy for the current and planned future use of the University's VLE and extended e-Learning environment and how this is underpinned by staff development.

The panel will also review research informed teaching in the subject area and how research mindedness is engendered in students.

The SED should articulate how scholarly research and professional activities underpin teaching particularly at honours and masters level. Pedagogic staff development will also be discussed. The panel will explore engagement of staff with the wider national and international frameworks for pedagogy and quality enhancement. This may include involvement with the Scottish national enhancement themes, the [Advance UK](#), external examiners, QAA etc. How such external activity enhances the delivery of the subject will be considered together with planned staff development and the partnership between the subject/programme team(s) and the University's UWS Academy and Education Futures teams. The staff Performance & Development Review (PDR) process, "My Contribution", will be discussed and its relationship with strategic planning in the School.

The review will consider the opportunities for and response to student feedback at all campuses, and sites of delivery, as well as all modes of delivery. The role of the Student/Staff Liaison Group (SSLG) and how this group assists in considering the effectiveness of processes for annual monitoring arrangements, maintaining standards and enhancing quality will be explored by the review panel. **ILR is required to consider and report to SFC on the effectiveness of annual monitoring and enhancement arrangements and follow up actions.** The panel will explore how the team uses student statistics in the annual and ongoing monitoring processes and what comparisons are made with similar statistics within and out with the University.

The staff development activities and aspirations to support staff in taking forward programme development and enhancement of the student experience should be discussed in the SED.

The SED should evaluate the effectiveness of the subject/programme team's/School's implementation of strategies for promoting quality enhancement and for identifying, disseminating and implementing good practice.

In the context of a large multi-campus University, the panel will wish to explore communication strategies for module and programme management across all sites of delivery. The SED should make this clear.

3.3 Research and Knowledge Exchange

The panel will consider opportunities for research student development, staff development and networking internally and externally on research issues in the subject area under review. The School plans for research and the relationship between this and the subject under review will be scrutinised, these will also be considered in line with the aspirations of the Research and Enterprise Enabling Plan 2018. Support mechanisms for staff to undertake research and subject consultancy activity and research-led teaching will be explored. The quality of the research students' experience including supervision, support and appropriate student feedback are reviewed under this heading. The panel should have the opportunity to meet research students where there are such students in the subject area.

3.4 Student Assessment and Feedback

The SED should illustrate staff awareness of the University's [Assessment Handbook for Staff: Effective Practice in Assessment](#) and provide assurances that cognisance is being taken with respect to the principles outlined within this strategy.

Reviews will consider the effectiveness of assessment strategies and the variety and appropriateness of assessment methods and whether the intended learning outcomes set for programmes are valid and are being achieved. The balance between formative and summative assessment will be explored. Quality and timeliness of feedback to students on assessment and student understanding of how learning outcomes are achieved will also be considered and discussed with students.

How the subject/programme team makes use of the reports from external examiners will be considered and the School's response to these will be key evidence for the review.

3.5 Progression and Achievement

The panel will also consider progression and achievement, and will review actions taken as a result of ongoing analysis of programme success rates, including strategies for retention and progression, module success rates, honours classifications, destination statistics and graduate employment. Strategic Planning will provide a range of [relevant data](#) which will be made available to the ILR team and the panel.

As part of the annual monitoring processes at UWS, Programme Monitoring Reports (PMRs) are prepared to enable teams to reflect on their practice. The PMR will be data-led and this will be submitted as part of the evidence for ILR.

3.6 Student Support and Guidance for Learning

ILR considers the effectiveness of strategies for admission and subject specific induction arrangements (including arrangements for direct entrants/Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)). There should be evidence of how high quality support and guidance for all modes and locations of study in relation to module/title choices is applied consistently across the subject area. Support arrangements for students on placement/Work Based Learning (WBL) will be considered.

The panel will explore the implementation of Personal Development Planning (PDP) and the impact this has on the diverse range of students, including those with protected characteristics and those with additional learning support needs. Support for international students may be a specific issue to consider. The University's **Student Success Policy Statement** will be discussed with the subject team. This statement applies to all students and to professional and academic staff who provide advice and support to students, and sets out the approach to how the staff and students of the University will work in partnership to build an excellent student experience and

enhance opportunities for students to achieve success. The University's [Student Partnership Agreement \(SPA\)](#), revised for session 2019/20, shall be considered in tandem with the Student Success Policy Statement.

ILR will explore the contribution made by professional support services to promote high quality learning and support.

3.7 Quality Enhancement and Assurance

The panel will be interested in exploring the mechanisms in place for quality enhancement and assurance. This will include understanding institutional quality processes including how annual monitoring, collaboration and student engagement systems operate and inform improvements.

3.8 Strategic Development/Five Year Vision

The panel will want to have a clear understanding of the School's vision for the strategic development of the programme, leading to the development of a five-year vision in the context of external evolution of the subject, professional bodies/industry and the University's Corporate Strategy. The panel will interrogate the relationship between the SED and School Plans. The planned development of the portfolio of programmes, interschool activity, postgraduate and collaborative/new market developments will be discussed. There will be detailed consideration of student data from the dashboard; this will feature as a key part of the ILR considerations and evidence base.

4 ONGOING PROGRAMME APPROVAL

For the majority of University programmes the review of their continuing academic health and re-approval is confirmed via the ILR process rather than in separate re-approval events.

The panel will be asked to confirm that the programme specifications and module descriptors for the ILR are current, up-to-date, accurate, relevant and complete (see section 8). ILR confirms the re-approval of provision until the next ILR (or reapproval), making conditions and recommendations where necessary.

If there are serious issues specific to the re-approval of individual programmes, the panel may set conditions for ongoing approval or recommend in its report to EAC that a formal review of the programme(s) takes place.

5 STUDENT ENGAGEMENT IN ILR

5.1 *Scottish Funding Council Guidelines*

The SFC guidance on the engagement and involvement of students in quality states an expectation that student engagement and participation in quality shall continue to be extended in line with the [Student Engagement Framework for Scotland](#). It is expected that students will be engaged at all stages of the ILR process including the development of the SED, as full members of ILR teams and in follow-up activity. (*SFC Guidance – July 2017 circular, para. 35 - 36*)

Furthermore, the Quality Code states that: “*The provider engages students individually and collectively in the development, assurance and enhancement of the quality of their educational experience*”.

The [QuEST ILR site](#) provides useful information for staff.

5.2 *Informing and Involving Students*

At the start of the session in which the ILR is to take place, the subject/programme team(s) should advise all students of the ILR process. This is facilitated by an [‘Informing and Involving Students’ leaflet](#) available from QuEST. [Online video footage](#) is also available. **The ILR should be on the agenda of SSLGs to ensure students are aware of the process, how to engage with it and the importance of their involvement.** The SSLG also provides a forum for student input to the SED. Responsibility for involving students in the ILR process lies with the subject/programme team.

As defined within the UK Quality Code, students should be engaged in curriculum design, development and review processes. Students are encouraged to engage with ILR on several levels:

- Each ILR has a student representative in full membership of the panel. Normally, but not exclusively, this will be a sabbatical officer of the Students’ Association. The student representative will not be/have been a student from the subject area under review. (training is provided for all student panel members);
- The panel will have the opportunity to meet a spectrum of students/graduates (taught and research) from the subject area from all programmes under review. The students invited to these discussions will, as far as possible, reflect the broad diversity of the student cohort;
- Graduates should also be included in the meetings with students. (School should arrange for 10-20 such students/graduates to be available. Academic staff can seek necessary advice and guidance from QuEST regarding student population);
- ILR teams are strongly advised to brief the students who are going to meet the ILR panel on what to expect when meeting the panel. Refer to the QuEST, [‘Informing and Involving Students’](#) leaflet. Ideally, this should prepare students for the likely questions they will be asked, but not to script the students. Academic staff are known to the students and are best placed to brief their students on the process and encourage participation;
- SFC guidance also states that the ILR team should gather additional specific evidence from students in the subject area under review for the ILR panel. **Students should be given the opportunity to influence the content of the SED**, particularly in contributing to the evaluation of learning, teaching and

enhancement and student support and guidance. This may include all or some of the following:

- The report of a special meeting or minutes of specific discussions at an SSLG of the provision under review and the draft SED;
- The report or written commentary of one or more focus groups convened to discuss the provision under review and/or the draft SED (ILR teams should co-ordinate, but QuEST/UWS Academy/SAUWS can help contribute at the focus group itself);
- Specifically devised 'ILR' questionnaires.

It is recommended that student views are sought, where possible, in a controlled environment.

Whatever methods are employed, the process of collecting the additional student feedback should:

- Generate holistic evidence about student views of provision and of their learning experience;
- Differentiate between the views of different categories of students where these are likely to be significant (for example part-time and full-time, students from different levels of programme, entrants from school and entrants from further education etc.);
- Allow identification of distinctive characteristics of provision; and
- Take account of the view of graduates on the relevance of provision for their careers.

6 SUPPORT SERVICE ENGAGEMENT IN ILR

There is increasing recognition of the important role of professional support services in determining the overall quality of the student learning experience. For instance, students interact with guidance services, learning resources, ITDS, the library, recruitment, student finance etc. and together these services have an impact on the overall student experience. Refer to the QuEST, '[Involvement of Professional Support Services in ILR](#)' leaflet.

All services contributing to the student experience should be reviewed as part of an institution's approach. Support services are of crucial importance in determining the overall quality of the student learning experience and can impact significantly on student achievement and well-being. It is a matter for each institution to determine how this should be done. Whatever the approach taken, the evidence should allow the institution to reflect on the contribution of support services to the 'quality culture' within the institution, the ways in which the services engage with students to monitor and improve the quality of services, and the ways in which the services promote high quality learning and continuous quality enhancement. (*SFC Guidance – July 2017 circular, para.37*)

Professional Support Services should engage with ILR on several levels:

- ILR teams should develop evidence that can be made available to ILR panels on how Professional Support Services contribute to the quality culture. **This should include how Subject/Programme teams and Support Services interact to engage with students to monitor and improve the quality of services** and the ways in which the services promote high quality learning and continuous quality enhancement. Over time this will draw on a range of input such as review by the University of Support Areas, the output from and the use made of questionnaires and other student feedback, external reports on specialist areas etc.;

- Reviews should take account of the [UK Quality Code for Higher Education: Student Engagement \(November 2018\)](#);
- The Subject area under review should engage with professional support services to jointly evaluate the impact of service department support to that subject's students, the equivalence of support across campuses and the meeting of the particular needs of the students in that subject area;
- Professional support services may be asked by the subject/programme team to comment on the SED and/or to identify how their unit supports improvement in the student experience at UWS. Input into the SED may be via an SED Engagement Workshop where support units may engage with the subject team to evaluate the impact of support services on that subject's students, and identify any required input into the SED. Any outcomes arising from this workshop should be incorporated into the SED;
- Meetings with Support Service representatives will be built into the Phase 2 ILR event providing an opportunity to describe the interface between the Subject/Programme team and the Professional Support Service, and the support arrangements in place for the students of the subject area and how they work together to meet the needs of students. The panel can divide if need be, to enable a range of members to meet appropriate specialists from support areas to explore the particular themes they are pursuing from their engagement with the SED.

7 SELF EVALUATION DOCUMENT (SED)

7.1 ILR Lead/Team Approach

A Self Evaluation Document (SED) is prepared by the subject/programme team, based on the key areas to be addressed (outlined in section 3), and taking cognisance of the guidance in [APPENDIX 2 \(SED guidance\)](#).

The Deputy Dean will identify the ILR lead/author of the SED; however sole responsibility does not lie with this one individual and a team approach must be taken. In order to get the best outcomes from ILR to support subject development, it is recommended that ILR teams are established. The ILR team should have clear performance objectives in relation to the ILR, including clear roles for specific individuals.

Recommended ILR Teams should include:

- ILR Lead/author of SED;
- Deputy Dean;
- Programme Leaders (for all programmes under review);
- Other key academic staff involved in the delivery of the subject area under review;
- School/Student Enhancement Developer(s) (where applicable);
- School Administrative Support;
- Education Futures (where appropriate)
- UWS Academy (where appropriate)

The SED should be explicit about the ILR team's view of the strengths of the subject as well as areas for improvement by placing emphasis on evidence-based reflection. It should be **reflective and self-critical, evaluative rather than descriptive** and should demonstrate that discussion and analysis is ongoing within the subject/programme team and pose suggested ways forward in reaction to current and

anticipated challenges. The SED should also outline what the team/subject area particularly wishes to achieve from the ILR.

On embarking in the drafting the SED, some starter questions are appended in **APPENDIX 3** to assist the ILR team in reflecting and preparing for ILR. UWS Academy has particular skills to assist ILR teams in undertaking this activity and they should liaise closely in this regard. Furthermore, students should be given the opportunity to contribute to the SED (see section 5).

7.2 General

The University follows a six-year cycle of reviews; hence each subject area will be reviewed at least once every six years. Although the review should reflect on key developments over the period since the last review, a reasonable length of time for the scope of the review would encompass the previous three sessions (i.e. the panel could request to review a sample of student work for the previous three-year period). **However, the focus on the ILR is about enhancement and future developments and how the subject/programme team learns from the past to inform the future and takes deliberate steps to bring about enhancement.**

The team should bear in mind that the SED will be considered by externals and colleagues from outwith the subject area and should be clearly written, making explicit the range of provision and the strategies for taking it forward and therefore a limited amount of descriptive content is necessary in the SED to provide context for reviewers. However, the brief description should be followed by evaluative and reflective comment under each heading.

Members may request samples of student work for review so it is recommended that Schools retain samples of student work (as described in procedures for the Retention of Assessed Work (**APPENDIX 4**) to prepare for any requests which may arise).

7.3 SED Workshops/Discussion Forum

ILR teams are encouraged to hold SED Workshops/or an alternative discussion forum to promote self-reflection and inform preparation of the SED, ensuring all relevant colleagues are given opportunities to participate or input. This should involve all ILR team members and relevant Support Services. Advice on suggested formats for such events can be obtained from UWS Academy in terms of the best approach to maximise effectiveness of such workshops and stimulate reflection.

7.4 Guidance on Format of the SED

As intimated in section 7.1, SED guidance ([APPENDIX 2](#)) is available for use. The SED should include the following sections:

- Introduction and context – a short statement on the range and history of provision, distinctiveness and how the subject contributes to the University’s strategic aim of excellence in the student experience, and what the team hopes to achieve from the ILR;
- List of programmes/titles included in the review – including student numbers at each level of each programme title, full-time/part-time/online learner/other status, (where possible including gender breakdown) and at which campus/collaborative partner sites these are delivered. The panel will be interested in the cohort analysis used by the subject/programme team to understand the student profile and retention and progression. **Where individual modules [University credit-bearing] in the subject are offered outwith a programmatic structure these should also be listed as**

should modules which contribute to programmes outwith the subject area under review;

- Critical evaluation of the effectiveness of the areas to be addressed as detailed in section 3 above, and taking Enabling Plans into account;
- The SED provides an opportunity for the ILR team to provide its perspective in terms of the current arrangements in place for the quality enhancement and assurance of standards; particularly in terms of external examiner reports/responses, effectiveness of annual monitoring, Programme Boards, Student/Staff Liaison Groups, level of student input, MEQs, student surveys etc.;
- The SED concludes with a summary of strengths and an action plan, identifying areas for further development based on the ILR team's evidence-based reflection. Teams are at liberty to shift format ordering and layout, provided the key areas are included.

7.5 Footnotes

The document should be fully footnoted and annotated, citing references and document sources to which the evaluation refers. It is important to ensure that the sources referred to (footnote) are available and brought together as the SED is being written (lodged on the ILR-specific drive – see section 7.7). This provides essential reference material to the panel in supporting the claims made by the subject/programme team.

7.6 Approximate Length

The SED should be as concise as is reasonable to cover the required detail and normally should range between **8,000 – 16,000 words** plus appendices.

7.7 School Approval of SED & Associated Evidence Base

The SED should be scrutinised and endorsed by the School, prior to being submitted to QuEST. The final SED, along with the current programme specifications (see section 8 below) should be signed off on behalf of the School by the Dean as conforming to the University's expectations for submissions.

In development of the SED, the School must confirm the following:

- **Appropriate student engagement into SED** (to include evidence as appendix to SED to support student input – eg. commentary as an appendix/or a footnote);
- **Appropriate Professional Support Service engagement into SED** (confirmation will be sought that Support Services have had the opportunity to input to the SED. This may be via an SED Workshop/Discussion Forum or by other activities);
- **Programme specifications and module descriptors** are current, up-to-date, accurate, relevant and complete.

Other documentation and evidence to support the review shall be lodged on a **ILR-specific drive (z:drive)** populated by the ILR team and QuEST. Details of the required documentation can be found in [APPENDIX 5](#).

Prior to the review, in addition to the SED, the panel will also receive a briefing pack together with access to a Microsoft OneDrive account containing module descriptors, student handbooks, student progression data and all other documented evidence to support the review. In relation to this, the School must also confirm:

- Specific material lodged on z:drive for the ILR is current, up-to-date, accurate, relevant and complete. This material will be transferred to the Microsoft OneDrive for Panel to view.

BOUND SETS OF MATERIAL REQUIRED -:

The School will also be required to provide a specified number of hard-copy bound sets (QuEST to confirm number) of the following material for distribution to panel members:

- **Self-Evaluation Document** (Final School approved version with School Confirmation Form attached);
- **Programme Specifications** for all programmes under review (presented in an appropriate order to align with SED and with supporting contents page);
- **Module Descriptors – for core modules (and any proposed new modules)** contributing to programmes under review (presented in appropriate order) as well as any newly proposed modules. Optional modules will be accessible to the panel via the OneDrive (taken from the University's Programme Specifications and Module Descriptor (PSMD) site).

The School will forward the above to QuEST approximately **ten weeks** in advance of the Phase 2 main event, together with a completed and signed School Confirmation Form ([APPENDIX 6](#)) stating that the School is satisfied that the expectations of ILR have been met. Furthermore, the supporting documentation (on z:drive) should be ready to be transferred onto the Microsoft OneDrive for issuing to panel members.

Both SED and password details to the OneDrive will also be forwarded to the ILR panel via QuEST prior to the Phase 1 (i.e. 10 weeks in advance of main event), together with a note of guidance from the panel Chair asking for feedback and proposed lines of enquiry. Feedback questions will be provided.

8 MODULE DESCRIPTORS AND PROGRAMME SPECIFICATIONS

Module descriptors and programme specifications are key documents for ILR; these must be current, up-to-date, accurate, relevant and complete. The cycle for ILR indicates that there is a process of reflection and review within the School and subject area when modules and programme structures will be updated in preparation for the review. The panel will be interested in the rationale and process by which changes were made/are proposed and how students have been consulted.

Where amendments are proposed for the next cohort, the ILR panel should receive the proposed modules and programme structures but also a summary of the key changes/existing structure so the panel can understand the changes and enter into dialogue with staff and students about this. A useful way to present this is by means of **programme structure tables** showing current and proposed versions which can be readily compared (QuEST can provide exemplars).

As stated in section 7.7, the School will be required to provide hard-copy bound sets of both programme specifications and core/new module descriptors in addition to the SED for distribution to panel members.

9 PLANNING AND PREPARATION

9.1 *General Overview*

ILR is an ongoing period of review rather than a 'big-bang' event. Careful planning of the process by the School working together with QuEST is therefore required. The Education Advisory Committee (EAC), assisted by the Academic Quality Committee (AQC) will monitor these arrangements.

A brief pattern of activity for ILR is as follows:

- An **initial kick-off** meeting will normally be held 4 – 6 months before the ILR to assist ILR teams to prepare for their forthcoming review;
- A proposed schedule containing an **indicative timeline/schedule** shall be made available by QuEST to assist ILR teams in meeting key milestones; also acting as a prompt for events and deadlines, and helping to ensure a full understanding of the ILR process ([APPENDIX 7](#)). The Dean of School is responsible for ensuring this timeline is adhered to and deadlines met;
- Regular meetings can be facilitated by QuEST if required to assist ILR teams. UWS Academy are available to offer specific academic-related support;
- The ILR team should forward potential **external panel nominees** to QuEST for consideration and approval;
- QuEST will invite and determine internal panel members (including student panel members);
- The ILR team should identify staff and students/graduates who will meet with the panel and confirm names to QuEST at least one week before the Phase 2 Event.
- The responsibility for involving students in the ILR process lies with the ILR team. Academic staff are known to the students and are best placed to brief their students on the process and encourage participation. ILR teams therefore hold responsibility for briefing those students/graduates due to meet the ILR panel on what to expect (highlighting likely questions but not scripting the students). Academic staff can however seek necessary advice and guidance from QuEST to carry out these tasks. Refer to the QuEST, '[Students Matter – Informing and Involving Students' leaflet](#).
- Furthermore, the School is responsible for circulating the SED and copies of the panel membership/programme to the internal subject/programme team and students/graduates as well as any other stakeholders (clinical managers, service users, practice mentors, Industrial Advisory Board members etc) who may be attending.
- Any requests from the panel for further documentation must be made via QuEST.

9.2 *Internal Communication*

The ILR should be an inclusive and developmental process involving all staff, relevant support services, as well as students in the subject area. The School will determine the attendance of staff to each relevant meeting of the review (predominantly during Phase 2) but it is expected that all staff should be available. Given that advance notice is given for the ILR dates, it should be possible to schedule other priorities to maximise

staff attendance. The Dean of School, Deputy Dean and relevant Divisional Programme Board Chairs are invited to appropriate meetings for Phase 1 and 2.

QuEST staff are available to the School at all times in the preparation phase to clarify issues/expectations and can brief groups of staff and students as requested by the School.

QuEST will provide the ILR lead contact with copies of the agreed programmes as well as panel membership for the ILR, they should ensure these are forwarded to members of staff attending the event.

9.3 Staff Profiles

The School under review will be required to provide a full list of teaching and research staff involved with the provision. This can be done via CVs and/or use of PURE Research Profiles. See [APPENDIX 10](#) for details.

10 THE REVIEW PANEL

10.1 Role of the ILR Chair

The Chair of the ILR will act on behalf of the University, representing EAC by undertaking an institution-led review of a subject's quality assurance and enhancement arrangements.

The role of the Chair is pivotal as a co-ordinating and directing influence on the process. Chairs are nominated by UWS Vice Principals and Depute Principal. The Chair of ILR will be a senior member of staff from outwith the subject under review and all will be required to undergo specific ILR Chair training.

The Chair of the ILR has the authority to air serious concerns about the quality of an SED and/or the associated evidence base, or engagement with the process in advance of the event. In cases where the Chair raises significant concerns, the decision to proceed or not would be taken following discussion between the Chair, the Depute Principal and the Head of QuEST.

Furthermore, following an ILR event, should any concerns regarding quality, standards or engagement with the ILR be identified, the Chair of the ILR along with the panel may agree to hold a follow-up event one year later.

Adoption of the Phase 1 and 2 approach will bring additional responsibility to the role of the Chair, in terms of co-ordinating the revised approach.

10.2 Selection of External Participants

The selection of external panel members will be discussed at a preliminary meeting between the Deputy Dean, the relevant Head of Division, the ILR Lead and QuEST; and thereafter verified by the ILR team. Nominations for external panel members should be submitted to QuEST at the earliest opportunity, to ensure that availability of first choice externals is maximised. The School Board should scrutinise the nominations proposed by the ILR team and approve these before they are provided to QuEST.

All nomination forms ([APPENDIX 8](#)) must be completed in full and signed off by the School Board before being passed to QuEST. QuEST will need this information to confirm the balance, expertise and experience of the panel before recommending

approval of the panel. The Head of QuEST will authorise invitations to be issued on behalf of EAC.

There should normally be a minimum of two academics and one professional/industrialist. The School may request additional panel members to cover the specialisms under review.

ILR teams should follow specific criteria outlined in [APPENDIX 9](#). This guidance should assist in identifying potential external candidates for individual reviews. External panel members will need to provide evidence to confirm their eligibility to work in the UK; this is a requirement for honorarium payment.

10.3 Selection of Internal Panel Members

The selection of internal panel members will usually be from the following:

- Chair of the ILR: A senior member of staff (from outwith the subject under review). All Chairs must undergo ILR Chair training;
- A minimum of two members of academic staff from outwith the subject under review. These should normally comprise of either:
 - A senior member of academic staff from a subject area recently Institution Led Reviewed; OR
 - One or more members of EAC from a School not connected with the review; OR
 - One or more members of staff from an area to undergo an ILR in the next year (if more appropriate, those with forthcoming ILRs may prefer to act as an observer);
- Students' Association Sabbatical Officer or nominee (not from the subject area under review);
- Observers (as required).

The Panel and Chair will normally be supported by two members of QuEST; this will normally include the Head of QuEST/or one senior member.

11 THE EVENTS: PHASE 1 AND 2

All ILRs will comprise a Phase 1 and Phase 2 Event.

Phase 1 will involve written input from all panel members followed by an interim half-day event involving the Chair of ILR, QuEST, Deputy Dean, Head of Division and the ILR Lead only.

Phase 2 will form the main face-to-face event requiring attendance by all panel members. Reviews will normally comprise a single 2-day event but for smaller reviews, it may only be necessary to hold an event over a shorter time period, QuEST will make decisions on a case by case basis. QuEST will discuss with the Chair of the ILR and the School the planned location of the ILR depending on the campuses involved in delivery. The length of the programme will also be dictated by the number of programmes within the review and the need to ensure the panel can review these in appropriate detail.

No rigid event programme exists. It is intended that the event programmes to be more flexibly arranged depending on the panel's focus.

In summary -:

- **Phase 1** will consider the programmes under review, mainly for assurances surrounding quality management arrangements and re-approval purposes. An interim report will be produced by QuEST to inform Phase 2.
- **Phase 2** will steer the review towards an enhancement-led approach and explore the benefits of having dedicated time with external experts devoted to subject development discussions. It is intended that programme teams will be able to tailor Phase 2 more specifically to their subject area, instilling more engagement, and providing opportunities to showcase good practice, to identify case studies where there be challenges that the ILR panel could engage with, to enable incorporation of accreditation elements, among other considerations.

The nature of ILR is not adversarial. The panel will seek an open and constructive exchange with the ILR team who are encouraged to adopt the same approach, to engage fully with the process and not to feel defensive. To support this stance, a transparent agenda will be maintained through the process with advance comments from the panel shared with the subject/programme team.

The SED and the meetings with staff should demonstrate that a process of honest self-evaluation is embedded in the ILR team's approach to improving the student experience.

The panel may request VLE access to enable members to review live modules and other student facing material.

11.1 Phase 1 (Written input)

- (i) The SED and supporting programme/module material to be circulated to panel approximately **two/three months prior** to the final event.
- (ii) All panel members are **required to** provide advance written comments (using a standard template provided by QuEST). Genuine engagement will be essential and receipt of written feedback will be crucial to fulfil the role as panel member. Written feedback received from panel will be reviewed by the Chair and QuEST, to inform the agenda for the Phase 1 interim event.
- (iii) **Phase 1 Interim event** (held approximately **1 month prior** to final event):
This will involve Chair of ILR, QuEST, Deputy Dean, Head of Division and ILR Lead only. This meeting will involve general discussion of issues arising from the Phase 1 review, consider resolution of some issues, and seek confirmation of quality management arrangements. There will also be agreement of the provisional programme for the Phase 2 event.
- (iv) Production of written report arising from Phase 1 by QuEST – this summary report will highlight good practice and areas for further exploration.
- (v) Phase 1 summary report – this will be circulated to all panel members prior to Phase 2. It is intended that, successful completion of Phase 1 should:
 - Resolve any queries surrounding routine practice which would no longer require consideration at the final event, thus freeing up time during Phase 2 event to focus on subject-specific areas.
 - Identify specific areas for consideration during Phase 2 event.
 - Identify specific colleagues who should meet with the panel during Phase 2 (e.g. Professional support staff/technical staff).
 - Identify any additional information required from the School.

11.2 Phase 2 (Face-to-Face Final Event)

The programme for Phase 2 event will not follow a standard format; however students and School/subject staff will always be expected to participate in their specific ILRs. The panel will meet with students at the start of the event.

The duration of this event is normally 2 days, but will be determined locally, dependent on the size and nature of the review.

All panel members are **required to** attend the Phase 2 event on campus.

The ILR programme for the Final Phase 2 event will:

- Be informed by the Phase 1 summary report and any further feedback received by the panel. It will be clear from completion of Phase 1 what the issues requiring further exploration are.
- Provide flexibility to enable the programme team to tailor Phase 2 more specifically to their subject area, hopefully instilling more involvement and engagement from subject teams (e.g. providing opportunities to showcase good practice, to identify case studies where there may be challenges that the ILR panel could engage with, to enable incorporation of accreditation elements, among others).
- Continue to involve students and School/subject staff input (as appropriate) in terms of participation in specific ILRs.

11.3 *Exceptional – Phase 3/Additional Event*

If required, there will be an opportunity for a Phase 3 or additional event at the request of the Chair (any exceptions will be agreed by EAC). This may be due to the number of programmes or complexity of the review. If required, a further meeting will take place 4 – 6 weeks after the initial meeting. It may take place at a different campus. At this meeting there is further exploration of the issues identified at the earlier meetings and additional documentation received. Usually, there are meetings with Senior School staff and with teaching staff.

Where the panel has significant issues for the subject/programme team to address, it may exceptionally seek to reconvene in a one year follow-up.

12 REPORTING AND FOLLOW-UP ACTION

The final report will be written by QuEST, usually within 6-8 weeks after the Phase 2 event and circulated to the panel for confirmation following approval by the Chair of the ILR. The ILR team will be given the opportunity to comment on the factual accuracy of the draft final report and provide any outstanding data.

The final report should be discussed in detail by relevant Divisional Programme Board(s) and the School Board. The final report will be scrutinised by AQC (normally within 6 months of finalisation of the report) on behalf of EAC and will report on key themes and monitor follow-up action. Where necessary, an institutional action plan will be developed and any wider University issues will be summarised for the attention of the VCEG. EAC will be responsible for sharing and disseminating good practice arising from ILR.

The School/ILR team/Divisional Programme Board(s) will engage with the recommendations of the report and provide a Follow-up Action Plan within 6 months of receipt of the full report. A pre-populated ILR Follow-up Action Plan template will be provided for use by programme teams ([APPENDIX 11](#)). EAC shall continue to take an

institutional overview of the outcomes of ILR whilst remitting the action plan to AQC to monitor one year follow up.

Committee Reporting of ILR Outcomes			
	AQC	EAC	Senate
Summary Outcomes	Report submitted to first available meeting of AQC	Assurance through AQC reporting	Assurance through EAC reporting
Conditions met	Confirmation that any conditions have been met, and all programme material updated accordingly. Requires approval by Chair.		
Full Report and ILR Team Action Plan	Action Plan (with link to the full report) submitted to AQC within 6 months of the finalisation of the report.		
One Year Follow-up	Report with updated ILR Team Action plan submitted to next available meeting of AQC.		
Annual ILR Thematic reporting	Approval sought from AQC for submission to EAC and Senate.	Annual ILR Thematic reporting	Annual ILR Thematic reporting

Schools should recognise the importance of ensuring open and transparent communication of internal review outcomes and action plans across the School; this applies to both staff and students. The outcomes should be highlighted at relevant **Student-Staff Liaison Group (SSLG)** meetings with a view to monitoring and review involving student input. SSLGs should receive outcomes as well as the One-Year Follow-up Action Plan and details of progress.

An overview of ILR themes will be made available to Senate annually.

The ILR report will:

- Confirm the **approval or re-approval** of provision until the next ILR (or revalidation), making conditions and recommendations where necessary;
- Highlight strengths of provision and areas of positive practice for dissemination within the University;
- Include brief commentary in relation to SFC expectations and outcomes with regard to:
 - Confirming satisfactory engagement of students;
 - Confirming satisfactory engagement with Professional Support services;
 - Commenting on engagement of subject staff in the ILR;
 - Commenting on the quality of reflection and evaluation;
 - Commenting on the accuracy, currency and relevance of the documentation and evidence to support the SED;
- Provide conclusions of the health of each of the areas addressed, making recommendations where necessary.

12.1 One Year Follow-Up Event

Each ILR will be subject to a follow-up event the following session (normally within 12-15 months of the review). A small panel of AQC members and QuEST staff will meet with the Programme Leader(s) and selected staff to discuss the outcomes arising from implementation of the action plan. The School shall update the action plan prior to the follow-up event to outline progress against each condition and area for development.

In summary, ILR Follow-up activity should consist of the following:

Note: EAC remits scrutiny and ongoing monitoring to AQC. AQC provides assurances to EAC.

Task	School/Other	EAC/AQC/ QuEST/Other
ILR Summary Report (produced by QuEST)	Comment on factual accuracy; Report discussed at Divisional Programme Board(s)	ILR Programme Teams - for consideration. EAC – Assurance through AQC reporting
Conditions met (where applicable)	Team ensures conditions are met and all programme material is updated accordingly.	Confirmation that any conditions have been met - requires approval by Chair.
Full ILR Report (produced by QuEST)	Comment on factual accuracy; Report discussed at Divisional Programme Board(s). Action plan should be developed by team and submitted to AQC within 6 months of finalisation of the report.	Team Action Plans considered by AQC (with link to Full Report) to identify themes and University wide actions (wider issues maybe referred to VCEG). This scrutiny of Action Plans/Reports will inform the annual letter to SFC.
ILR Team Action Plan (produced by School on pre-populated template)	Divisional Programme Board(s) prepare one action plan in response to the report. Divisional Programme Board(s) and School approval of action plan by AQC/EAC. Desirable for outcomes to be linked to School Plans / EAM. <i>(date for completion of actions is normally within 12 month window – any exceptions should be clearly flagged and justified)</i>	Institutional Themes/Action plan prepared by QuEST/AQC for endorsement by EAC (& then Senate). Programme Board(s) engages with Team Actions. School monitors progress.
ILR Outcomes & Action Plan	Outcomes & Team Action Plan should be highlighted at relevant SSLG meetings with a view to monitoring and review involving student input.	SSLG meetings
ILR Themes	Themes made available for information.	Senate; Institutional EAM Event
One year follow up <i>(should comprise evidence of impact rather than simply a narrative of change)</i>	Will normally take place within a year of the ILR Phase 2 Event. Divisional Programme Board(s) provides update on how actions have been addressed one year later. School confirms that follow up has been addressed. SSLG comments on updated action plan.	AQC convenes formal follow up meeting with Deputy Dean, ILR Lead and key members of the relevant Subject/Programme Team to seek assurance that actions have been addressed.
	Divisional Programme Board(s) address any outstanding items prior to reporting to EAC.	Follow-up report provided to next available meeting of AQC and assurances thereafter reported to EAC.
General Milestones		
Annual Institutional Overview	Discussion and approval of SFC Institutional letter and agreement of institutional wide actions. SEPTEMBER ANNUALLY	QuEST Endorsed by: Vice Principal (Academic)
Annual confirmation to COURT/SFC	Annual statement of assurance to Funding Council from governing body (Court)* NOVEMBER ANNUALLY	QuEST Return of annual report to SFC on ILR Endorsed by: Chair of Court
Dissemination of ILR Reports /Findings	The following to receive ILR Summary Outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAUWS • Student body (via relevant SSLGs) • Schools • UWS Academy 	QuEST Full reports will be lodged on QuEST site .
Sharing of Good Practice	UWS Academy to identify good practice and disseminate across the University. Good Practice Staff Seminars anticipated.	UWS Academy / QuEST
Full ILR Reports	Provided annually to the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) SEPTEMBER ANNUALLY	QuEST Discussed at annual meeting with QAA.

PROPOSED: INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW (ILR) - SCHEDULE 2019/20 – 2024/25

Proposed Schedule (and date of Last Review)
<p>2019/20 (6 Reviews plus ELIR)</p> <p>Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR) 4 Contemporary Drug & Alcohol Studies (CDAS) (2012/13) UG Social Sciences, PG Social Sciences and Criminal Justice (2013/14) Career Guidance & Development (2013/14) Career Long Professional Education (2013/14) (including CAP)</p> <p>Community Provision (2014/15) Midwifery (2014/15)</p>
<p>2020/21 (7 Reviews)</p> <p>Law and Legal Studies (2014/15) Accounting and Finance (2014/15)</p> <p>Creative Technologies (2014/15)</p> <p>Pre-Registration Nursing Provision (Adult Health (2014/15)) / Mental Health (2015/16) *Undergraduate Non-commissioned Provision *Postgraduate Provision (various dates as previously contained in different ILRs) (*UG Non-commissioned provision & PG provision may merge into one event)</p> <p>Education: Initial Professional Programmes (IPP) (2015/16) (5-year cycle required for SSSC accreditation body) (School currently reviewing allocation of programmes and timing of this ILR) – comprises (i) Teacher Education; (ii) Early Years; (iii) Community Education)</p>
<p>2021/22 (3 Reviews)</p> <p>Arts & Media (formerly Culture & Creativity) (2015/16) Divinity (Scottish Baptist College) (2017/18) (Streamlined, Joint ILR/Collaborative Review agreed by EAC) Sport & Exercise (2015/16)</p>
<p>2022/23 (3 Reviews)</p> <p>Physical Sciences (2016/17) (comprising Chemistry, Forensic Science, Formulation Science) Pharmacy Science & Health (2016/17) (previously within Physical Sciences ILR / HLS considering where this sits) Languages (2016/17)</p>
<p>2023/24 (6 Reviews)</p> <p>Business Undergraduate (2017/18) (provision to include Business Graduate Apprenticeship award) Business Postgraduate (2017/18) Business – MBA/DBA (2017/18)</p> <p>Physics (2017/18) Psychology (2018/19) (BPS NOT attending) (5-Year cycle required for accreditation body) Social Work (2018/19) (SSSC attending) (5-Year cycle required for accreditation body)</p>
<p>2024/25 (3 Reviews)</p> <p>Computing (2018/19) (provision under review to include Computing Graduate Apprenticeship awards x2) Engineering (2018/19) and Quality/Project Management (2012/13) (provision under review to include Engineering Graduate Apprenticeship award and MSc Waste Management) Life and Environment (2018/19) (Comprising Bioscience, Safety, Health and Environment)</p>

INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW - SED GUIDANCE

The Self Evaluation Document (SED) is the key document for the ILR. This guidance is designed to assist the authors whilst drafting their SEDs.

1. INTRODUCTION

- Add context and core information about the programmes within the subject in the School (2 or 3 paragraphs)
- Year and timing of review, i.e. Session 2019/20, January/February.
- Who has prepared document? Details of how it has been endorsed by staff and students, including statement on how the expectation to gather additional specific information from students as part of the evidence base for the review has been addressed.

1.1 Range of provision

(List all programmes under review – undergraduate, postgraduate, collaborative etc)

1.2 Staff profile

Brief narrative regarding staffing including academic staff, recognised teachers, admin support, clinical, placement and external facing activities.

1.3 Current student profile² - below

Undergraduate

Current students	Level 7	Level 8	Level 9	Level 10
No. FTE/headcount				
Programme 1				
Programme 2				
Programme 3				
Programme 4				
Programme 5				
Programme 6				
Programme 7				

Postgraduate

Students	PgC	PgD	MSc
Programme 1			
Programme 2			

PhD students		

² More detailed information in supporting documentation.

Staff student ratio		

Campus Location & Number of Students		

Brief narrative on student profile including analysis over time.

1.4 Aims of provision in relation to University Corporate Strategy (Refresh 2017/20)

- What is main aim of provision – internationalisation, access, distinctiveness, niche provision?
- Describe the subject’s contribution to excellence in the student experience.
- Outline what the subject team hopes to achieve from the ILR at this time in the subject’s development?

NB Point 1:

For all sections, the SED should highlight good practice or innovation.

NB Point 2:

Whilst completing the SED, ILR teams should endeavour to illustrate how their School/Subject group are taking cognisance of the following:

- UWS Corporate Strategy Refresh 2017-20
- Education Enabling Plan 2018
- Global Engagement Enabling Plan 2018
- Research & Enterprise Enabling Plan 2018
- Student Success Policy

2. REFLECTION ON – PROVISION (CURRICULUM DESIGN CONTENT AND DEVELOPMENT)

For each programme under review, how has the School/Subject area addressed the following (where applicable)?

- Effectiveness of design and content of curriculum in delivering programme(s) aims³.
- How has provision changed since last validated/reviewed. Summary of changes for each programme along with rationale/details of student consultation/involvement.

³ It is likely that the background detail for much of this section will be in validation reports and documents. It is appropriate to refer to these in this section rather than repeat text.

- How learning outcomes demonstrate progression between levels (consistent with SCQF level outcomes).
- The appropriateness of the curriculum for developing knowledge, understanding and skills as identified in the benchmark statement.
- The appropriateness of the curriculum for developing cognitive, subject specific and employability skills. Use of personal development planning to demonstrate how graduate attributes are promoted. (See AdvanceHE website for guidance on embedding employability in the curriculum.) <https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/career-development-learning-and-employability>
- Integration of placement/work based/work related learning.
- How the UWS Graduate Attributes have been embedded into the curriculum.
- Reflection on PSRB accreditation.
- Employer / industry / student / alumni engagement in curriculum design to ensure currency and validity.
- The appropriateness of the curriculum in relation to inclusiveness, accessibility and internationalisation, sustainability and enterprise.
- Reflection on national and international good practice, including national enhancement themes.

3. REFLECTION ON – LEARNING, TEACHING & ENHANCEMENT

How has the School/Subject area addressed the following (where applicable)?

- Implementation of the Education Enabling Plan.
- Use of VLE and staff development planning/opportunities.
- Variety, appropriateness, inclusiveness and accessibility of teaching methods across cohorts and campuses, including collaborative institutions, to encourage independent learning, critical thinking and personal development planning.
- Consideration of mobility and flexibility in accordance with individual learners' needs.
- Evidence of research informed teaching.
- Appropriateness and effectiveness of learning and teaching resources.
- Engagement with best practice Equality and diversity policies in relation to issues regarding delivery.

4. REFLECTION ON – RESEARCH AND KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE

How has the School/Subject addressed the following (where applicable)?

- The School research plans for the subject under review.
- Taking into account the Research & Enterprise Enabling Plan.
- The support mechanisms for staff to undertake research, consultancy and knowledge transfer.
- Opportunities for internal and external networking on research issues.
- Research staff profile/publications (Staff population of UWS Research Profile/PURE).
- Research student development and availability of learning resources.
- Supervision and support for research students.
- Support for research students undertaking undergraduate teaching.

5. REFLECTION ON – STUDENT ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK

How has the School/Subject area addressed the following (where applicable)?

- The appropriateness and effectiveness of the design of assessment to meet intended learning outcomes.
- Range and variety of assessment methods.
- Programme overview of variety and volume of assessment.
- Appropriateness of balance between formative and summative assessment including specific commentary on relative balance of summative assessment.
- Quality and timeliness of feedback to students.
- Staff development for assessment practice.
- Reflection on student feedback in relation to assessment design and practice.
- Engagement with appropriate policies and assessment design as outlined in the Assessment Handbook for Staff.

6. REFLECTION ON – PROGRESSION AND ACHIEVEMENT

How has the School/Subject area addressed the following (where applicable)?

- Reflection on progression rates over time, including specific comment on progression to Honours.
- Reflection on honours classifications and comparison across school/other HEIs.
- Commentary on employment destinations.

7. REFLECTION ON – STUDENT SUPPORT & GUIDANCE FOR LEARNING

How has the School/Subject area addressed the following (where applicable)?

- Induction arrangements for new and continuing students, including off campus, such as local delivery/distance learning.
- Guidance on module and programme choices.
- How lifelong learning modules have been used to support student learning, to support transition.
- Use of effective learning resources (staff).
- Use of the Disability Services.
- Support for students off campus i.e. collaborative and placement.
- Effectiveness of support for the needs of the diverse student body, i.e. international, mode of delivery.

8. REFLECTION ON – QUALITY ENHANCEMENT & ASSURANCE OF STANDARDS

How has the School/Subject area addressed the following (where applicable)?

- Use made of external examiner reports and responses.
- Reflected and acted on Module Review Forms (MRFs), Programme Monitoring Reports (PMRs) and Collaborative Annual Reports (CARs)/Programme Annual Reports (PARs).
- Effectiveness of annual monitoring and follow up action.
- Effectiveness of Quality Management arrangements.
- Effectiveness of Student / Staff Liaison Group (SSLG).
- Student input to design and operation of programme and organisation of learning environment.
- Consideration of student surveys including NSS, i-Graduate, Graduate Outcomes and Module Evaluation surveys (MEQs).

9. STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT / FIVE YEAR VISION

- Development of vision for subject and programmes in line with University strategy.
- The outward face of the subject team, e.g. external appointments and engagement with PSRBs.
- Plans for development of the portfolio.

10. CONCLUSION

1 Summary of strengths

2 Summary of areas for further development (Action Plan)

PROMPT QUESTIONS TO ASSIST THE SUBJECT TEAM IN PREPARING THE SELF EVALUATION DOCUMENT

- What is the strategy in our subject area driving each of the themes of ILR?
- How is our subject developing in the context of the School Business Plan – is there a shared vision of the future?
- What use have we made of validation reports on our programmes over the last three - five years? Can we show all conditions and recommendations have been addressed?
- What use have we made of external examiners' reports over the last three - five years?
- What was the value of the last ILR? How have we addressed all the issues in the report?
- What have we learned from student feedback questionnaires and SSLGs over the last five years? What have we done as a result?
- How do we effectively involve our students in the quality management of our programmes? Are the students agents for change?
- How do we ensure the broad spectrum of students are engaged in feedback opportunities?
- What other mechanisms have we found to be effective in securing student involvement/feedback?
- What changes have we made to our provision in this subject as a result of the above?
- What is our understanding of enhancement?
- What deliberate steps have we taken/do we take to continually improve the effectiveness of the student learning experience? Can we give examples?
- How effective are the quality management arrangements in this?
- Do we have basic data for students in terms of age, disability, gender re-assignment, pregnancy and maternity, marital status, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation and socio-economic group (using SIMD)?
- How have we used this data on students to review practice?
- How do we systematically review student data in terms of progression and retention and multi-campus delivery?
- Have we got formal evidence of the use made of student feedback, external examiner comments, strategies for learning and teaching etc?
- What impact has the Education Enabling Plan (EEP) had on our practice/our students?
- What impact has the Assessment Policy/Handbook had on our practice/our students?
- How do we evaluate the quality of our students' experience on placement/WBL?
- How do we quality assure the placement setting/select new placements? Is the University guidance (QAA Code of Practice) followed?

- What use have we made of employer feedback?
- How are we taking forward WBL?
- How are we as a subject team engaging with:
 - the national enhancement themes and their outputs?
 - the Advance HE activities?
 - the SCQF?
 - the Subject Benchmark Statements/development of new standards?
 - other external activities such as external examining, acting as external reviewers for other HEIs, QAA activities?
 - our professional bodies/their reports?
 - the University's Single Equality scheme?
- Are we sufficiently outward looking nationally/internationally?
- How are our programmes informed by international good practice?
- How do our programmes compare with international provision?
- What is our relationship/aspirations with relevant professional bodies?
- How have we used previous PSRB reports?
- Are the intended learning outcomes of our programmes still valid? Can we show through quality management arrangements (e.g. Programme Boards) or elsewhere that these have been reviewed?
- How do they relate to external reference points including relevant subject benchmarks, SCQF level descriptors and PSRB requirements?
- Do we evaluate the maintenance of standards in relation to these reference points?
- How do we ensure the curriculum content enables students to achieve the intended learning outcomes (ILOs)?
- How are our ILOs communicated to students, staff and external examiners?
- Do our students know what we expect of them?
- Is there clear progression of challenge between each SCQF level/year of the programme?
- Does the design and content of curricula encourage achievement of ILOs?
- Is curricula content informed by recent developments in techniques in learning and teaching, by current research and scholarship and by professional requirements?
- Have changes to curricula been considered to promote inclusiveness, accessibility, and to meet our responsibilities for equality and diversity?
- Have we got a full set of module descriptors and programme specifications fully updated to present for re-approval?
- Do we have a shared vision for learning and teaching, do we discuss this at Programme Boards?
- Does our assessment strategy enable learners to demonstrate achievement of the ILOs?
- Do we use adequate formative assessment?
- Is the feedback we give to students consistent and of high quality?
- Is it provided within the normal University deadlines?

- How do we ensure standards are maintained and seek to help students achieve these at the highest levels?
- How effectively do we draw on our research to confirm our learning?
- How good are the materials we provide to support learning?
- How effective is our use of the University's VLE? Is there a consistent approach by the subject team? How do teams wish to enhance the VLE and maximise its use and effectiveness?
- What is the staff development strategy?
- Do we use part-time tutors/recognised teachers of university (RTU)? How are they supported?
- Is there effective induction of these staff?
- Is student support effective?
- How do we effectively support students with additional support requirements (e.g. disabled/international/minority students)?
- Do we provide a parity of student experience at all campuses? How do we know?
- Do we address skills development and employability appropriately as well as developing subject expertise in students? Please expand.
- Are admissions and induction arrangements for students effective?
- Are we confident using RPL arrangements?
- Are resources suitable and appropriately updated to deliver this subject?
- How is PDP embedding into our provision?
- How are UWS Graduate Attributes embedded into provision?
- What is the subject/School research strategy? Do all staff know what it is?
- What is the quality of our research students' experience?
- Do we consider our annual monitoring activities to be effective? Can this be illustrated by providing good examples?
- Are we clear on the five year plan/vision of the subject?
- What are the future plans for developing the portfolio, e.g. postgraduate, collaborative, new markets, and international?
- What makes this subject distinctive at the University of the West of Scotland?

QuEST can provide copies of previous validations and ILR reports if these are not readily available within Schools.

RETENTION OF ASSESSED WORK

This is a confirmed policy statement and currently features in the [Assessment Handbook for Staff](#) (section 6.7). The current procedures are outlined below:

All exam submissions, following each School Board of Examiners (SBOE), to be retained for two months following the final SBOE for the academic session in which the module was delivered. Thereafter, for hardcopy submissions, a sample of assessment material will be retained as outlined below. The Dean of School will be responsible for arranging the collection, storage, retrieval and subsequent secure disposal of assessment material.

For coursework assignments: if not given back to students as part of feedback on assessment it should be disposed of as above.

For quality review purposes, where external or internal assessors may wish to review assessment material from a range of modules or student performance over time, a representative sample of module assessment material should be retained. A sample of module assessment material (following the School Assessment Board) for each module in the University at all levels should be retained on a rolling basis for five years. Mark sheets should be retained along with scripts and other assessed work. Students should not be required to submit two copies of coursework etc. The sample scripts should be copied by the School following marking to capture examiners' comments. The Module Co-ordinator is responsible for identifying the sample and the Dean of School should make administrative arrangements for scanning/photocopying, storage and retrieval.

Where professional and statutory bodies require retention of examination scripts and projects/dissertations and/or other assessed work for a longer period than specified in the University policy, then this requirement should be met: the programme leader will be responsible for ensuring that this policy is met.

It is recommended that all Schools adopt a system for organising the comprehensive storage of module material⁴ for quality review purposes. An ideal 'module pack' would contain:

- Module Descriptor;
- examination paper/coursework outline;
- assessment strategy;
- marking schedule;
- evidence of moderation;
- samples of assessed work and marks/grades (for the previous session).

This policy will be reviewed from time to time in light of the changing requirements of the University and QAA methodologies.

⁴ Definition of Module Sample: For the purposes of this policy, a minimum sample constitutes five pieces of assessment or 5% - whichever is greater (for each assessment method as identified in the module descriptor) for each module. The sample should reflect the range of marks awarded and should be accompanied by a copy of the Gradebook printout.

INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW – DOCUMENTATION 2019-20

Other documentation and evidence to support the review shall be lodged within appropriate folders on a **ILR-specific drive (z:drive)** populated by the ILR team. The content of the z:drive ILR folder will later be transferred to a Microsoft OneDrive where Panel members will be provided access rights to this **Advance Information Set (AIS)** prior to the review. This material should be current, up-to-date, accurate, relevant and complete.

NB. File names should be appropriate – these should normally comprise a title and date format.

	CHECKLIST (for Admin use)
Folder Title on Z:drive / Recommended Material	Populated (Yes/No/Date Details useful)
Folder 1 – Self Evaluation Document (SED) & Supporting Material	
Self-Evaluation Document (SED) (<i>current</i>)	eg. Populated Final 12/01/17 SED Version lodged
Footnotes (<i>as referenced in SED</i>) (<i>styles variable, need clarification</i>)	If considered necessary, guidance on footnotes could be included here.
Briefing Pack	
Previous ILR Report	eg. Populated (Title of ILR Report & Date to be included as they may differ from current ILR title)
Previous ILR Follow-up Report/Action Plan	eg. Populated
Folder 2 – Module & Programme Documentation	
Module Descriptors (<i>current</i>) (<i>Plus any proposed New Modules</i>) (Core modules in briefing packs for panel)	eg. All MDs lodged/populated. Or Provides guidance note directing to PSMD Hard copy provided for panel during the review.
Programme Specifications (<i>current</i>) (All provided in briefing packs for panel)	eg. Populated Hard copy provided for panel.
Student Handbooks (<i>most up-to-date</i>):-	
➤ Programme Handbook(s)	
➤ Module Handbook(s) (where available) ➤ (Panel member may request access to Moodle to view if not been provided)	
➤ Placement Handbook(s) (where applicable)	
Folder 3– Quality Assurance	
Validation Reports (for all programmes under review)	
External Examiner Reports (3 years)	
External Examiner Responses (3 years)	
Collaborative Approval Reports & Reviews (where applicable)	[Where material is not applicable, relevant sub-folders should be removed prior to transfer onto pen stick]

Annual Monitoring Reports:-	
➤ Module Review Forms / Analysis (<i>any documentation available to demonstrate where analysis of module review forms has taken place</i>)	
➤ Programme Monitoring Reports (PMRs) (3 years) (<i>formerly PARs</i>)	
➤ Collaborative: Collaborative Annual Reports (CAR)/Programme Annual Reports (PARs) (3 years)(<i>where applicable</i>)	
➤ Professional, Statutory & Regulatory Body Reports (PSRBs) (<i>where applicable</i>)	
➤ Reports arising from School Annual Monitoring Events (3 years)	
➤ School SMART Targets (3 years)	
Folder 4 – Student Feedback / Involvement	
National Student Survey (NSS) results and analysis	
Other Surveys – record of analysis	
Student Staff Liaison Group (SSLG) minutes (3 years) (<i>may also be in Committees Folder</i>)	
Record of Focus Groups/Year Group meetings etc (where applicable)	
Folder 5 – Committees/Minutes	
Student Staff Liaison Group (SSLGs) minutes (3 years) (<i>may also be in Student Feedback/Involvement Folder</i>)	
Minutes from other School related Committees or Sub-groups: ➤ School Board; ➤ School Education Forum (<i>existed prior to 2019/20</i>); ➤ Programme Boards / Divisional Programme Boards; ➤ Other (as determined by School)	
Folder 6 – Research	
Research Student Handbook (<i>most up-to-date</i>)	
Research Student Feedback (<i>analysis may be in Student Feedback Folder</i>)	
School Research Strategy (<i>most up-to-date</i>)	
Research Student Numbers	eg. None (folder removed from z:drive)

Folder 7 – External Engagement	If activities listed are not applicable, useful to indicate this on checklist.
External Engagement activities of Subject Staff:-	
➤ Information on Conferences attendance/presenting (3 years)	
➤ Involvement in Reviews for other Universities (3 years)	
➤ External Examiner appointments – at other institutions (3 years)	
➤ QAA involvement (3 years)	
➤ PSRB Involvement (3 years) (where applicable)	Accreditation reports/visits
➤ HEA Involvement (3 years)	
➤ Employer / Industry Involvement (3 years) (eg. Industrial Advisory Boards etc)	
Folder 8 – Strategic Development	
School Academic Plans and Strategies (most up-to-date) (where available)	
Staff Development Plans (most up-to-date) (NB. This is NOT PDRs ; the SED may make reference to general strategies either in place or being considered in relation to staff development, this folder has been provided in cases where further supporting information is available)	
Folder 9 – Statistics	
Statistical Information:-	Available from Dashboard (https://dashboard.uws.ac.uk/QvAJAXZfc/opendoc.htm?document=dashboards%2Fmain%20landing%20page.qvw&host=QVS%40csvqlikviwprod)
➤ Student Numbers (including full-time/part-time/online learning/campus distribution etc)	
➤ Programme and Module Success Rates data	
➤ Honours classifications (where applicable)	
➤ Employment/Destination statistics (where available)	
➤ School Analysis of data (or reference to relevant minutes etc)	
Folder 10 – Staff Profiles	From 2018/19, CVs are no longer solely acceptable. All staff must have a populated PURE profile which exists on the UWS Research Portal.
PURE and UWS Research Portal (Refer to Appendix 10 of ILR handbook) Generic Link: https://research-portal.uws.ac.uk/en/persons/	School to provide full list of teaching and research staff with direct link to individual staff members from each Programme Team under review.

Folder 11 – Examples of Students’ work	
Examples of Student’s work (3 years available) A review of student work is not normally conducted, however, Panel members may request such information so it is recommended that Schools retain samples of student work should any requests arise.	This folder may contain samples of electronic submissions (provided permission given).
Folder 12 – Background documentation	
Background documentation relevant to the subject	This may frequently be empty. However, it may be particularly relevant where professional accreditation exists, among other scenarios.
UWS and Background Documentation	
Campus Maps	
UWS prospectuses	
SCQF information and level descriptors	
UK Quality Code for Higher Education:	
Benchmark Statements	
UWS Corporate Strategy Refresh (2017/20) ‘Dreaming/Believing/Achieving – A 21 st Century University’	
UWS Enabling Plans -: Education Enabling Plan 2018 Global Reach Enabling Plan 2018 Research & Enterprise Enabling Plan 2018	
UWS Quality Handbook: In particular -: ILR Handbook 2018/19	
University Assessment Handbook for Staff (2018/19)	
Student Success Policy Statement 2018	
Student Success Policy: <i>Included on site are the following:</i>	UWS Guidelines, Procedures & Protocols
Regulatory Framework 2019/20 Code of Discipline UWS Graduate Attributes UWS Code of Ethics Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Research & Scholarship Student Programme Handbook	
Admissions Procedure; Criminal Charges and Convictions Procedure (title tbc) Disciplinary Procedure Fitness to Practice Procedure Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Procedures and Guidelines Referencing Guidelines Extenuating Circumstances Procedure Appeals Procedure Academic Engagement and Attendance Procedure Plagiarism Procedure Students with Parental Responsibilities Procedure Personal Tutor Guidance Procedures for Supporting Students in Distress Work-Based and Placement Learning Handbook	
Responsibility for providing documentation:	Strategic Planning: Available from Dashboard
Quality Enhancement Support Team (QuEST)	School / ILR Team

University of the West of Scotland Institution-Led Review

Institution-Led Review (ILR) Confirmation Form, to be completed and endorsed by the School on submission of the Self Evaluation document (SED).

School	
ILR Title Programme / Titles for Re-approval	<i>Insert ILR Title</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>List Programmes under review</i>
School Approval of SED	<i>Insert Date of Approval</i> <i>Specify Forum of Approval (eg. School Board)</i>
<p>In development of the SED, the School must confirm the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate student engagement into SED (include evidence as appendix to SED to support this); • Appropriate Professional Support Service engagement into SED; • Programme specifications and module descriptors are current, up-to-date, accurate, relevant and complete; • Specific material lodge on z:drive for the ILR is current, up-to-date, accurate, relevant and complete. 	

Guidance for Schools

By signing below the School is satisfied that the above expectations for ILR have been met.

Dean of School: _____

Date:

ILR Lead/Other (as appropriate): _____

Date:

PROPOSED SCHEDULE/TIMELINE – LIFE & ENVIRONMENT ILR

	ACTIVITY	LIFE & ENVIRONMENT ILR (School of Health & Life Sciences)
	SHR “Kick off” Event	ADE - 16/07/18; With Team - 16/08/18
	Accreditation: IBMS accreditation due in 2018/19. Confirmed that this will be a separate event after the ILR.	
	External Panel Members – submission of proposed nominees from School	ASAP - By end September 2018 (need early to maximise first choice nominees) (need School Board approval)
	Subject under review to ensure appropriate students and staff input into the SED. (e.g. Workshops, Focus Groups, SSLGs etc.):	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Engagement – gather additional specific information as part of the evidence base for reviews. Sample questions available. • Appropriate Professional Support Service Engagement into SED (impact on student experience). 	
	Programme Board to endorse SED. SED is a School Document and must be signed off via School Board. Confirmation Form required.	
P H A S E 1	SED & Other Documentation (including programme specifications, core module descriptors & supporting documentation / Advance Information Set) Submission to QuEST by: (i.e. 10- weeks prior to Phase 2)	Monday 12th November 2018 A signed Confirmation Forum should accompany the SED.
	QuEST distribute SED and AIS to Panel by:	Friday 16 th November 2018
	Deadline given for Panel to provide Feedback: (Where possible, allowing 4 weeks including postage Feedback template included)	Wednesday 12 th December 2018
	Phase 1 Preparation meeting: (between Chair and QuEST to agree Phase 1 Agenda)	Monday 17 th December 2018 (tbc)
	Phase 1 Interim Event: (with Chair of SHR/QuEST & ADE/selected Subject Team)	Tuesday 18th December 2018 (10am-12noon / Blue Room A100 booked)
	QuEST Produce Draft Summary Report (Phase 1): (i.e. Completion of Phase 1)	Wednesday 19 th December 2018
P H A S E 2	Phase 1 Summary Report and Phase 2 Programme sent to Panel (via email by QuEST)	Thursday 20 th December 2018
	Phase 2 Main Event: (with Chair/QuEST/School/Dean/ADs/ Full Subject Team/ Students/ Staff/others)	Wednesday 23rd and Thursday 24th January 2019
	Wednesday 23rd January 2019	LANARKSHIRE CAMPUS
	Thursday 24th January 2019	PAISLEY CAMPUS
	QuEST Produce Draft Full Final Report (comprising both Phase 1 & 2) (i.e. Within 6 weeks)	Friday 8 th March 2019
Summary Outcome Reports to AQC/School (i.e. Completion of Phase 2)	School Boards – next available round AQC – by August 2019	

UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST OF SCOTLAND

NOMINATION FORM FOR APPROVAL OF EXTERNAL MEMBERS OF INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW (ILR) PANELS

Schools are asked to complete the following sections for external nominations to the Institution-Led Review panel.

Please note: If required, subject lead contacts can informally approach nominees for purposes of ascertaining interest in ILR. Where nominees are approached, it is vital that they are made aware that this does not indicate that their nomination will be accepted. Formal contact is via QuEST only – QuEST will approach nominees individually.

External panel members will normally include two academic experts and one professional/employer (see footnotes). Further guidance on criteria can be found in the ILR handbook available from QuEST.

All sections of the nomination form must be completed in full by one nominated person within the subject area and signed off by the School prior to approval by the Head of QuEST on behalf of Education Advisory Committee (EAC).

INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW: _____

DATES FOR INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW: _____

Nominee Details:-

Surname:.....

Forenames:.....

Salutation:.....
(eg Mr/Mrs/Dr etc)

Job Title/Designation:.....
(eg Head of Department/Senior Lecturer etc)

Academic and Professional Qualifications:.....

Contact details:-

Institution/Company.....

Department:.....

Full Postal Address:.....

.....

e-mail address:.....

Telephone no:.....

Preference rating - (1 - 4)

Rationale for selection including subject expertise: (please indicate what particular strengths and expertise the School believes this person can bring to this review referring to academic/professional experience and, in particular outlining the subject area(s) within the review they would cover)

Experience of review activity? e.g. Experienced Internal Reviewer, QAA Reviewer

Background: How is the nominee known to the subject area(s)? Furthermore, in what professional capacity has the subject team selected this nomination? (see footnote*)

Completed forms should be submitted to the School Operational Managers for Dean's/School Board approval and thereafter to QuEST.

Confirmation of Endorsement by School:

Approval by Head of QuEST:
(on behalf of EAC)

Footnotes

* Any current/previous connection with the University of the West of Scotland (e.g. previous external examiner, [must be more than 4 years since period completed], previous member of staff, former validation panel member). University Regulations preclude the appointment of any current University external examiners as Institution-Led Review panel members. Retired professionals/academics cannot be considered after 12 months has elapsed since their employment in the subject/HE).

** From session 2016-17 onwards, external panel members will now need to provide evidence to confirm their eligibility to work in the UK; this is a requirement for payment. Passports and/or valid Photo ID will be required to participate.

*** Panel members will only be entitled to receive their honorarium fee on appropriate participation and input during both Parts 1 and 2.

Education Advisory Committee appreciates the time taken to complete these forms. This assistance allows for an appropriate balance of panel members to be established

INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW (ILR)**– EXTERNAL PANEL NOMINATION CRITERIA 2019-20*****Selection of External Participants***

The selection of externals will be discussed at a preliminary meeting between the Deputy Deans and QuEST; and thereafter verified by the ILR team. Nominations for external panel members should be submitted to QuEST at the earliest opportunity, to ensure that availability of first choice externals is maximised. The School Board should scrutinise the nominations proposed by the ILR team and approve these before they are provided to QuEST.

All nomination forms must be completed in full and signed off by the School Board before being passed to QuEST. QuEST will need this information to confirm the balance, expertise and experience of the panel before recommending approval of the panel. The Head of QuEST will authorise invitations to be issued on behalf of Education Advisory Committee (EAC).

There should be a minimum of two academics and one professional/industrialist. The School may request additional panel members to cover the specialisms under review. The following guidance should inform the identifying of potential candidates.

- The full breadth of the subject provision under review must be covered by the externals;
- It is preferred that at least one external is from a non-Scottish Higher Education Institution. At least one panel member should be able to offer an international perspective;
- It is preferred that at least one of the externals should be an experienced QAA Reviewer or an experienced internal reviewer for another University;
- It is preferred that at least one external panel member should be in a senior academic role with an understanding of strategic development of provision in HE;
- In nominating an industrial/professional panel member regard should be given to his/her ability to comment on the currency of the curriculum, the employability of graduates from the provision under review and any relevant expertise such as association with an appropriate professional body and ability to engage fully with the areas to be addressed in ILR;
- It may be prudent not to choose someone from a close or competitor institution as future strategic plans for the subject area will be discussed in detail during the review;
- Once potential external panel members are identified; subject lead contacts can informally approach nominees for purposes of ascertaining interest in

ILR. Where nominees are approached, they should be made aware that this does not indicate that their nomination will be accepted. Formal contact is via QuEST only – QuEST will approach nominees individually;

- It is useful initially to identify more than the minimum number of externals, as not all may be available during the ILR period of review and this will allow QuEST to make subsequent invitations without delay;
- Those precluded from the nomination process include honorary professors, visiting lecturers, recognised teachers of the University, or any person deemed to be in current employment of the University. In addition external examiners, former members of staff or persons who have previously been members of Approval Panels cannot be nominated unless it has been more than four years since their previous appointment. Panel members should not be from areas where UWS currently has colleagues acting as External Examiners within the specific subject/programme area under review. Retired professionals/academics cannot normally be considered after 12 months has elapsed since their employment in the subject/HE, unless exceptional circumstances exist and continuing practice within the sector can be evidenced.
- When nominating individuals, the subject lead should identify any current/previous connection with the University of the West of Scotland.

Eligibility to Work in UK:

External panel members will need to provide evidence to confirm their eligibility to work in the UK; this is a requirement for payment. Passports and/or valid Birth Certificate together with evidence of National Insurance eligibility will be required to participate. Panel members will only be entitled to receive their **honorarium fee** on appropriate participation and input during both Parts 1 and 2.

UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST OF SCOTLAND

1. Staff Profiles

The School under review will be required to provide a full list of teaching and research staff involved with the provision. It is recognised that for some areas, there is a view that CVs offer greater breadth and depth of experience to support the programme.

Schools can determine the most suitable means of providing this information; this information may be provided via staff Curriculum Vitae's (CV's) and/or use of PURE Research Profiles.

2. PURE and UWS Research Portal

UWS uses [PURE](#) as its Current Research Information System (CRIS) and institutional research repository. UWS researchers can access PURE to populate their profile and upload their research publications and add their research activities.

Students, staff and members of the public can find out about research staff, activity and outputs on the UWS Research Portal. (<https://research-portal.uws.ac.uk/>). PURE arranges staff by School and by Research Institutes where specific staff members can be accessed at the generic link:

<https://research-portal.uws.ac.uk/en/persons/>

<https://www.uws.ac.uk/library/research-support/research-repository-portal-pure/>

Staff profiles can be extracted through the UWS Research Portal which pulls information from PURE profiles.

1. Schools to Provide for ILR: Staff Profiles

For each ILR, the School under review will be required to provide a full list of teaching and research staff involved with the provision by providing the CV and/or their research portal link alongside.

Schools will determine whether to use staff CVs or PURE profiles (via the UWS Research Portal), or a combination of both, to provide to ILR Review Panels.

Suggested format -:

	Staff Member	Designation (and role in ILR)	CV provided (tick)	UWS Research Portal Link
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				

INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW (ILR): FOLLOW-UP ACTION PLAN
ILR: INSERT TITLE OF ILR, INSERT SCHOOL (ACADEMIC YEAR: XXXX)

After the ILR the School/ILR team/Programme Board(s) will engage with the recommendations of the report and advise AQC on actions. The final report and Action Plan will be scrutinised by Academic Quality Committee (AQC) on behalf of Education Advisory Committee (EAC). EAC will receive assurances through ACQ reporting. Any institutional actions shall be escalated to EAC.

A follow-up meeting will be held, normally within a year of the ILR event, to consider progress against the Team Action Plan, a report from this meeting and an updated action plan will be submitted to AQC.

ILR Event	INSERT DATE OF PHASE 2	ILR Lead: INSERT LEAD
	Activity	Date
Conditions met (where applicable)	Confirmation that any conditions have been met, and all programme material updated accordingly. Requires approval by Chair.	
ILR Team Action Plan	Divisional Programme Board(s) agree Team Action Plan. Action plan submitted to AQC (with link to full report – QuEST site) submitted to AQC within 6 months of the finalisation of the report. (EAC will receive assurances from AQC; ongoing monitoring remitted to AQC)	Date Agreed by Divisional Programme Board: INSERT XX
ILR Outcomes & Action Plan	SSLG: To be highlighted at relevant SSLG meetings with a view to monitoring and review involving student input. (Outcomes and Follow-up)	Date of SSLG meeting(s): INSERT XX
ILR Outcomes feed into Annual Monitoring	School to ensure ILR outcomes are embedded in School EAM activities.	Date of EAM event: INSERT XX
ILR One-Year Follow Up Action Plan (AQC-led event)	Should normally take place 12-15 months after the ILR . Divisional Programme Board(s) provides update on how actions have been addressed one year later. <i>(This should comprise evidence of impact rather than simply a narrative of change)</i>	Date of One-Year Follow Up: INSERT XX

No. in Full Report	ACTION COMMITTED TO: (Using the numbering contained in the original ILR Report, please list conditions, recommendations, areas of development and observations)	How will this be achieved? Who will take responsibility for this action?	By when will this action be completed? How will the effectiveness of the action be evaluated?	ILR One-Year Follow-up meeting: Update from Team
---------------------------	---	---	--	---

	CONDITIONS			
X				
X				
	RECOMMENDATIONS			
X				
X				
	AREAS OF DEVELOPMENT			
X				
X				
	OBSERVATIONS			
X				
X				

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Signed off by School (Normally Deputy Dean or Head of Divisional Programme Board(s) and AQC:			
School of XXXX Deputy Dean:	Head of XXXXX Divisional Programme Board:	Head of XXXXX Divisional Programme Board:	AQC Chair: (for onward reporting to EAC)
Signature: Date:	Signature: Date:	Signature: Date:	Signature: Date: (or AQC minute)



GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED AT THE UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST OF SCOTLAND

AQC	Academic Quality Committee – as sub-committee of the Education Advisory Committee
EAC	Education Advisory Committee – a Standing Committee of the University’s Senate. Proactive in the strategic development and enhancement of learning, teaching, assessment and quality management
External Examiner	An academic or professional expert in the area of study who acts as a member of the Progression & Award Board or Subject Panel or both. No recommendation for the conferment of an award of the University shall be made without the consent of the External Examiner
FTE	Full Time Equivalent
ADVANCE HE	Advance HE (2018) is the Successor to HEA – to support institutions in their strategies to improve the quality of the student learning experience, providing subject and staff development, subject networks and research and evaluation on HE policy
HEI	Higher Education Institution
ITDS	Information Technology and Digital Services
ILO	Intended Learning Outcome
ILR	Institution-Led Review – the system of internal review of the academic health of the total taught and research provision in a subject delivered by the University every six years
KPIs	Key Performance Indicators
MEQ	Module Evaluation Questionnaire – students complete one towards the end of each taught module
Module Co-ordinator	Responsible for the development of a particular module and monitoring the module descriptors. Member of the SDGs
Module Moderator	Moderates the marks for the module
Multi-campus	UWS operates over five campus sites, Ayr,

Dumfries, Lanarkshire, Paisley and London therefore activities are often referred to as 'multi-campus'.

PDP	Personal Development Planning - supports students' learning by recording their learning goals and reflection on these
PDR	Performance Development Review – annual discussion with academic and support staff to discuss activity, planning and key results
PSRB	Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body
Programme Leader	Member of staff appointed by the School who directs the development of the programme.
PABs	Progression & Awards Boards – ceased from session 2019/20. PABs formerly agreed decisions about progression, awards and honours classification for each level of a programme. Replaced by SBEs.
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education for the UK
QuEST	Quality Enhancement Support Team— heads the implementation of the UWS's quality framework and directives of the EAC
REF	Research Excellence Framework
RPL	Recognition of Prior Learning
SAUWS	Students' Association, University of the West of Scotland
School	There are four Schools: School of Business & Creative Industries, School of Computing, Engineering & Physical Sciences, School of Education and Social Sciences, School of Health & Life Sciences.
SAB	School Assessment Board - confirms the mark, grade and decision for each student on each module and to which School Assessment Board external examiners are appointed
SBE	School Board of Examiner - Considers the eligibility of students on a group of programmes to progress or gain an award and to which School Board of Examiners external examiners are appointed.

SED	Self-Evaluation Document – a document which identifies the areas to be addressed by Institution-Led Review
SIMD	Scottish Index Multiple Deprivation
SSLG	Student/Staff Liaison Group – organised at Faculty or subject level to enable students to raise issues with teaching staff
Senate	The Senate is the academic authority of the University responsible for the overall planning, coordination, development and direction of the academic work of the University
T1/T2/T3	Term 1/Term 2/Term 3 – the University academic year is divided into three 15 week terms ('Term' replaced reference to 'Trimesters' in 2018/19)
UWS	University of the West of Scotland
WBL	Worked-based Learning – working with a company/provision in a planned and structured way to achieve academic credit
VLE	Virtual Learning Environment