

GUIDELINES FOR INTERNAL SUBJECT/PROGRAMME REVIEW: ANNEX 7

SUMMARY REPORT STRUCTURE FOR INTERNAL REVIEWS

(maximum word limits given in parentheses where relevant)

1. **Subject and/or Award and Programme Title(s) Covered by the Review**- including reference to any external awarding body responsible for any of the programmes and a note of any special features e.g whether a distance learning programme and/or collaborative partnership, naming any partner organisation(s) encompassed by the review.

2. **Date of Review** – date of (final) meeting of the review panel.

3. **Objectives of Review** (100)

Use a standard form of words here e.g "The objectives of the review were to scrutinise and to form judgements about the academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities associated with the programme(s) listed above".

4. **Conduct of the Review** (100)

A brief statement of how the review was conducted, who was involved and what review methods they used. Use words like "The review was conducted by a Panel of x internal and y external peers. The Panel scrutinised documentation related to learning outcomes, curricula, assessment, enhancement, teaching and learning, student progression and learning resources. The Panel also held and/or observed meetings involving staff, current and past students and employers and viewed relevant learning resources, student support facilities and supporting information".

5. **Evidence Base** (100)

A brief statement of the evidence which was drawn on. Use words like "The panel scrutinised a self evaluation document, curriculum documents, programme handbooks, internal and external reports, minutes, data and other written evidence relevant to academic quality and standards, including external examiners' reports, feedback from current and previous students, students' assessed work, assessment and grading criteria, outcomes and feedback to students".

6. **External Peer Contributors** (100)

Words should be used to the effect that "External peers were full members of the review panel, looking particularly at the learning outcomes, curriculum, assessment tasks, student work and achievement, feedback to students in their assessed work, learning resources. External peers were nominated by the School and, based upon provision of a completed nomination form and a curriculum vitae, were approved by the Deputy Vice Chancellor.

7. **Overview of Main Characteristics of the Programmes Covered by the Review (100)**

A brief statement of the Panel's overview of the subject/programme(s) in relation to content, approach and notable strengths. Short answers to the questions Are intended learning outcomes being achieved by students? Are quality and standards being achieved? Are the programme specifications being delivered?

8. **Conclusions on Innovation and Good Practice (500)**

A section identifying current aspects of the programme(s) which are particularly innovative or which represent good practice.

9. **Conclusions on Quality and Standards (500)**

Section 9 should be written as a concise narrative which explicitly answers the following questions, with any qualification and/or commendations, as appropriate.

9.1 Learning Outcomes

- (i) Whether learning outcomes are clearly stated, reflect relevant benchmark statements (and/or other external reference points) and the aims of the provision, and are communicated adequately to students.
- (ii) Whether there are adequate procedures for ensuring that the programmes are designed to enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

9.2 Curricula

- (i) Whether the intended learning outcomes are adequately supported by the curricula.
- (ii) Whether the curricula are current.

9.3 Assessment

- (i) Whether assessment processes can adequately measure achievement of the intended programme outcomes.
- (ii) Whether appropriate standards are being achieved.

9.4 Teaching and Learning

- (i) To what extent learning and teaching contributes to the achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

9.5 Student Progression

- (i) How effective are the recruitment arrangements, the strategy for student support and the progression of students.

9.6 Learning Resources

- (i) Whether there are appropriately qualified staff, who are contributing effectively to student achievement of intended learning outcomes.
- (ii) How effectively learning resources are deployed in support of students' achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

9.7 Enhancement

- (i) Whether the School demonstrates the capacity to adequately review and calibrate its academic standards and standards and to promote enhancement.

It should be noted that the headings 9.1 – 9.7 and the questions raised parallel those throughout the University's current guidelines for internal subject/programme review. They are intended to provide a framework for self-evaluation, for panel scrutiny, for meeting agendas and for review reports.

10. **Conclusions on Currency and Validity (250)**

Do the programmes remain current and valid in the light of developing knowledge in the discipline, practice in its application and developments in teaching and learning?

11. **Decision and any Conditions and/or Recommendations for Action to rectify any identified shortcomings and for further enhancement of quality and standards (250)**

The Panel may decide to recommend to Senate that it:

- approve all or part of the provision until the next internal subject review, or for a defined period;
- refer all or part of the provision back to the Subject Team for further factual information;
- not approve all or part of the provision.

Conditions are defined as either 'academic' – these **must** normally be addressed satisfactorily before the provision can be granted unconditional approval, or as 'documentary' – these would not normally preclude approval and the deadline set for them would usually reflect this position. There are also specific administrative requirements to be met subsequent to the review.

Recommendations are matters which the Panel would like to see implemented to enhance the provision but which it would not insist upon. A response to the recommendations should be provided, as well as to the conditions.

In making a recommendation to Senate the Panel may additionally identify other issues for attention which it judges would contribute to the enhancement of the provision.

The recommendation will normally be arrived at by consensus amongst the Panel. Where a Panel is undecided the Chair will have a casting vote, if required, but will take due account of the views of external members before coming to a decision.

Sections 7 –11 could sensibly form the basis for the Panel's oral feedback to the School at the concluding meeting.