

UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL SCHOOL REVIEW GUIDELINES

1. Introduction

The University School¹ Review Process is an opportunity to take a holistic view of a school. The review evaluates the balance of a school's activities and how they relate to one another.

These guidelines explain the University's School Review process, which has been re-evaluated in the light of the current internal and external changes the University is facing. The Review process is intended to enable the University to meet the objectives given in 2 below. In preparing documentation for the review, schools should bear in mind the need for an **analytical** account of school activities, and should note the procedures set out below. One of the aspects of the review will be evaluation of school activities against relevant University policies, including the Research Strategy (Annex A) and the Education Strategy (Annex B). Please see also the list of University policies and guidelines at Annex I. Evaluation of school activities will also include performances against the University Vision and Strategy (Annex C) and Faculty and School Plans.

2. Objectives

The School Review process has the following objectives:

- to assure the University that its schools deliver high quality teaching and research, and that they are working effectively in terms of staffing and financial matters.
- to assist the University and schools in identifying and evaluating strengths or weaknesses in:
 - learning, teaching and assessment (including partnerships/collaborations)*
 - research & entrepreneurship*
 - engagement*
 - academic staff management*
 - planning and resource management (including space)*
 - administration (including systems)*
 - clinical work/provision of clinical service (where appropriate)*
- to be part of the robust quality assurance mechanism acceptable to external audit requirements including assuring the University that all its academic programmes are current and valid.
- thereby to improve school and institutional effectiveness and efficiency in relation to academic performance
- to identify examples of good practice, areas for improvement and, where necessary, to recommend that schools are given appropriate support to make changes
- to review all academic schools in a rolling, five yearly cycle

3. Main Features

University School Review is designed to fulfil internal quality assurance requirements (as part of a broader internal scheme) and to be auditable by external regulatory bodies. It is based on the principle of using existing documentation wherever possible, including internal quality assurance reports from Faculty Quality Assurance Teams (FQATs) and Annual Programme Review and other material such as documents prepared for the RAE/REF or reports by the QAA and professional accrediting bodies.

The University's School Review process has four distinctive features:

- It is school based; though if deemed appropriate a constituent unit or department within a school may be reviewed independently;
- It is based on a process of self-evaluation carried out by the school itself;
- The use of external reviewers to ensure objectivity;
- The review evaluates the full range of school activities, allowing balanced recommendations to be made by the Panel, taking into account the relationship between the school's teaching and learning, research, engagement and any organisational and administrative activities.

¹ A School is defined as any unit or group within the University that is decreed by the University Planning and Resources Committee to be a school for this purpose.

4. Procedure

4.1 Selection of Schools

Schools will be selected by the Pro Vice-Chancellors, in consultation with Deans of faculties (normally at a meeting of UPARC) based on a rolling programme of review. They will also take account of internal considerations including outcomes of annual faculty reviews, strategic planning issues and will also use the schedule of any proposed external reviews to inform their decisions.

4.2 Arrangements for the Visit

Confirmation of the schools to be reviewed will take place approximately 18 months before the visit. The timing of visits will be arranged to accommodate school priorities wherever possible. The Education Support Unit (ESU) will contact the relevant Head of School and will provide a school briefing on the process. Throughout the preparation period the Education Support Unit will liaise closely with the school.

A meeting between the Chair, the Dean of the Faculty and the Review Co-ordinator from the ESU will take place at an early stage to plan and identify the main issues to be explored and the priorities for the review.

The ESU will ensure that external reviewers are chosen in the way outlined below and will take the lead in convening the Review Panel.

All members of the Panel will receive the relevant documents 3 weeks in advance of the visit. They will be invited to request other information to help them prepare for the visit and to comment on the programme.

The review will normally take place over a period of one and a half days. Where a school is small in size or the review is of a smaller sub unit, the visit may be shorter. Where a school is large the review is likely to be longer or the Panel may concentrate on particular areas (this will be agreed by the Chair, the Dean of the Faculty, the school and the Review Co-ordinator in advance).

4.3 Roles and Responsibilities

The UPARC has responsibility for the school review procedure. The Committee will:

- assist the Pro Vice-Chancellors in selecting schools for review, based on a rolling programme of review
- maintain an overview of the implementation of review recommendations approved.

The Education and Research Committees plus the Divisional Heads and relevant FPARC have responsibility for:

- monitoring the implementation of any relevant review recommendations approved by the UPARC.

The Education Support Unit has responsibility for:

- ensuring that appropriate arrangements are made for carrying out the review;
- producing an analysis of Quality Assurance Issues (see details in Annex F)
- producing the first draft of reports and co-ordinating any further updates.

4.4 School Review Team

Once a school has been confirmed, the school appoints its own School Team, comprising the Head of School and at least one other member of the academic staff. Neither the Head of School nor the other member(s) of the School Team are members of the Panel, but will be available for consultation.

Members of the school should be involved in the review, either by contributing to the Self Evaluation Document (S.E.D.) and/or attending meetings with the panel.

4.5 Review Panel

The Chair of each Review Panel is appointed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor. Panels will be chaired either by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, a current Pro Vice-Chancellor, a Dean of a Faculty or, exceptionally, a former Pro Vice-Chancellor. The Chair will be a full member of the Panel. Once the Chair has been appointed he or she will have responsibility for approving other members of the Panel, including the external reviewer/s. In addition to the external reviewer/s (see 4.6), Panel members will normally include:

- the Dean of the Faculty concerned
- an academic member, but not the Dean, of another Faculty (e.g. Faculty Education or Research Director)
- Faculty Managers of another Faculty, and members of Support Services, may be Panel members.
- a member of the ESU, nominated by the Director, who will prepare the QA analysis paper and will also act as Review Co-ordinator
- The Faculty Education Director(s), Research Director and Faculty Managers will be asked to contribute

as appropriate, particularly at the early and closing stages of the review.

Should the Dean's own school be under review s/he can nominate an alternative (e.g. the Faculty Education/Research Director). Alternatively, the Dean and Head of School, in consultation with the Chair of the Panel, will agree which sessions the Dean shall attend and to what extent the Dean should contribute to the report.

There will normally be one external reviewer, chosen as outlined below. In cases where a large school or group of schools is/are being reviewed or where there are reasons for a more in-depth review, more than one external reviewer may be appointed. The External/s will be expected to look holistically at school activities, and to comment on all aspects of the review.

The Chair of the Panel will normally take the lead in review meetings, however all Panel members are expected to take a full part in all aspects of the Review.

4.6 External Reviewer/s

The School will be asked to provide the names of six external academics who could act as external reviewer/s on the Panel. Selection criteria for external panel members are available at Annex D. In some subject areas, where more than one external is required, a reviewer might be industrially or professionally based rather than from another academic institution.

From this information, the Chair, in discussion with the Dean of the faculty concerned, will normally choose one external reviewer based on suitability and availability. If a special opportunity arises that makes it possible to appoint alternative external reviewers of a high calibre or with particular expertise, the Chair may approve this course of action, with the Vice-Chancellor's permission.

The choice of external reviewers will be approved by the Chair, advised by the Dean of the relevant faculty. The letter of appointment will be sent by the Chair.

The external reviewers should not include the school's current external examiner, nor have held that role during the past three years. Neither should they have been a member of academic staff in the school during the previous three years.

4.7 FQAT involvement

A representative of the relevant FQAT (nominated by the FQAT Chair but not a member of the school being reviewed) is invited to attend any review sessions relevant to the work of the FQAT. The FQAT representative may participate in the sessions but is not a member of the Panel and does not contribute to the final report. Schools undergoing review will not be subject to a FQAT visit in the same academic year.

4.8 Guidance to Panel Members

Attached as Annex E is a set of sample questions under each of the review headings, provided as guidance for Panel Members. Annex G provides guidance on the content of each section of the self-evaluation document, which may also be useful to Panel Members.

5. Documents

A checklist of documents to be used in the Review is attached (Annex F). Schools are asked to produce a self evaluation document and to keep supporting documentation to a minimum.

6. The School Self-Evaluation Document (SED)

Since the emphasis in the review process is on self-evaluation, the production of the self-evaluation document by the school is a most important part of the exercise and takes most of the time. These documents should aim to be around 12-15 pages and should in no circumstances exceed 20 pages (excluding appendices). (Maximum length to be emphasised and enforced by referring longer SEDs back to schools for refinement.)

Each SED should include 'core' information presented in a structured way. Where appropriate it should emphasise future plans including research and entrepreneurial development, student numbers, new programmes and financial projections. It must contain an analysis of strengths, weaknesses and ability to meet objectives.

The agenda for the review meetings will be informed by the analytical SED provided by the school. **The section headings and guidance on content of the SED are at Annex G.** These headings provide the broad framework for the Review. Other headings may be added, depending on the school's priorities.

6.1 Guidance on Writing the SED

Guidance on writing the SED is available from the Review Co-ordinator. An example of a SED is available on the Education Support Unit website and others can be made available to schools. Guidance on content is available at Annex G.

6.2 School Consultation and Circulation of Self-Evaluation

It is essential that during the preparation period full consultation takes place with the members of the

school. The draft school self-evaluation should be submitted to all members of academic staff for comment and fully discussed at a meeting of the school. **It is important that the opportunity is taken at the school meeting to consult support staff and students who also contribute to the academic work of the School.**

When the draft self-evaluation has been agreed by the school, a copy should be sent for comment to the Review Co-ordinator **at least four weeks before the visit**. A final version will be distributed to Panel members **approximately three weeks before the visit**.

7. The Review Programme

Before the visit takes place the Panel will have received the school self-evaluation and other documents (see Annex F).

The length of the review will be decided by the Panel Chair and Dean, in discussion with the school and Review Co-ordinator, but the norm will be one and a half days. The programme will be drawn up by the Review Co-ordinator in consultation with the Panel Chair and the school. A sample programme is attached as Annex H.

The initial meeting of the Panel will be for them to discuss specific themes and issues for consideration during the Review. On the evening of the first day the Review Panel will meet over dinner to discuss the day and to plan for the second day.

The review should include meetings with staff of the School. It is recommended that, as far as possible, groups of staff be identified for separate discussions with the Panel, e.g. teaching staff, research groups and that such meetings take place 'on site'. This does not preclude the Panel/school from arranging a meeting at which all staff of the school are present. The visit will include opportunities for the Panel to meet both undergraduate and graduate students. The review panel will be mindful of potential issues of confidentiality arising from meetings.

There may also be a tour of facilities to include library, laboratory and other relevant resources as appropriate.

The programme will include short periods in each day when the Panel has a private meeting, to allow time for discussion of issues raised by different groups.

There will be a final Panel meeting to discuss recommendations and the structure of the report. Following this, the Panel will meet the School, to provide initial feedback on their findings, but the School should bear in mind that the final report will provide the specific recommendations for action.

8. The Review Report and Follow-Up Action

The Panel will seek to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the School and to assess the extent to which its objectives are appropriate, as well as the extent to which they are being met. The Panel will wish to place the work of the school in the context of the University's activities as a whole and to make recommendations on any action that it considers needs to be taken by the school, faculty or University.

All members of the Panel must contribute a written report for inclusion in the first draft of the report; the Review report is the report of the Panel as a whole. The first draft of the review report is undertaken by the Review Co-ordinator. The draft report is then circulated in turn to the Chair, the Panel and the School before being finalised for a meeting of UPARC. This process can take up to three months, depending on the meeting at which UPARC are able to receive the report.

The report should be as concise and as analytical as possible, supported by a copy of the programme for the Panel visit, an executive summary of the self-evaluation, the statistical profile, information on the staff profile within the School and the latest Financial Information Sheet.

The report should normally comment upon:

- The process of the review procedure, the programme followed, and any proposals for change.
- The attitude to, and success of, school teaching at undergraduate and postgraduate levels and the steps being taken to recognise, encourage and improve good teaching and learning provision.
- The thrust of school research and in particular the steps being taken to maintain or improve current research ratings.
- Commendations of those aspects of the school's activities that may be recommended as examples of good practice within the University.
- Finally, commentary upon aspects of school activity and conclusions that are the basis for discussion by and recommendations under the three main headings:
 - Education
 - Research
 - Organisational and staff matters

Recommendations may be directed to:

- the School
- the Faculty
- the University

Recommendations can be from any aspect of the review and may be aspirational.

When the Panel has agreed its report, the document will be sent to the school for correction of factual errors. If, having received a final version of the report, the school wishes to submit additional comments to UPARC, it may do so.

School reviews sometimes identify management and other weaknesses that, although sensitive, need to be explored in depth when the report is considered. If such issues are identified and the Chair of the Review Panel believes that specific attention should be drawn to them, he/she may choose to ask for a separate, confidential report to be made to the Vice-Chancellor.

8.1 Follow up action

The Review report, with attachments and any additional comments, will then be considered by UPARC. The Head of School may be invited to join UPARC during this discussion. If there are major concerns arising from the review, the Review Co-ordinator will also be invited. UPARC will then report to Senate on the content and recommendations of the Review report. The Committee may decide not to endorse all recommendations made by the Review Panel. Its decisions will be conveyed to the School by the Chair of UPARC, with a copy of the relevant section of the minutes, which will outline any actions to be taken. The approved report is also sent to Education and Research Committees. These committees will decide how relevant recommendations (normally those made to the University) may be taken forward. The report will also be circulated to the relevant Divisional Heads.

Following approval of the report's recommendations by UPARC, the Dean of whose faculty the school is a member takes steps to implement the recommendations made to the school and faculty in consultation with the Head of School. This will include discussion of the report at a meeting of the Faculty Planning and Resources Committee.

The school is asked to report back on progress before the end of the following academic year. The Education Support Unit and the relevant FQAT Chair may also assist the school in working to fulfil recommendations. The Education Support Unit will co-ordinate the production of a progress report, including seeking comments from the above committees, or members thereof, and relevant Divisional Heads. The final draft of the progress report, once agreed by the school, will be considered by the Review Chair, and a final version approved. If necessary, the Dean and Head of School will be asked to undertake further work. The progress report will be published internally alongside the original report in order to show progress on recommendations. It will also be disseminated to the same committees as the original review report for information.

8.2 Annual Report

An annual report of strategic issues identified in school reviews will be drafted by the Education Support Unit and discussed by UPARC.

8.3 Publishing

Review reports, the Executive Summary of the S.E.D. and the progress report will be published internally.

9. Resources

The fee and expenses of the external reviewers will be met from the funds centrally allocated for this purpose.

List of Annexes

- Annex A - [University Research Strategy](#)
- Annex B - [University Education Strategy](#)
- Annex C - [University Vision and Strategy](#)
- Annex D - Selection Criteria for External Reviewers
- Annex E - Sample Questions
- Annex F - Checklist of Documents to be Provided
- Annex G - Suggested Section Headings for Self-Evaluation Document and Guidance on Content
- Annex H - Sample Programme
- Annex I - Other documents

Revised September 1997
Revised and approved by Education Committee, November 2001 and Senate, December 2001
Revised July 2002
Revised and approved by UPARC, June 2003
Revised and approved by Education Committee, December 2003
Revised and approved by Senate June 2005
Revised and approved by UPARC, November 2006
Revised and approved by UPARC, July 2007
Revised and approved by UPARC, November 2010

University of Bristol - School Review**SELECTION CRITERIA FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS**

Schools are requested to nominate six external academics who they would recommend to act as an external member or members of the School Review panel.

The selection of nominees for appointment as External Reviewer/s by schools should be made with reference to the following criteria:

The External Reviewer/s SHOULD:

- be familiar with the subject taught in the relevant programmes of study and have a good knowledge of a similar degree, diploma, certificate, etc,
- be sufficiently knowledgeable and expert in their individual field to have an expectation of how the subject will develop in the next few years
- be familiar with higher education so as to provide assurance that their judgement in matters of standards and future developments in the field are sound

The External Reviewer/s SHOULD NOT:

- be an external examiner in the school concerned or have carried out this role within the previous 3 years.
- have had held a post at the University of Bristol for at least 3 years
- be from a school where there is an External Examining arrangement with the host school.

It is DESIRABLE that

- nominees from outside the higher education system, eg: industry or professional bodies, be submitted where they have knowledge/experience of the appropriate area of study. This should be clearly indicated.
- external reviewers have some previous experience of external examining for taught programmes (please indicate where this is not the case,)

If more than one external is required:

- there should be enough scope within the six nominees for the Chair to choose two who can cover all aspects of the review between them
- in some subject areas one reviewer might be industrially or professionally based rather than from another academic institution
- In areas where the subject is accredited, an external from the accrediting body may be appropriate.

Rationale for choice

When making selections of the six nominated reviewers please include a short paragraph justifying your choice of each external, based on these criteria.

Selection of External Reviewers

The relevant Pro Vice-Chancellor, in discussion with the Dean of the faculty concerned, will choose one or two external reviewer/s based upon the nature of the review and their suitability and availability. If a special opportunity arises that makes it possible to appoint alternative external reviewers of a high calibre or with particular expertise, the Pro Vice-Chancellor may approve this course of action, with the Vice-Chancellor's permission.

University of Bristol - School Review

SAMPLE QUESTIONS

The following questions are not intended to be prescriptive but to act as a starting point for exploring each area. Please cross-refer to Annex G for additional information.

Research, entrepreneurship and engagement

- Is the School's research strategy realistic and achievable? If implemented, will it enable the School to attain a level in research that matches its own, the Faculty's and the University's goals?
- How does School research performance measure up to international benchmarks?
- How does the School strategy fit into the University Research Strategy?
- What are the School's research strengths?
- What factors are likely to prevent the School from attaining its research goals?
- What changes could be made to make achievement of the goals more likely?
- Are the research profiles of individual staff sufficiently strong?
- Are there areas of the School's research that could be successfully exploited through entrepreneurial activity without compromising the integrity of the research?
- Do staff engage with the public appropriately for their area of research?
- Does the School support public engagement activity, through effective planning and prioritisation and by encouraging training?
- Does the School take a strategic view of public engagement, and if so is it in line with the University's Engagement Strategy?

Planning and resource management (including space)

- What is the mechanism by which the School Plan is reviewed and updated? Is it made available to staff in an accessible format and are staff encouraged to contribute to the plan?
- How does the School try to maximise its income?
- What policies does the School have to enhance its income over the next three years?
- How does the School prioritise the non-salary spend allocated in its budget?
- Do the organisational structures of the School and the Faculty facilitate efficient and effective use of resources?
- Does the School have sufficient resources overall to meet the goals expressed in its Plan, and in its research and learning and teaching strategies?
- Are resources for IT, Library, and all learning and teaching activities adequate and appropriate?
- Is the distribution of space between teaching, research, administrative, technical and social activities adequate?
- How effectively are areas of risk assessed, managed and maintained?
- What is the mechanism by which the effectiveness of the operation of the management structure and processes in relation to both staff and resources are evaluated by the School?

Learning, teaching and assessment

- What types of programme does the School offer? Are there collaborations with other schools within the University? Are there external collaborations?
- If there are external collaborations what are these and when were they last reviewed?
- Does the School have a Learning and Teaching strategy? If so, is it realistic and achievable?
- Does the School's strategy complement the University's strategy?
- How have the teaching, learning and assessment methods developed in the last five years?
- How has the School addressed any recommendations made by external examiners and accrediting organisations (if relevant)?
- Are teaching and learning methods designed to achieve the objectives and enable students to attain learning outcomes? Are the unit outcomes coherent with those of the programme?
- Are these tested appropriately by assessment methods?
- How have increased student numbers affected teaching and learning practices?
- Is there adequate provision of student induction, both undergraduate and postgraduate?
- How does the personal tutor system work? Is it effective and in line with University guidelines?
- What are the School's mechanisms for obtaining student feedback? Is it acted upon and are students made aware of the action taken?
- Does student feedback indicate satisfaction with the learning experience?
- How are the National Student Survey (NSS) results discussed and responded to, including similar survey information e.g. PRES?

- Do the statistics show high retention, progression and completion rates?
- Is the staff/student ratio above or below average? What are the implications?
- What extra support is there for non-traditional entrants?
- How are employers' views taken into account in curriculum planning and development?
- What do graduates' first destinations show?

Questions for students

- Why did you choose programme/Bristol?
- What was the induction process like?
- What has been the match between the curriculum and your expectations (for example, flexibility, choice, content)?
- Is the curriculum appropriate?
- What do you believe to be the strengths of the programme?
- What are your career aspirations? Is the programme relevant to these?
- What is your timetable and workload like?
- Are there opportunities for practical and vocational experience (where appropriate)?
- What types of teaching and learning methods have you experienced?
- What programme materials do you receive (e.g. do you use Blackboard)?
- What do you think of the IT provision (opening hours, practical access, user support, availability of terminals)?
- What are your views on the quality of teaching?
- What sorts of guidance and support do you receive (e.g. personal tutorial system) and is it appropriate?
- If relevant, what support is there during study abroad/in industry?
- Do you understand the assessment methods and criteria?
- Do you get feedback on your work?
- What do you think about central support services?
- What is the library like? (opening hours, practical access, user support, availability of stock)
- What is the space in the School like (teaching accommodation, laboratory or studio provision, space for study or other independent learning, common rooms, refectory, social areas)?
- How are your views sought and do you feel that your views are influential?
- Are you represented on programme/school committees?
- Did you contribute to the self-evaluation document?

Staff management

- Is the School management and committee structure explicit, are the lines of responsibility and roles of management clear and understood by all staff?
- Are induction procedures for new staff - academic and support – appropriate and working effectively?
- Do newly appointed academic staff receive training in learning, teaching and assessment in line with University guidelines – ie are they attending the Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (TLHE) Programme for new staff?
- Do postgraduates/research staff who teach also attend the relevant TLHE programmes sessions?
- Are the opportunities for continuing professional and personal development appropriate and are staff supported and encouraged to benefit from them? Does everyone understand how the development of individuals contributes to the School's overall plan?
- Do support staff receive appropriate information and training for the job?
- What are the promotion/regrading procedures, do staff understand them and do staff think that they are generally fair?
- Does the Staff Review & Development scheme take place annually for all staff and is it working?
- What are academic staff loads in terms of teaching, research and administration? How are the work loads for support staff set, agreed and monitored? Are practices consistent with the University's Workload Agreement?
- How effective are the mechanisms for communicating University, Faculty and School policies and information to all staff?

Systems administration

- Does the School have in place systems (electronic and other) that enable effective administration of school activities, e.g. management of research grants, easy/shared access to teaching materials, student records, etc.?
- How is the School enabled to use University central records systems, e.g. Finance (CODA), Personnel (PIMS), student records (Dolphin)?
- Are central records supplemented by School systems? What benefits/disadvantages does this have?

Health and safety

- Is there effective management of Health and Safety?
- Are there any particular health and safety issues for the School, especially any that are not currently addressed by University procedures?
- Have there been any recent incidents that highlight good or bad practice?
- How are staff and students trained in health and safety in the lab, teaching and office environments

Clinical work and external links

- What contribution is made by clinical staff to school research?
- How does the external organisation (e.g. NHS) in general to research and development in clinical areas?
- What are the implications of the clinical and external links for the day to day work of the School?
- How are resources managed between the University and the external organisation?
- What is the nature and extent of the clinical work undertaken by School staff?
- Are there any geographical constraints that affect the collaborative nature of the work carried out by the School and the external organisation?

University of Bristol - School Review

CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE PROVIDED

	To be sent to the Review Panel members 3 weeks in advance of the visit:	Provided by
1	School Self Evaluation	School
2	A list of school staff and their roles and responsibilities (within the SED)	School
3	Relevant material that the school thinks would be useful to the Review Panel, for example, school plan, research strategy and/or learning and teaching strategy	School
4	Information from the most recent RAE (or equivalent)	ESU
5	Summary of the school's financial position, this should normally include financial information sheets from the University Finance Office (or equivalent)	ESU
6	Summary of Quality Assurance Issues (see below)	ESU
7	Statistical information (see note 3 below)	ESU
8	Report, and follow-up report from previous school review	ESU
9	A brief report, about the school in the Faculty context, from the Dean of Faculty incorporating comments from the following: Faculty Education Director; Faculty Research Director; Faculty Accountant; Faculty Head of Academic Administration. This could be in the form of a SWOT analysis and may be given verbally at the first meeting of the review panel.	Dean

The School Self-Evaluation should comment specifically on action taken in response to external comments and advice, provided in any of the documents above.

	Documents to be considered in compiling the summary of quality assurance issues
1	External Examiners' reports for all programmes for the last three academic years and the school's response/s
2	Annual Programme Review reports (taught and research) for the last three academic years
3	The most recent Faculty Quality Assurance Team report on the School and any school response and also the FQAT Overview Report for the last academic year
4	Programme specifications for all taught programmes. (These will be drawn from the central database https://www.bris.ac.uk/esu/unitprogcat/Welcome.jsa and the Review Co-ordinator should ask the School to confirm that these are up to date.)
5	Information about any educational partnerships
6	Most recent National Student Survey, Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey and Postgraduate Research Experience Survey results
7	Results of survey of representative sample of current students (if appropriate)
8	Minutes from the most recent meetings of the Staff-Student Liaison Committee

Please note:

- Panel members may ask for other documentation but should request this through the Co-ordinator before the start of the review.
- The ESU Co-ordinator will liaise with the Finance Office and RED for copies of financial information and RAE documents.
- Statistical Information - Statistical information to support the SED will be provided approximately 6-8 weeks before the start of the review. This is drawn from the University's student record system (SITS). It will include the following:
 - School statistical profile: overview of the school review data.
 - Undergraduate and Postgraduate **Total Student Numbers**.
 - Undergraduate **Admissions** Data including ratio of offers to applications, ratio of offers to intake and information on gender, age, ethnicity, school type and locality.

- Undergraduate **Intake** Data including total intake numbers and information on gender, age, ethnicity, entry qualifications, fee status, disability, school type and locality.
- Undergraduate **Progression** Data by year of study.
- Undergraduate **Exit** Data including degree classifications.
- Undergraduate **First Destination** Data.
- Taught Postgraduate **Intake, Progression and Exit** Data.
- Postgraduate Research **Intake, Progression and Exit** Data.

The Review Co-ordinators will liaise with schools to ensure that this information is accurate.

University of Bristol - School Review

SUGGESTED SECTION HEADINGS FOR SELF-EVALUATION DOCUMENT AND GUIDANCE ON CONTENT

Executive Summary

This section should provide a brief summary of the self-evaluation. The summary should not exceed two sides of A4 in length and will be appended to the Review report when it is discussed by UPARC and will be published alongside parts of the review report (see Guidelines section 8).

Research, Entrepreneurship and Engagement

- Research strategy of the school in relation to staff expertise available (now and in the future), taking account of national and international benchmarks and trends (probably best to append the most recent RA5/6 and refer to it)
- Evaluation of the school's research strategy in terms of measurable and achievable goals (research contracts, overhead recovery, etc) (RA0 RA4)
- Details of staff publications (RA2)
- Feedback from the most recent round of the Research Assessment Exercise
- The extent to which the school's teaching and learning activities are informed by research (reference to RA1 would be helpful)
- Entrepreneurial activities in which the school and its students are engaged
- Public engagement activities in which staff and students are involved

Planning and Resource Management (including space)

This part of the review will cover developments indicated in the School and Faculty Plans and, in this context, the School's financial profile, exploring the current situation and any business plan being developed.

This section should:

- Give a summary of the School's financial position, this should include reference to the financial information sheets from the University Finance Office which will be included as an annex to the SED.
- Detail all sources of income and, where relevant, suggest which income stream(s) are likely to increase or diminish; why this might happen and what action the School is taking to maximise its income.
- Detail the main headings of expenditure and explain how they are prioritised, particularly in relation to staffing distinguishing between core funded and externally funded staff.
- Outline the various aspects of School activity and plans for the next 5-10 years (as indicated in the School and Faculty Plans), evaluate the extent to which the School is achieving and updating its objectives, and indicate the mechanisms by which staff are involved in the planning and resource management process.
- Evaluate the extent to which resources and space are available to enable the School to meet its academic aims and objectives (such as library and computing provision, quality of research and teaching space, and the quality of office and social space).
- Evaluate the procedures by which risk is assessed, managed and monitored
- Highlight any faculty-wide issues which affect the work of the School.

Teaching, Learning and Assessment

This section of the self-evaluation should be written under the headings provided by QAA for discipline trail self-evaluations. Specific details can be found on the QAA website:

<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews/institutionalAudit/handbook/annexes.asp#c> (see below) Please consult the ESU Review Co-ordinator for further guidance on this aspect.

- This part of the review will evaluate school teaching and learning practice in the light of University policy, including the Education Strategy, and other key documents such as the University Regulations and Code of Practice for the Assessment and Progression of Students on Taught Programmes, the Regulations and Code of Practice for Research Degree Programmes, the Regulations and Code of Practice for Taught Postgraduate Programmes; the Handbook for External Examiners of Taught Programmes and the Regulations and Code of Practice for Educational Partnerships.
- Information on all taught programmes should be included in this section including joint awards and programmes offered through educational partnerships.
- The School's arrangements for peer observation/peer review of teaching should be commented on in the self-evaluation.

- The School's methods for providing feedback to students, both on individual pieces of assessed work and in general should be explored.
- The School should indicate how it has used/responded to the National Student Survey (NSS) data, or similar survey information e.g. Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES), etc.
- The statistics should be used wherever possible to support statements made in this section. Trends and anomalies in the statistics should also be covered.
- Where possible comparisons of statistics (e.g. on intake and completion) should be made with similar Schools in other Universities.

Staff Management

At a general level this section should evaluate the extent to which there is an integrated approach to staff and resource planning and management in the light of University, Faculty and School objectives. This section should address:

The extent to which School management structures and the roles of individuals within that structure are clearly defined and understood by all staff (academic, administrative, technical and manual).

- The extent to which staff induction management, development and training enables all staff to fulfil the School's expectations of them and to achieve personal goals.
- How the School ensures new staff or postgraduates/research staff who teach attend the Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (TLHE) Programme and are provided with school mentors.
- The nature and effectiveness of the support and encouragement system for all staff in meeting both individual continuing professional development needs and overall School objectives
- Mechanisms for communicating University, Faculty and School policies and information to all staff
- The operation of the annual Staff Review and Development process and its outcomes.
- The operation of the annual promotions procedures and their outcomes for academic staff (and the parallel regrading exercise for support staff).
- The School's staff profile and how this affects the ability to achieve School goals and plans.
- The mechanisms by which effectiveness of the management structure and processes are evaluated.
- How the School is implementing the University's Workload Agreement and how generally workloads of staff are managed.

Systems Administration

- This will cover the administrative and computing systems in the School and the extent to which the School systems are able to interact with University systems.
- The adequacy of record keeping and archiving of information.
- It will also provide an opportunity for Panel members to make recommendations on issues such as archiving of materials in preparation for external scrutiny, indexing, updating of information, etc.

Clinical Work and External Links

This section should address:

- The extent and nature of the clinical work undertaken by staff in the School
- The balance (if appropriate) between their clinical work and other duties (e.g. teaching)
- The contribution to clinical research made by staff
- The contribution of the external organisation to research and development
- The implications of clinical and external links for the day to day working of the School
- Recommendations made by special reviews or commissions about the relationships between academic and external organisation (e.g. the Follett Review)
- The constraints of professional programme including requirement for accreditation by GMC/GDC/RCVS

Conclusions

This section should be written as a SWOT analysis.

This is an important part of the self-evaluation. It should identify strengths, and how the School plans to build upon these. It should also highlight areas to be targeted for improvement and include plans for action in these areas. Such developments may result from feedback obtained by the School, or from internal initiatives in response to perceived needs. Evidence of continuous self-assessment and striving for improvement in a range of School activities will be helpful and should be cross-referenced here. New staffing arrangements or changes in student numbers or ftes should also be referred to.

The self-evaluation should be analytical rather than descriptive and this section should summarise the results of the analysis.

Existing Documents

The self-evaluation will refer to documents, such as the School plan, RAE submission, existing subject review or accreditation report, etc. To avoid duplication, it is usually helpful to cross-refer to such documents rather than reproducing sections of them in the self-evaluation. The documents can then be made available to the Review panel at the appropriate time.

Appendices

The documents referred to in Annex F will be sent to the Panel with the SED as appendices. The School can ask for other documents to be appended as appropriate.

A list of School staff and their roles and responsibilities should be appended to or included in the self-evaluation. This should include brief details of research specialisms, teaching responsibilities and any Faculty or University roles

QAA Institutional Audit - Handbook for institutional audit: England

Annex C: Guidelines for producing self-evaluation documents for discipline audit trails

1 After the audit team has confirmed the discipline audit trails to be pursued during the audit visit, the institution is asked to provide self-evaluative documentation for the area of each discipline audit trail (the discipline SED). The discipline SED should normally take the form of a recent (within the previous two years) internal review report (or similar) covering the area of the discipline audit trail, accompanied by programme specification(s) for the programme or cluster of programmes covered by the trail.

2 Where a recent internal review report is not available, the institution may prepare a discipline SED specifically for the purposes of the audit trail. A discipline SED prepared in this way should be around 3,000 words in length and cover the following:

- **educational aims of the provision** - a statement of the overall aims of the programme or cluster of programmes covered by the discipline audit trail;
- **learning outcomes** - evaluation of the appropriateness, to the educational aims, of the intended learning outcomes of the programme or each of the cluster of programmes, making reference to internal and external reference points such as *Subject benchmark statements* and the *FHEQ*;
- **curricula and assessment** - evaluation of the ways in which programme content and methods of assessment support achievement of the intended learning outcomes of the programme(s); how curricula and assessment together determine the academic level of the award(s) to which the programme(s) lead; the extent to which students achieve the programme aims and intended learning outcomes;
- **quality of learning opportunities**, which can be further divided into:
 - teaching and learning - evaluation of the effectiveness of the teaching and learning strategies employed by the programme(s) for providing students with good learning opportunities to support achievement of the intended learning outcomes and academic standards;
 - student admission and progression - evaluation of the ways in which students' progression through the programme(s) is supported and monitored, from intake to completion;
 - learning resources - evaluation of effectiveness of the deployment of the resources, human and material, that support the learning of students, and of the effectiveness of their linkage to the intended learning outcomes of the programme(s).
- **maintenance and enhancement of standards and quality** - evaluation of the effectiveness of procedures for maintaining and enhancing the quality of provision and the security of academic standards in respect of the programme(s);
- **annex** - programme specifications for each programme covered by the trail.

3 The emphasis in a discipline SED should be on evaluation of student achievement of the appropriate academic standards, and of the learning opportunities offered to students to support their achievements. Description of the programme(s) should be the minimum necessary to enable the audit team to understand the background of the self-evaluation.

4 Discipline SEDs should:

- be balanced and relevant;
- be concise and accessible to the audit team;
- be appropriately balanced between analysis and description.

University of Bristol – School Review

SAMPLE PROGRAMME**Review Panel:**

Pro Vice-Chancellor (Chair)

Dean of the Faculty

External Reviewer/s

Internal Reviewer from another faculty eg: Faculty Education / Research

Director (as appropriate)

Member of Support Services (as appropriate)

Review Co-ordinator, Education Support Unit

School Team

Head of School

At least 1 other member of academic staff

Thursday 16th October

13.00 – 14.30 Private meeting of the Review Panel to plan the review

14.30 – 15.00 Tour of facilities

15.15 – 16.00 Meeting with the Head of School

16.00 - 17.00 Meeting with the School Senior Management Team (to discuss: strategies, finance, organisation, staff development, planning and resource management)

17.00 - 18.00 Private meeting of the Review Panel

19.00 Dinner (Review Panel only)

Friday 17th October

08.30 - 09.30 Private meeting of the Review Panel

09.30 - 12.00 Meeting to discuss education and the student experience for taught programmes with Head of Education (or equivalent), Programme Directors and relevant academic-related support staff (possibly separate into two meetings: undergraduate / taught postgraduate provision):
Include (but not limited to) discussion/analyses of:

- The subject area in a national context
- The School's education strategy in relation to that of the Faculty and University
- Quality assurance policy and procedures, including partnerships
- Support for education in relation to both staff and students
- Performance indicators, such as: student progression / completion data, survey (NSS, PTES) results, student feedback on teaching, external examiners reports and reports from any accrediting bodies

To include a meeting with taught postgraduate and undergraduate students

12.00 - 13.00 Lunch and Private meeting of the Review Panel

13.00 - 15.30 Meeting to discuss research, entrepreneurship and engagement with Head of Research (or equivalent), Heads of Research Themes and relevant academic-related support staff
Include (but not limited to) discussion/analyses of:

- The School's research structure and strategy in relation to that of the Faculty and University
- Research strengths and future ambitions /plans
- Preparation for the REF
- Public engagement
- Support for research staff, and postgraduate research programmes / students
- Coffee meeting with research postgraduate students

15.30 - 16.30 Private meeting of Review Panel to clarify recommendations and points of commendation for inclusion in the review report and for immediate feedback to the School (can include briefing with Head of School)

16.30 - 17.00 Review Panel feedback to the School (all staff may attend)

Please note:

The programme will be drawn up by the Review Co-ordinator in consultation with the Chair, the Dean of the Faculty and the School. This is an example programme; and will vary in accordance to each School review and dependent upon structure and composition.

University of Bristol – School Review**USEFUL DOCUMENTS**

The following are University policies and guidelines which members of the Review Panel, especially the external member(s), and the school may find helpful.

Regulations

- [General Regulations for First Degree Programmes in Modular Form](#)
- [Regulations and Code of Practice for Taught Postgraduate Programmes](#)
- [Regulations and Code of Practice for Research Postgraduate Programmes](#)
- [Regulations and Code of Practice for the Assessment and Progression of Students on Taught Programmes](#)
- [Regulations and Code of Practice for Educational Partnerships](#)
- [Regulations for Personal Tutoring](#)
- [Rules and Regulations for Students](#)
- [Examination Regulations](#)
- [University Credit Framework](#)

Guidance

- Admissions Principles and Procedures [Undergraduate Home/EU](#), [Undergraduate overseas](#) and [Postgraduate Taught Programmes](#)
- [Guidelines on the accreditation of Prior Learning for Taught Programmes](#)
- [Guidelines for Direct Feedback from Students](#)
- [Guidelines for Annual Programme Review – Taught and Research Programmes](#)
- [Guidelines for Peer Observation](#)
- [Guidelines for Personal Tutoring](#)
- [Guidance on formulating Programme Aims and Learning Outcomes and Unit Aims and Learning Outcomes](#)
- [Guidelines for Programme Directors](#)
- [Responsibilities of Unit Directors](#)
- [Guidance on Programme Specifications](#)
- [Guidance for Student Handbooks for Taught Programmes](#)
- [Guidelines on Student Placements in Taught Programmes](#)
- [University Policy on the Timetabling of Teaching](#)

Strategy documents

- [Education Strategy](#)
- [E-Learning Strategy](#)

Engagement

- [The University's Engagement Strategy](#)
- [Public Engagement Stories](#)
- [Centre for Public Engagement](#)