

## University Quality Team: review process

**Process owner:** Michael White, Deputy Director of Education Quality and Policy, Academic Quality and Policy Office: Education and Student Experience

**Primary actors/roles:** The University Quality Team (consisting of the Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor (Quality and Standards), University Education Directors (Quality), professional quality reviewers from AQPO and student quality reviewers); Programme Directors, School Education Directors, School PGR Directors, Faculty Education Directors, Faculty PGR Directors.

**Description:** This document sets out: how the University Quality Team (UQT) and its constituent panels are appointed and arranged; the scope and scheduling of the reviews; induction and training for UQT members, responsibilities in the administration and organisation of the process; the methodology for review; and the consideration and ongoing monitoring of the outcomes of the reviews.

**Start point:** On the appointment of the Team each year.

**End point:** Once all the review reports have been received by UAQSC and relevant Faculty Boards.

**Process inputs:** School Education Action Plans, quality documentation, including any professional accreditation reports; student data and metrics; student survey results and SSLC minutes.

**Process outputs/outcome:** The reports of the UQT.

**Published:** 10<sup>th</sup> September 2021

**Applies to:** the 2021/22 academic year

**Version:** 3.0

### Related documents

- [University Quality Team policy \(PDF, 200kB\)](#)
- [Student Quality Reviewer agreement \(PDF, 155kB\)](#)
- [Education Action Planning](#)
- [Periodic Programme Revalidation Policy \(PDF, 204kB\)](#)

### Process

Process diagrams are provided at: [www.bristol.ac.uk/academic-quality/facultyadvice/uqt/](http://www.bristol.ac.uk/academic-quality/facultyadvice/uqt/) .

## Planning and Preparation

### Membership of the Team

1. The Team is appointed and confirmed on an annual basis, as follows:

- University Education Directors (Quality) are appointed by the Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education Quality and Standards) for a fixed term of three years, with the potential for re-appointment;
- Student quality reviewers are recruited and appointed by the Bristol SU and the University and remunerated centrally; the fees and the responsibilities of student quality reviewers are set out in the student quality reviewer agreement;
- Professional quality reviewers are designated from senior staff in the Academic Quality and Policy Office by the Director of Education Policy and Quality.

### Induction

2. The UQT meets at the beginning of each annual process for training workshops and updates, in collaboration with Bristol SU. A specific induction for new members is arranged. Bristol SU and AQPO are jointly responsible for recruiting, training and supporting SQRs.

### Grouping programmes for review

3. Reviews are grouped by cognate programmes and subject to annual review. AQPO will determine the groupings on the basis of:

- Subject discipline, and, where relevant, the University's school structure
- Programme type (single; joint; inter-disciplinary)
- Level of study (UG; PGT; PGR)
- Student numbers

4. Joint honours and multi-disciplinary programmes are associated with the 'owning' school's provision. Inter-disciplinary programmes that are not owned by a school will be associated to the review of the school or department of the Programme Director.

5. PGR provision is reviewed on a faculty basis. Doctoral Training Entities, where Bristol is the lead party, are associated with the faculty in which they are based. The taught component of a PGR programme will be attributed to either the PGR or relevant taught UQT review, as advised by the Faculty PGR Director.

### Scheduling of reviews and review panels

6. The Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education Quality and Standards) is responsible for determining the areas of taught provision that require a UQT review in each cycle based on relevant metrics and previous quality reviews, in consultation with members of the Quality Team and Deans and Faculty Education Directors.

7. AQPO arrange the schedule for review, establish panels derived from the membership of the UQT and allocate them to review designated groups of programmes, in liaison with the members and relevant post-holders from the programmes / schools under review.

8. Review activities commence from October each year. The deadline for review activities to be concluded is the end of week 24 (start of May).

9. Reviews are spread across the year and scheduled at the point when relevant evidence sources from the previous academic year is available. Review activities should normally occur and conclude within a two-week period.

10. AQPO shares the schedule of review with UQT members, programme, school and faculty representatives at the relevant points in the year, as below, including communicating the date by which relevant EAPs need to be updated.

- September for reviews in October - November
- October for reviews in November - December
- December for reviews in January - February
- January for reviews in March - May

11. There are three members in each panel: a University Education Director (Quality) or the Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor (Quality and Standards), a Student Quality Reviewer and a professional services quality reviewer from AQPO.

12. The role-holders who are expected to attend and the recommended number of attendees for the meeting between the panel and the area of review is set out here: [UQT attendees guidance.docx](#) [UoB only].

Administration and logistics

13. AQPO is responsible for the administration of the UQT process, including:

- Compiling the information and documentation for each UQT review, apart from SSLC minutes and professional accreditation reports that are provided by the relevant Student/Graduate Administration Manager;
- Setting up meetings of the Panel and meetings between the Panel and members of staff;
- Payment of SQRs and keeping a record of hours worked by students with a Student visa.

14. Bristol SU and the relevant Student/Graduate Administration Manager is responsible for assisting the Student Quality Reviewer in setting up a meeting with relevant student reps (including room booking and arranging catering), as appropriate.

15. The School Education Director or PGR Director updates the relevant Education Action Plan ahead of the UQT review, by the deadline.

16. The collated responsibilities of the school and faculty officers in organising and contributing to the process is set out in Annex A.

## Review process

17. The panel meets to plan the review.

18. The panel performs a desk-based review of the quality and standards across the designated group of programmes in which relevant EAP/s are reviewed against evidence from the previous academic cycle, as follows:

a. The AQPO Quality Reviewer reviews Quality Framework documentation, including:

- notes from the annual review of programmes meeting, if available;
- a summary of significant changes to the programme/s or new programmes over the last year;
- external examiner reports and responses;
- accreditation reports;
- Periodic Programme Revalidation reports;
- previous UQT report;

- any 'teaching out' or 'new programme' report mandated by UEC.
- b. The University Education Director (Quality) reviews student data and metrics, including:
- student population and intake data
  - statistical trend data on student progression and degree classification;
  - retention and attainment (including resubmissions in PGR programmes), as provided in the student data dashboard.
- c. The Student Quality Reviewer considers student feedback including:
- student survey results;
  - Student-Staff Liaison Committee minutes.
19. 'Live' insight is then gathered:
- a. For taught provision, the University Education Director (Quality) meets the Faculty Education Director (FED) and Faculty Education Manager (FEM) to gain local insight on any concerns, or areas of innovation or education excellence, as well as future plans that will be / are likely to be captured in the IPP and their fit with faculty strategic priorities<sup>1</sup>;
  - b. The Student Quality Reviewer obtains feedback from students on the impact of actions taken by the associated programmes through the student rep system and/or by attending a SSLC.
20. Each panel member compiles and shares a summary of the outcomes from the desk-based review and meetings with staff/students with the rest of the Panel.
21. The panel meets to consider the information and intelligence in the round and to analyse the relevant EAPs. The panel interrogates the relevant EAPs in terms of:
- Whether staff and students within the school are able to contribute and engage with it;
  - Whether any actions arising from the evidence, including from direct student feedback, appear to be missing from the EAP;
  - Whether the actions listed are SMART;
  - Whether it appears that progress has stalled in any significant areas, especially in relation to the outcomes from the University-level school EAP meetings and/or institutional priorities or themes;
  - Whether there are areas where more support at faculty or University level may be required; and
  - Whether good or innovative practice has been utilised in addressing EAP actions.
22. The panel meets with the relevant school, departmental and/or faculty representatives to:
- introduce the process;
  - invite the representatives to introduce the EAP, highlight any contextual points they wish to make and set out how the plan aligns with the University's educational priorities;
  - seek clarification on any queries that arise from the evidence.

---

<sup>1</sup> A single meeting with faculty officers will be organised to cover any relevant reviews of taught provision in each teaching block, followed up by a prompt to the faculty officers immediately prior to an individual quality event to ensure any in-year updates from these staff are captured

23. At the conclusion of its review activities, the panel produces a report that sets out the results of its review, including any observations, commendations and/or recommendations for action.

24. The panel are jointly responsible for writing the report but may allocate sections to individual members.

25. The panel formally submits the finalised report to:

- the relevant school/departmental representatives;
- the relevant faculty representatives;
- the University Academic Quality and Standards Committee.

26. Where there are urgent recommendations that arise from review activities, the panel also raises them directly with:

- the Chair of the University Academic Quality and Standards Committee;
- the Director of Education Policy and Quality;
- and the relevant faculty representative/s outside of the standard reporting route.

such that they are considered and addressed in a timely manner. Members of staff made responsible for specific recommendations must take satisfactory action by a date specified by the Chair of UAQSC, with the support of a UED (Quality), school and faculty officers and professional services divisional staff, as appropriate, reporting completion to UAQSC.

27. Where a school or department is not subject to a UQT review (see 6), a University Education Director (Quality) will review the relevant Education Action Plan to identify good practice and establish where support might be offered to assist in the completion of actions in the Plan. The completion of this activity will be reported to UAQSC.

## Consideration of the report and monitoring progress

28. The School Education Director / Director of PGR Studies are responsible for updating their EAP in response to the outcomes of the review process<sup>2</sup>.

29. The Student/Graduate Administration Manager and School Education Director / Director of PGR Studies are responsible for ensuring that any students involved in the review process are aware of the outcomes and that the report is discussed at the relevant SSLC meeting.

30. The Programme Director is responsible for ensuring that all members of staff involved in the delivery of the programme are aware of the outcomes of the review process.

31. Faculty Board should receive the report and discuss the outcomes of the UQT review. The relevant faculty committees should also consider the relevant report and recommendations in the round and discuss and action any faculty-level issues or recommendations.

32. Recommendations from the report for action by central professional services divisions are circulated by AQPO following receipt by UAQSC. AQPO forward good practice examples to BILT.

---

<sup>2</sup> Some recommendations will lead to clear, measurable actions; whilst others will be longer-term due to the nature of the action or its priority and it is acknowledged that significant change may not be accomplished in a single cycle; however, schools should effectively utilise the rolling nature of the EAP to identify interim markers of success from which to catalogue and clarify the direction of progress.

33. Progress in response to recommendations attributed to schools, faculties and central professional service divisions are monitored, as follows, to ensure they are satisfactorily completed in a timely way:

- Recommendations for programmes and the school are monitored through the Education Action Planning process;
- Recommendations for the faculty are monitored by relevant faculty committees;
- Recommendations for the university are distributed by AQPO and monitored by UAQSC.

Progress against all recommendations is considered at the next UQT review activity, unless action is deemed urgent (see 26).

34. AQPO, in liaison with UQT members, produce a set of annual reports (UG, PGT, PGR) for UAQSC setting out the results of its work and any common themes, particularly where University-level intervention and support is required. UAQSC submits the applicable annual reports for report to:

- University Education Committee
- University Postgraduate Research Committee

The annual reports also contribute to the annual quality assurance report that is submitted to the Board of Trustees by UAQSC.

Evaluation of process

35. The UQT meets at the end of the process to reflect on the work undertaken, review feedback from faculty and school staff involved in the UQT process, discuss and suggest any changes to the policy and/or procedure that it wishes to recommend to UAQSC and to plan arrangements for the next year.

## Annex A

### Responsibilities of the faculty

1. Faculty representatives (i.e. the Faculty Education Director and Faculty Education Manager) provide the context to each review process providing local insight on any concerns, or areas of innovation or education excellence, within areas of review as well as a commentary on future plans that will or are likely to be captured in the IPP and the fit with faculty strategic priorities.
2. Faculty representatives may also contribute to resolving any queries or clarifications that the panel has following review of the evidence and any subsequent follow up visit to investigate any matters of concern.
3. The outcomes from the UQT review process are discussed at the Faculty Board. The relevant review reports are also considered in the round by the relevant faculty committee and any faculty-level issues discussed and actioned.

### Responsibilities of schools / programmes

4. EAPs are organised at the school level or faculty-level for PGR and School Education Directors and PGR Directors of Studies have management responsibility for them. It is crucial that a School's EAP/s is up to date ahead of any review activity, including by the UQT.
5. Ensuring that the content of an EAP is a valid reflection of and meaningful for a school's taught and PGR programmes is the dual responsibility of both the relevant School Education Director / PGR Director of Studies and Programme Directors. The EAP should capture school and/or department-wide as well as programme-specific matters and actions.
6. Programme Directors, PGR Directors and/or School representatives may contribute to resolving any queries or clarifications that the panel has following review of the evidence and any subsequent follow up visit to investigate any matters of concern.
7. The Student/Graduate Administration Manager is responsible for ensuring that relevant evidence sources (in particular Student-Staff Liaison Committee minutes and accreditation reports) are provided for the review process; they should also assist SQRs in helping to arrange student meeting with course reps and attending SSLCs, as appropriate.
8. The Student/Graduate Administration Manager is responsible for informing AQPO of any changes to the relevant post-holders in programmes and schools on an annual basis, updating AQPO if there is any change in-year.
9. The Programme Director is responsible for ensuring that all members of staff involved in the delivery of the programme are aware of the outcomes of the review process.
10. The Student/Graduate Administration Manager and School Education Director / Director of PGR Studies are responsible for ensuring that any students involved in the review process are aware of the outcomes and that the report is discussed at the relevant SSLC meeting.
11. The School Education Director / Director of PGR Studies, in liaison with relevant Programme Directors, are responsible for updating their EAP in response to the outcomes of the review process and overseeing progress against the recommendations made.