

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/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Documents/InstitutionalAuditHandbook2009.pdf> (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.