



**UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL  
SCHOOL REVIEW GUIDELINES**

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Objectives**
- 3. Main Features**
- 4. Procedure**
- 5. Documents**
- 6. Review programme**
- 7. Review Report and Follow-Up Action**
- 8. Resources**

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 The University School<sup>1</sup> 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.
- 1.2 These guidelines explain the University's School Review process. The Review process is intended to enable the University to meet the objectives given in point 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.
- 1.3 One of the aspects of the review will be an 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 any faculty and school plans.

**2. Objectives**

- 2.1 The School Review Process has the following objectives:
  - 1) to assure the University that its Schools have appropriate strategies in place, deliver high quality teaching and research, that they are delivering a positive student experience, and that they are working effectively in terms of staffing and financial matters;
  - 2) to assist the University, Faculties and Schools in identifying and evaluating strengths or weaknesses in:
    - i. learning, teaching and assessment (including partnerships/collaborations, UK and Overseas)

---

<sup>1</sup> A School is defined as any unit or group within the University that is decreed by the University Management Team (UMT) to be a School for this purpose.

- ii. research & entrepreneurship, engagement & research collaborations, UK and Overseas
  - iii. academic staff management and the student experience
  - iv. planning, resource management, including space, and administration, including systems)
  - v. (where appropriate) clinical work/provision of clinical service
- 3) to be part of the robust academic quality management and enhancement process mechanism acceptable to external audit requirements including assuring the University that all its academic programmes are current and valid;
  - 4) to improve School and institutional effectiveness and efficiency in relation to academic performance;
  - 5) to identify examples of good practice, areas for improvement and, where necessary, to recommend that schools are given appropriate support to make changes and;
  - 6) to review all academic Schools in a rolling, five yearly cycle<sup>2</sup>

### 3. Main Features

- 3.1 A University School Review is designed to fulfil the requirements of the academic quality management and enhancement process, and to be auditable by external regulatory bodies. Such reviews should, where feasible, be aligned to Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) visits and processes. It is based on the principle of using existing documentation wherever possible, including internal quality assurance reports from Faculty Quality Teams (FQTs) and Annual Programme Review (APR) and other materials, such as documents prepared for the RAE/REF, or reports by the QAA and professional accrediting bodies.
- 3.2 The University's School Review process has four distinctive features:
  - a) it is School based (though if deemed appropriate a constituent unit or department within a School may be reviewed independently);
  - b) it is based on a process of self-evaluation carried out by the School itself;
  - c) the Review Panel will include external reviewers, to ensure objectivity;
  - d) the Review evaluates the full range of the School's 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.
- 3.3 The process has the following main stages:
  1. The identification and notification of a date for the School Review (agreed by UMT).
  2. The appointment of external reviewer/s and other members of the Review Panel.
  3. The School submission of a self-evaluation document (SED), together with any relevant supporting documentary evidence.
  4. The scrutiny of the SED and supporting evidence by the Review Panel.
  5. A visit by the Review Panel to the School, normally lasting 1.5 working days.
  6. The production of a Review Report including recommendations.
  7. The submission of the Review Report to UMT for their approval.

---

<sup>2</sup> Note: On some occasions, ad hoc reviews of specific Schools, Programmes or Departments may take place, which may be more finely focussed on specific key issues, and structured to fit need.

8. Following the approval of the Review Report by UMT, an Action Plan to be drawn up and completed by all relevant parties (with 4 weeks of UMT approval).
9. The production of a Review Action Plan, submitted to UMT by way of a progress update (nine months after the date of the School Review visit).
10. Continued review of the progress of the Action Plan by the School, either as part of their annual monitoring review process (if actions are completed) or to ensure that any outstanding actions are completed. The Action Plan should form an Annex to the School's SED at their next School Review in five years' time.

#### 4. Procedure

##### Selection of Schools

- 4.1 Schools will be selected by the Pro Vice-Chancellors, in consultation with Deans of Faculties (and agreed at a meeting of UMT) based on a rolling programme of reviews. Heads of Schools will be consulted as to appropriate timings for the Review so as to avoid clashes with major events in the School's calendar wherever possible, such as exam periods and university closure days. They will also take account of internal considerations, including the outcomes of annual faculty reviews, outcomes of a recent REF or an HE Review, strategic planning issues, and will also use the schedule of any proposed external reviews to inform their decisions.
- 4.2 Schools undergoing review **will not be subject to an FQT (Faculty Quality Teams) visit in the same academic year.**

##### Arrangements for the Visit

- 4.3 Confirmation of the Schools to be reviewed will take place **approximately 12-18 months** before the visit. The timing of visits will be arranged to accommodate School priorities wherever possible. A member of the Governance team will contact the relevant Head of School and will provide guidance on the Review process (guidance is also available on the University Governance webpages). Throughout the preparation period (i.e. the development of the self-evaluation document and the Review programme) the Review Co-ordinator (from the Strategic Planning and Projects Office) will liaise closely with the School by way of regular meetings to check progress and answer any process-related and/or logistical questions.
- 4.4 A kick-off meeting between the **Chair**, the **Dean of the Faculty**, the Faculty Manager, the **Head of School**, and the **Review Co-ordinator**) will take place at an early stage to plan and identify the main issues to be explored during the Review and the priorities for the Review. The discussions of this kick-off group will include specifically:
  - a) Agreement of the key themes which the Panel will consider during the Review.
  - b) Consideration of a draft programme, to reflect the key themes of the Review (see point a). and whether there is a correct balance of central and Faculty staff meeting the Review Panel
  - c) Agreement of the type and format of the supporting data for reference in the SED and also for the purposes of the Review Panel
  - d) Consideration and agreement of the Review Panel membership (internal and external).
  - e) (Where appropriate) Consideration of Centres for Doctoral Training and how well connected these are with the School will also be considered at the kick-off meeting.

- 4.5 The Governance Office will ensure that external reviewers are selected according to the process

outlined below, and will take the lead in convening the Review Panel based on discussions held at the kick-off meeting.

- 4.6 All members of the Panel will receive the relevant documents **3 weeks** in advance of the visit (see **Annex F** for further details about what the relevant documents consist of and **Annex L** for a detailed Review checklist/timetable). Panel members will be able to request additional information to help them prepare for the visit (subject to timescales).
- 4.7 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/department, the visit may be shorter. Where a School is large the Review may take the full two days, 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).

#### Roles and Responsibilities

- 4.8 UMT 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 reviews, and
  - maintain an overview of the implementation of Review recommendations approved.
- 4.9 The Dean, Faculty Board, University Education and Research Committees and appropriate Heads of professional services have responsibility for:
- monitoring the implementation of any Review recommendations relevant to them, which are approved by the UMT.
- 4.10 The Strategic Planning & Projects Office has responsibility for:
- ensuring that appropriate arrangements are made for carrying out the Review (including establishing a Review Co-ordinator), and ensuring regular meetings between the Review Co-ordinator and the School throughout the Review process, to provide support and to monitor progress in the development of the SED and the Review programme;
  - working with the Academic Quality and Partnerships Office (AQPO) to produce an analysis of quality assurance and enhancement issues to be addressed during the Review (see **Annex F**); and
  - producing the first draft of the Review Report following the Review visit, and co-ordinating with the UMT Committee Secretary on the initial creation of the Action Plan.
  - Following up on any further updates, particularly in relation to the Action Plan and its presentation to UMT.
- 4.11 The School under Review has responsibility for:
- Supporting the Review Co-ordinator in developing the Review programme (in consultation with the kick-off group of the Chair, Dean of Faculty and Review Co-ordinator) to reflect the themes for the Review agreed at/after the kick-off meeting (see 4.4).
  - Identifying appropriate people to meet the Panel at sessions during the Review visit, agreeing proposed attendees with the kick-off group, and inviting agreed attendees to relevant sessions during the Review Visit.

- [Arranging rooms etc – not Panel travel or catering]
- Producing a self-evaluation document (SED) in accordance with the guidance provided for the School Reviews, plus any additional appropriate documentation requested by the kick-off group or the full Panel.
- Providing the final SED to the Review Co-ordinator no later than 4 weeks before the Review visit.

#### School Review Team

- 4.12 Once a School Review date has been confirmed, the School appoints its own Review team, comprising the Head of School and his/her School Senior Management Team (suggested members can be found in the sample programme, **Annex H**). Neither the Head of School nor the other member(s) of the School Team are members of the Review Panel, but will be available for consultation during the Review itself.

Members of the School should be involved in the Review, by contributing to the Self Evaluation Document (SED) and/or attending meetings with the Panel.

#### Review Panel

- 4.13 The Chair of each Review Panel is appointed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor on behalf of UMT. Panels will be chaired either by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, a current Pro Vice-Chancellor, or, exceptionally, a former Pro Vice-Chancellor or Dean of a Faculty. 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 (with consultation with the Dean of the Faculty as appropriate– this is usually discussed at the kick-off meeting (see **4.4** above), including the external reviewer/s. Panel members will normally include:

- The Chair
- external reviewer(s)
- the Dean of the Faculty concerned
- an academic member of staff, but not the Dean, of another Faculty (e.g. a Head of School or Faculty Education Director)
- a professional services member of staff (e.g. a School Manager)
- a student representative – e.g. a UBU sabbatical officer
- a member of the Governance team or Planning team (who form the wider Strategic Planning & Projects Office), nominated by the Head of Governance, to act as the Review Co-ordinator

- 4.14 In exceptional circumstances only, the Chair may decide, in consultation with the Dean of Faculty and the Head of School, to change the make-up of the Review Panel to reflect specific circumstances (for example, by choosing to invite fewer or more external panel members). (see 4.15)

- 4.15 Should the Dean's own School be under Review they can nominate a substitute (e.g. the Faculty Education Director/Research Director). Alternatively, the Chair of the Panel, in consultation with the Dean and Head of School, should determine if there are any sessions which it would be inappropriate for the Dean to attend and to what extent the Dean should or should not contribute to the Review Report.

- 4.16 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. The Chair may choose to ask other Panel members, e.g. externals, to lead individual sessions of the Review, where they deem this to be appropriate.

#### External Reviewers

- 4.17 There will normally be two external reviewers appointed to the Review Panel. In cases where a large School or group of Schools is/are being reviewed, or where there are legitimate reasons for a more in-depth Review, more than two external reviewers may be appointed, at the discretion of the Chair. The Chair may also choose to appoint only one external reviewer to the Review Panel. The External Reviewers will be expected to look holistically at School activities, and to comment on all aspects of the Review.
- 4.18 External reviewers, as recognised experts in their fields, provide critical judgement, ensure the objectivity of the Review process, and help to determine how the School compares to similar Schools of which they have had experience. They should bring an informed and unbiased view to the assessment of the School. External reviewers should judge whether the plans of the School are appropriate, considering such factors as the current condition of the School, trends in relevant academic areas, the nature of the School, and the characteristics of the stakeholders and customers that it serves. They are expected to take a proactive role during the Review: in particular, taking the lead on discussions during Review sessions, with the support of the Chair.
- 4.19 At the beginning of the Review process, the Chair will decide what skills, background and experience will be required of the external reviewers for each Review, and will then advise the School of their requirements. The School will then be asked to provide a **long list** (ideally 4-6) containing the names of suggested external academics who could act as external reviewer/s on the Panel, taking account of these requirements. Selection criteria and the process for selecting external reviewers are available at **Annex D**. In some subject areas, where more than two externals are required, a reviewer might be industrially- or professionally-based rather than from another academic institution, and might be a consultant with a specific expertise (where appropriate). It is important that the School provides a **choice** of external names, so that the Chair can select who they think would be most appropriate. From the list provided, the Chair will select the external reviewers. The Review Co-ordinator will then approach the potential external reviewers to invite them to take part in the Review (n.b. in some circumstances the Chair may deem it appropriate for the Head of School to approach agreed externals, to invite them to participate in the Review, directly. This should be agreed with the kick-off group, and the School should liaise with the Review Co-ordinator accordingly).

#### Guidance to Panel Members

- 4.20 Provided at **Annex E** is a set of sample questions under each of the general Review topic headings. This can be provided to Panel members as guidance on the kinds of questions they might consider during the Review. However, this list is not prescriptive, and the Panel's approach should primarily be informed by the key themes agreed before the start of the Review.

- 4.21 **Annex G** provides guidance on what should be the content of each section of the self-evaluation document (SED), which may also be useful to Panel members. Schools may, with the authorisation of the Panel Chair and the Dean of the Faculty, choose to approach their SED differently, although the SED must include 'core' information (see 5.3), as well as any particular requirements for information given to the School by the Chair, the kick-off group, the Review Co-ordinator, or Panel members, ahead of the Review.

## 5. Panel Documents

- 5.1 A checklist of the documents that will be sent to the Review Panel is attached at **Annex F**. Schools are asked to produce a self- evaluation document (SED) and to keep supporting documentation to a minimum (**see page limits below**).

### The School Self-Evaluation Document (SED)

- 5.2 Because the emphasis of the Review process is on **self-evaluation**, the production of the self-evaluation document by the School is **one of the most important elements of the Review process, and therefore generally takes a significant amount of time**. The document should aim to be **12-15 pages long** and **should not exceed 15 pages (excluding appendices: appendices should be no more than 30 pages long)**.
- 5.3 If the School feels there is a valid reason for them to provide a SED which is longer than 15 pages, or has more than 30 pages of appendices, they should seek the approval of the Chair before drafting a longer document: the Chair has final discretion over the maximum page length of the SED. Schools which produce a SED in excess of the page limit without discussing this with the Chair first, may be asked to revise/refine the SED before it is shared with Panel members.
- 5.4 Each SED should include 'core' information presented in a structured way. It should emphasise future plans, including for future student numbers, programme development, research and entrepreneurship development, and financial projections. It must contain a SWOT analysis of strengths, weaknesses and ability to meet objectives (see **Annex G**).

### Student Submission Pilot

- 5.5 The Students' Union are responsible for drafting written submission on behalf of students (see details below) and sharing it with the Head of School, and then the Review Co-ordinator. The process is as follows:
- The Students' Union to draft a student submission to the Review. This submission should include input from:
    - the Faculty and School staff student liaison Committee(s)
    - the student representatives for the degree programmes in the School
    - the student representatives on the Faculty Quality Team
    - relevant student societ(ies).
    - the Students' Union.
  - The Students' Union to share the submission with the Head of School in good time for them to have opportunity to comment on it, before the SED deadline. The Head of School to provide the Students' Union with any comments.

- The Students' Union to finalise the student submission, and send the finalised version to the Review Co-ordinator, copying in the Head of School, by the SED deadline (no later than 4 weeks before the Review). Whilst the Head of School has the right to comment/offer their views on the submission, the final responsibility for the submission (and its contents) rests with the Students' Union,
- The Review Co-ordinator to send out the final written submission to the Panel alongside the SED, and other documentation for the Panel.
- It is recommended that the submission is no more than **4 pages** in length.

#### Guidance on Writing the SED

- 5.6 A list of section headings, and guidance on the content of the SED, are at **Annex G**. These headings can help provide the broad framework for the Review. The School may, subject to discussion with and approval from the Chair and the Dean of the Faculty, choose not to incorporate all of these headings, or include different headings, though it should be noted that the headings given are helpful in assisting the Panel's understanding of the School's current and future position (particularly external panel members). Further headings may be added, depending on the School's priorities and the agreed themes for the Review. The School should consider that the questions asked by the Review Panel members at the Review meetings will be informed by the SED. The Review Co-ordinator may be able to provide previous SEDs from recent School Reviews to the School to use as examples, if required.
- 5.7 The SED will be supported by data provided by the Planning and Business Intelligence team. The data will be provided to the School as close to the start of the Review process as possible (see **Annex F** for a breakdown of the type of data provided). The School is responsible for raising any issues with the data with the Planning and Business Intelligence Team as soon as possible after receiving the data pack. The School is not required to produce any additional data or analysis, unless specifically requested by the kick-off group/Panel.

#### School Consultation and Circulation of Self-Evaluation Document

- 5.8 It is essential that during the preparation of the SED, the School Review team ensures that **full consultation** takes place with **all members of the School**. The draft SED should be submitted to all members of the School, including all academic and professional (including technical) staff and students, for comment, and all members of the School should have the opportunity to discuss and give feedback on the SED in advance of its submission.
- 5.9 The School should ensure that **students** who contribute to the academic work of the School **have the opportunity to review and comment upon the SED** prior to its submission, for example through a special meeting, or via consultation with School student representatives.
- 5.10 It is expected that **all School staff involved in meeting the Review Panel** during the Review visit will **have had the opportunity to contribute to the School's SED** in advance of submission, and will have seen the final SED submitted to the Panel.
- 5.11 The School is expected to **share a copy of its final submitted SED with all School staff, relevant Faculty staff, and indeed any other relevant members of staff.**

- 5.12 When the SED has been agreed by the School, a copy should be sent to the Review Co-ordinator **no less than four weeks** before the Review visit, to enable it to be sent to the Review Panel three weeks before the Review (for a more detailed Review checklist/timetable please see Annex L).
- 6. Review Programme**
- 6.1 The length of the Review visit will be decided by the Panel Chair and Dean, in discussion with the School and Strategic Planning & Projects Office, but the standard length of a Review visit is one and a half days.
- 6.2 The Review Programme will be drawn up by the School in consultation with the Review Co-ordinator. The draft Programme will be shared with the kick-off group, and must be agreed by the Chair of the Panel. A sample programme is at **Annex H**.
- 6.3 The programme will usually start with an initial meeting of the Panel to discuss specific themes and issues for consideration during the Review.
- 6.4 The Review programme will normally include the following elements:
- two meetings with the Head of School, one at the beginning of the Review visit to discuss their thoughts and priorities for the School, and one at the conclusion of the visit to advise them of the Panel's initial findings (see 6.5).
  - A meeting with the School senior management team
  - a meeting with Faculty staff (and other appropriate staff relevant to the Review e.g. BDC Director)
  - meetings with a representative and balanced group of students (undergraduate and graduates), effectively utilising the Course Representatives system
  - meetings to discuss education and the student experience (UG and PG)
  - meeting to discuss research, entrepreneurship and engagement
  - a tour/tours of facilities (which may include library, laboratory or other relevant resources as appropriate)
  - on the evening of the first day the Review Panel will usually meet over dinner to discuss the first day's thoughts and findings, and to plan for the second day.
  - a feedback session at the conclusion of the Review, open to all School staff, to advise them of the Panel's initial findings (see 6.5).
  - Short, regular periods in each day when the Panel has time for private meetings, to allow the opportunities for discussion of issues raised by different groups.
- 6.5 There will be a final Panel meeting to discuss recommendations and the structure of the Review Report. Following this, the Panel will meet the Head of School and then the rest of the School staff, to provide initial oral feedback on their findings, but the School should bear in mind that the final report will provide the specific recommendations for action.
- 6.6 There must be a **broad representation** of School staff participating in the Review, and the Review Panel must be mindful of potential issues of **confidentiality** arising from the Review meetings. **Those participating in Review sessions, both members of the School**

**and external participants, should be free to speak openly and answer any honestly any questions put to them by the Panel.**

## **7. Review Report and Follow-Up Action**

### Review Report

- 7.1 All members of the Review Panel must contribute to the drafting of the Report: the Review Report is the Report of the Panel as a whole. The initial draft of recommendations for inclusion in the Review Report is undertaken as part of the final Panel meeting. The first draft of the Review Report is then structured according to the School Review Report template (**Annex J**) by the Review Co-ordinator, who then circulates the Report in turn to the Chair and then to the Panel for comment. The Chair of the Review Panel has final responsibility for approving the completed the School Review Report.
- 7.2 The Review Report should be as concise as possible; following the report template it should normally include the Panel's conclusions (where relevant) on the following areas:
- context – placing the School within the Faculty's and University's activities and priorities
  - maintenance and enhancement of programme delivery and quality (- effectiveness of mechanisms for assuring quality and standards, curricula design, intended learning outcomes and assessment, currency of provision, discipline developments, quality of learning opportunities and future plans for all levels of educational provision)
  - student experience at all levels (- provision of feedback on student work, academic support/personal tutoring, mechanisms for listening to and acting on student views, personal development and quality of resources for all levels of educational provision)
  - research and entrepreneurship (- research structure, strategy, performance, preparation for the REF, impact, public engagement and support for research staff)
  - management, organisation, finance, facilities and resources (- overall management of the School, the learning and research environment, quality of facilities and resources)
  - commendations of those aspects of the School's activities that are innovative or reflect good practice
  - overall conclusions (e.g. the extent to which the School is meeting its stated strategic aims and overall impression of its current position and ability to achieve its ambitions over the next few years)
  - recommendations for improvement for the School, Faculty and University.
- 7.3 When the Report is finalised, it is sent to the School for correction of any **factual errors only**; the School is not otherwise able to change the Review Report. This process can take **up to three months**, depending on the meeting at which UMT is able to receive the Report for consideration. The Strategic Planning & Projects Office (in consultation with the Secretary to UMT) will confirm at the start of the Review process which UMT meeting the report is likely to be considered at in order to get a date in the diary in advance.

### Separate/Confidential Report

- 7.4 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, they may choose to ask for a separate, confidential report to be made to the Vice-Chancellor.

Review Report to UMT

- 7.5 UMT will consider the Review Report, supported by:
- the Review programme and;
  - the executive summary of the SED.
- 7.6 The Head of School will be invited to join UMT during UMT's discussion of their School Review Report, and the School is invited to submit additional comments to UMT at this meeting, via the Head of School, if they so wish. The Head of School is expected to present to UMT their reaction to the Review, including their indications of priority actions to follow. UMT may decide not to endorse all recommendations made by the Review Panel, and if so the report will be amended accordingly.

The Review Action Plan

- 7.7 Once UMT has approved the Review Report and its recommendations, the Dean/Head of School/PVC will agree and take forward the Action Plan. The Strategic Planning & Projects Office will send a copy of the Action Plan to the School, with the recommendations from the Report included within it. The Strategic Planning & Projects Office will contact the relevant Faculty and Professional Services Heads (relating to the University and Faculty actions) and ask them to contribute as appropriate to the Action Plan. The School is required to contact the relevant School action leads and ask them to do the same. (see Annex K for an Action Plan template).
- 7.8 The first draft of the Action Plan should be completed by all relevant parties within four weeks of the Review Report having been approved by UMT, and a copy sent to the Strategic Planning & Projects Office. It is expected that the Dean can (and should) review the Action Plans and progress with the Head of School during the nine month period before the Action Plan is discussed again by the PVC, Dean and Head of School by way of a progress update.

Communication of the Review Report and Action Plan

- 7.9 When all parties have decided on the actions required and added this information to the Action Plan, the Strategic Planning & Projects Office will send the Review Report and Action Plan for information to (where relevant):
- University Education Committee
  - University Research Committee
  - Divisional Heads
  - FQT Chair
  - Faculty Board

Action Plan monitoring

- 7.10 Nine months after the Review, the Review Panel Chair (PVC), Dean and Head of

School/Department will monitor and discuss the report. Action plan progress updates will be formally reported to the University Management Team (UMT) for information only **unless** the Review Panel Chair determines that a discussion at the committee was required. The Head of School will **not** be required to attend UMT.

- 7.11 The Action Plan will then continue to be monitored by the Head of School, Dean, PVC and the Strategic Planning & Projects Office. The School is asked to report back to the Strategic Planning & Projects Office on progress again within twelve months of the Review taking place in order that the Action Plan can be finalised.
- 7.12 At this stage, the Strategic Planning & Projects Office will contact the relevant parties to update and finalise the Action Plan. The finalised Review Action Plan will be published on the Governance secure website and disseminated to the same parties/committees (see above) as the original Review Report for information.

Publication of the Review Report and Review Action Plan

- 7.13 Review Reports, the executive summary of the SED and the final version of the Review Action Plan will be published internally on the Governance website.

School Review Process Annual Overview Report

- 7.14 An annual overview Report of any thematic issues identified through School Reviews will be drafted by the Governance team for consideration by UMT and the Education Committee.

**8. Resources**

- 8.1 The fee and expenses of the external reviewers and review catering will be met from funds centrally allocated for this purpose. The budget available specifically for hotel bookings and Review Panel refreshments is limited: please contact the Strategic Planning & Projects Office for more information. The School is not expected to book or pay for the catering/refreshments for the Review, but is expected to book the Review meeting rooms and any associated IT & AV equipment (where necessary) as the Review will normally take place within its own premises.

**List of Annexes** (available on the Governance webpages)

*Annex A* - University Research Strategy (a new strategy will be available in early 2018)

*Annex B* - [University Education Strategy](#)

*Annex C* - [University Vision and Strategy](#)

*Annex D* - Selection criteria and process for External Reviewers

*Annex E* - Sample Questions for Review Panel members

*Annex F* - Checklist of Documents to be provided to the Review Panel

*Annex G* - Suggested Section headings for the Self-Evaluation Document and Guidance on Content

*Annex H* - Template School/Department Review Programme

*Annex I* - Other useful documents for the Review Panel

*Annex J* – Review report Template (for the Review report author)

*Annex K* - Action Plan Template

*Annex L* – Review checklist and timeframe: for the School