



UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL
SCHOOL REVIEW GUIDELINES 2019-20

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 School¹ Review process is an opportunity to take a ‘deep dive’ view of a School, which will be focussed on data-driven key lines of enquiry. There will no longer be an automatic rolling programme of School Reviews. Instead, there will be a robust annual review process whereby candidates for School Review in any given academic year are discussed in Strategic Planning Meetings (see 1.2 below for more information). The selection criteria for School Reviews is as follows:

Substandard performance	Must be based on objective data; schools must understand why they have been selected.
On critical path to delivering strategic objectives	E.g. A School might be going through a major change and it is vital that the process, culture, ethos etc is there to make the change a success. School review may be necessary even if current performance is excellent.
Requested by Faculty/School or UEB	E.g. new HoS may ask for school review to get some advice on what they should prioritise.

- 1.2 Each Review will focus on key lines of enquiry/terms of reference² that have arisen as a result of discussions held at round 1 of the University Strategic Planning meetings (SPM1) (these

¹ A School is defined as any unit or group within the University that is decreed by the University Executive Board (UEB) to be a School for this purpose.

² Note that key lines of enquiry and terms of reference are used interchangeably throughout this document but have the same meaning.

meetings take place in circa October/November each academic year)). The Deputy Vice-Chancellor, in consultation with the University Executive Board will then agree which Schools should be reviewed (circa Dec/January), and the terms of reference for each review.

- 1.3 An example of data-driven key lines of enquiry might be where a school has persistently failed to hit its student-number targets, new entrant numbers are consequently falling, and the School is unable to meet make its agreed financial contribution. These data are considered as a matter of routine as part of the IPP, but further analysis as part of a School Review would help to get to the root of the issue (e.g. whether it is due to the design, marketing or delivery of the programmes, or indeed whether the decline is the symptom of more fundamental issues such School leadership or management). Similarly, data on research awards, non-continuation rates, EDI, league table rankings and/or NSS results could all give rise to a need for further in-depth investigation as part of a School Review.
- 1.4 An example of and excellent performing school requiring a review could be where there is a new Head of School who has requested a review in order to better understand the opportunities and challenges facing the School going forward.
- 1.5 It may be appropriate for some aspects of the review to include an evaluation of school activities against relevant University Strategies or key policies, e.g. Education Strategy, Research Strategy, International Strategy etc. Evaluation of school activities will include performance against the University Vision and Strategy and any faculty and school plans.

2. Objectives of School Reviews

2.1 Subject to the agreed terms of reference/ key lines of enquiry for each review, below are some **examples** (a non-exhaustive list) of what could form the key objectives of the School Review Process:

- 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)
 - ii. research & entrepreneurship, engagement & research collaborations, UK and Overseas
 - iii. academic staff management and the student experience
 - iv. planning, resource management, space, and administration, including systems
 - v. financial performance
 - vi. (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 both internally and externally (perhaps via market intelligence data), areas for improvement and, where necessary, to recommend that schools are given appropriate support to make changes.

3. Main Features

3.1 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 data driven;
- c) it is based on a process of self-evaluation carried out by the School itself;
- d) the Review Panel will include external reviewers, to ensure objectivity;
- e) it may evaluate the full range of the School's activities, taking into account the relationship between the School's teaching and learning, research, engagement and any organisational and administrative activities, as appropriate, OR it may focus on targeted/specific areas depending on the terms of reference for the Review. In all cases the Review will allow balanced recommendations to be made by the Panel.

3.3 The process has the following main stages:

1. The identification and notification of a date for the School Review by the University Executive Board and the broad terms of reference for the Review.
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 (data) by the Review Panel.
5. A visit by the Review Panel to the School, normally lasting 1.5 working days, but could be longer or shorter depending on the key lines of enquiry i.e. what the Review is looking to achieve.
6. The production of a Review Report including recommendations.
7. The submission of the Review Report to UEB for their approval.
8. Following the approval of the Review Report by UEB, an Action Plan to be drawn up and completed by all relevant parties (with 4 weeks of UEB approval).
9. The production of a Review Action Plan, submitted to UEB by way of a progress update (nine months after the date of the School Review visit and again at the appropriate juncture in the IPP process to ensure that good progress has been made against the agreed actions and recommendations).
10. A meeting between the Head of School and the Chair of the Review Panel to consider progress against agreed actions prior to the nine-month update to UEB, and the twelve-month update being presented to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Provost (acting on behalf of UEB).
11. 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.

4. Procedure

Selection of Schools

4.1 Schools will be selected by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor in consultation with the University Executive Board (UEB) as a result of discussions held at SMP1 meetings in October/November.

Heads of Schools will be consulted as to appropriate timings for the Review in order 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.

Arrangements for the Visit

- 4.3 Confirmation of the Schools to be reviewed will take place **approximately 6-12 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 Governance team) 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**³, 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 discuss the terms of reference/key lines of enquiry for the review and agree the main issues/key themes to be explored during the Review as a result⁴. The discussions of this 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 team 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 C** for further details about what the relevant documents consist of and **Annex I** 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 (note that there is

³ Usually the Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Provost or a Pro Vice-Chancellor

⁴ During the course of the review, depending on what arises from the review discussions, the Review Panel may need follow other lines of enquiry that fall outside of the remit of the terms of reference.

flexibility here as length of the Review is dependent on key lines of enquiry). Where a School is small in size or the Review is of a smaller sub unit/department, or the scope of the review is very specific, the visit may be shorter. Where a School is large, or the terms of reference for the review is wide in scope, the Review may take the full two days (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 UEB has ultimate responsibility for the School Review procedure. It will:
- assist in selecting Schools for Review, based on key lines of enquiry which have arisen as part of the Integrated Planning Process (IPP) 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 UEB.
- 4.10 The Governance team has responsibility for:
- submitting a proposed annual review schedule to UEB (Jan/Feb) for ratification;
 - 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 Policy Office (AQPO) to produce an analysis of quality assurance and enhancement issues to be addressed during the Review, if appropriate (see **Annex C**); and
 - producing the first draft of the Review Report following the Review visit, and co-ordinating with the UEB 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 UEB.
- 4.11 The Planning & Business Intelligence team has responsibility for the following:
- in September/October, the provision of relevant metrics/data (financial, NSS, League Tables etc) to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Provost per school, and the criteria by which each School has been selected, including recommendations about what the data tells the University about the need for reviews in the coming year. Feedback from DVC & Provost will feed into Strategic Planning Meetings (Round 1) in November.
 - coordinating Strategic Planning Meetings (Round 1) and identifying school review candidates, based on key data and discussions held in the meetings.
 - summarising the outcomes of the discussions in Strategic Planning meetings (Round 1) and the provision of a draft school review schedule for the upcoming year for UEB.
- 4.12 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/terms of reference for the Review (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) (or summary document) in accordance with the guidance provided for the School Reviews, plus any additional appropriate documentation requested as part of the Strategic Planning Meetings, or at the Review kick-off meeting, or by the Review Panel.
- Providing the final SED to the Review Co-ordinator no later than 4 weeks before the Review visit.

School Review Team

- 4.13 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 E**). Depending on the key lines of enquiry for each Review, the Head of School may also be a member of the Review Panel. Otherwise he/she and the other member(s) of the School Team will be available for consultation during the Review itself. Members of the School (staff and students) should be involved in the Review, by contributing to the Self Evaluation Document (SED) and/or attending meetings with the Panel. Again, this is dependent on the scope/terms of reference for the review.

Review Panel

- 4.14 The Chair of each Review Panel is appointed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor on behalf of UEB. Panels will be chaired either by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, a current Pro Vice-Chancellor, or, exceptionally, or Dean of a Faculty whose school is not currently under review. 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 (in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty and/or the Head of School, 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 or Faculty Manager)
- a student representative – e.g. a UBU sabbatical officer
- a member of the Governance team nominated by the Head of Governance or the Deputy Head of Governance, to act as the Review Co-ordinator

- 4.15 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 or by choosing to appoint the Head of School under Review as a member of the Review Panel). (see

4.14). Again, this may also be dependent on the key lines of enquiry/terms of reference for each Review.

4.16 Should the Dean's own School be under Review they should 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.

4.17 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

4.18 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.

4.19 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.

4.20 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, in consultation with the Faculty, 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 A**. 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 (note: 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

- 4.21 Provided at **Annex B** 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 lines of enquiry/terms of reference agreed before the start of the Review.
- 4.22 **Annex D** provides guidance on what could form the content of each section of the self-evaluation document (SED) – this guidance 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, depending on the scope of the review, 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, outcomes from the Strategic Planning meeting discussions, UEB, the Review Co-ordinator, or other 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 C**. Schools are asked to produce a self-evaluation document (SED) and to keep supporting documentation to a minimum (**see page limits below**). Again, this checklist is more of a 'wishlist' and will be adapted according to the scope of the review.

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 can take a significant amount of time, depending on the scope of the review**. 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.

Student Submission

5.5 **Where appropriate**, the Students' Union may be asked to prepare a submission on behalf of students (see details below) and share 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 D**. These headings can help provide the broad framework for the Review. Depending on the key lines of enquiry 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 the School should provide information that is helpful in assisting the Panel's understanding of the School's current and future position (particularly external panel members). 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 driven by the IPP. The School is required to undertake an analysis of that data and reference the data in its SED. The School may be asked by the Panel to produce additional data or analysis, depending on what the review key lines of enquiry are.

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.⁵ As appropriate, the draft SED

⁵ Unless the key lines of enquiry are highly confidential or if the scope of the review means that this is not wholly necessary. This should be agreed at the kick-off meeting.

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 As appropriate, 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**, although this again depends on the level of confidentiality and/or the scope of the Review.
- 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 I**).

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 the Governance team, 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 agreed by the Chair of the Panel. A sample programme is at **Annex E**.
- 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 Depending on the key lines of enquiry/terms of reference for each review, the Review programme will normally include the following elements:
- two meetings with the Head of School (unless he/she is a member of the Review Panel), 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 Depending on the key lines of enquiry for the review, there would usually 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 G**) 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 each key line of enquiry for the Review.

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 UEB is able to receive the Report for consideration. The Governance team (in consultation with the Secretary to UEB) will confirm at the start of the Review process which UEB 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 UEB

7.5 UEB 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 UEB during UEB's discussion of their School Review Report, and the School is invited to submit additional comments to UEB at this meeting, via the Head of School, if they so wish. The Head of School is expected to present to UEB their reaction to the Review, including their indications of priority actions to follow. UEB 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 UEB has approved the Review Report and its recommendations, the Dean/Head of School/PVC (Chair of the Review) will agree and take forward the Action Plan. The Governance team will send a copy of the Action Plan to the School, with the recommendations from the Report included within it. The Governance team 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 H** 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 UEB, and a copy sent to the Governance team. 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 seen again by UEB**.

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 Governance team 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
- Any other relevant body/university officer

Action Plan monitoring

7.10 Six to 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 Executive Board (UEB) 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 UEB.

- 7.11 The Action Plan will then continue to be monitored by the Head of School, Dean, PVC and the Governance team. The School is asked to report back to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Provost (acting on behalf of UEB) on progress again within twelve months of the Review taking place in order that the Action Plan can be finalised. Before the 12 month update goes to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Provost, the Review Panel Chair (PVC), Dean and Head of School must meet to discuss action plan progress.
- 7.12 At this stage, the Governance team 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.

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 Governance team 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 - Selection criteria and process for External Reviewers

Annex B - Sample Questions for Review Panel members

Annex C - Checklist of Documents to be provided to the Review Panel

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

Annex E - Template School Review Programme

Annex F – Review report Template (for the Review report author)

Annex G - Action Plan Template

Annex H – Review checklist and timeframe: for the School