



# Senate Handbook

## Senate Reviews

This Handbook supplements Regulations governed by Senate.

It includes policies, procedures, advice and/or guidance that staff are expected to follow in the proper conduct of University business.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>REVIEWS OF LEARNING AND TEACHING PROVISION</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT	4
1.1.1	WHY SHOULD WE REVIEW TEACHING PROVISION?	4
1.1.2	PURPOSES OF PERIODIC REVIEW OF LEARNING AND TEACHING PROVISION	4
1.2	TYPES OF PERIODIC REVIEW	4
1.2.1	INTRODUCTION	5
1.2.2	TYPES OF PERIODIC REVIEW	5
1.2.3	GENERAL OUTLINE AND CONDUCT OF PERIODIC REVIEWS	5
1.3	ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS	6
<b>2</b>	<b>SENATE REVIEW OF A SCHOOL (SRS)</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	INTRODUCTION	7
2.2	OVERALL PROCESS AND TIMELINE	7
2.3	STANDARD TERMS OF REFERENCE	10
2.4	REVIEW PANEL MEMBERSHIP	11
2.5	SELF-EVALUATION DOCUMENT FROM THE SCHOOL	11
2.5.1	GENERAL OUTLINE	11
2.5.2	CONSTRUCTING THE SELF-EVALUATION DOCUMENT	12
2.6	SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION	13
2.6.1	DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED BY THE SCHOOL	13
2.6.2	DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED BY THE OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC REGISTRAR	14
2.6.3	OTHER DOCUMENTATION TO BE COLLECTED BY THE SECRETARY TO THE REVIEW PANEL	144
2.7	REPORT FROM THE REVIEW PANEL	154
2.7.1	GENERAL OUTLINE	15
2.7.2	STRUCTURE OF THE REVIEW PANEL REPORT	15
2.7.3	SCHOOL RESPONSE TO THE REVIEW PANEL REPORT	16
2.7.4	FINAL CONSIDERATION BY EDUCATION COMMITTEE	16
<b>3</b>	<b>FOCUSSED REVIEW (FR)</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1	INTRODUCTION	18
3.2	OVERALL PROCESS AND TIMELINE	18
3.3	STANDARD TERMS OF REFERENCE	21
3.4	REVIEW PANEL MEMBERSHIP	21
3.5	CONDUCT OF THE FOCUSSED REVIEW	21
3.6	REPORT FROM THE REVIEW PANEL	22
3.6.1	GENERAL OUTLINE	22
3.6.2	STRUCTURE OF THE REVIEW PANEL REPORT	22
3.6.3	RESPONSES TO THE REVIEW PANEL REPORT	24
3.6.4	FINAL CONSIDERATION BY EDUCATION COMMITTEE	24
<b>4</b>	<b>YEAR ONE PARTNERSHIP REVIEW (Y1PR)</b>	<b>25</b>
4.1	INTRODUCTION	25
4.2	OVERALL PROCESS AND TIMELINE	25
4.3	STANDARD TERMS OF REFERENCE	28
4.4	REVIEW PANEL MEMBERSHIP	28
4.5	CONDUCT OF THE YEAR ONE PARTNERSHIP REVIEW	28
4.6	REPORT FROM THE REVIEW PANEL	29
4.6.1	GENERAL OUTLINE	29
4.6.2	STRUCTURE OF THE REVIEW PANEL REPORT	29
4.6.3	RESPONSES TO THE REVIEW PANEL REPORT	30
4.6.4	FINAL CONSIDERATION BY EDUCATION COMMITTEE	31
<b>5</b>	<b>SPECIAL MEASURES REVIEW (SMR)</b>	<b>32</b>
	<b>APPENDIX A FOCUSSED REVIEW: TEMPLATE 1</b>	<b>33</b>
	<b>REVIEW OF A SINGLE TAUGHT COURSE</b>	<b>33</b>
A.1	INTRODUCTION	33
A.2	TERMS OF REFERENCE	333
A.3	SUGGESTED SET OF INITIAL DOCUMENTATION	34

<b>APPENDIX B FOCUSED REVIEW: TEMPLATE 2 .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>REVIEW OF LEARNING AND TEACHING PROVISION INVOLVING SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS FROM A PARTNER INSTITUTION.....</b>	<b>35</b>
B.1 INTRODUCTION.....	35
B.2 TERMS OF REFERENCE .....	35
B.3 SUGGESTED SET OF INITIAL DOCUMENTATION .....	36
<b>APPENDIX C YEAR ONE PARTNERSHIP REVIEW .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>REVIEW OF LEARNING AND TEACHING PROVISION INVOLVING SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS FROM A PARTNER INSTITUTION ONE YEAR AFTER THE INITIATION OF A NEW PARTNERSHIP .....</b>	<b>38</b>
C.1 INTRODUCTION.....	38
C.2 TERMS OF REFERENCE .....	38
C.3 SUGGESTED SET OF INITIAL DOCUMENTATION.....	39

**Major changes to this document since version 2.3 (August 2018):**

- Updating of references to QAA and Quality Code

# 1 Reviews of learning and teaching provision

---

## 1.1 Background and context

### 1.1.1 Why should we review teaching provision?

Regular and periodic review of teaching provision is a well-established principle across the higher education sector. The UK Quality Code for Higher Education provides a key reference point for UK higher education.<sup>1</sup> Accepted practice is for reviews of learning and teaching provision to take place on both short-term (regular – usually annual) and longer-term (periodic) cycles.

The review of teaching provision should be at the core of the University's mission in delivering high-quality relevant education opportunities to its students. Review of teaching provision should take into account good practice in learning and teaching, the introduction of and experimentation with new teaching methods and pedagogic tools, and feedback from staff, students, industrial advisors, external examiners, potential employers and other interested parties.

The University endorses this view and has made provision for:

- regular, annual review of teaching provision for all taught courses, through *annual reflective reviews*;<sup>2</sup>
- periodic review of larger units of learning and teaching provision.

This Handbook outlines the structures, purposes and operation of longer-term reviews of learning, teaching and assessment.

### 1.1.2 Purposes of periodic review of learning and teaching provision

The purposes of more periodic monitoring of learning and teaching provision (i.e. on a 3-6 year cycle) are:

- to assess the continuing validity and relevance of courses, in the context of the University's strategy for educational provision;
- to reflect upon changes in student demand, employer expectations and employment opportunities, and to provide context for the development of any future University strategy for teaching provision and student support;
- to review the impact of changes (both cumulative and those made over time) on the design and delivery of the courses, and on provision of student support;
- to ensure the continuing availability of staff and other resources for the effective delivery of learning opportunities; and
- to reflect upon the impact of external changes and influences, including the requirements of any accrediting bodies or national or international stakeholders.

Periodic monitoring necessarily takes a broader view of the teaching provision, and would normally include advice and input from external participants of high calibre and with academic and/or professional credibility.

## 1.2 Types of periodic review

---

<sup>1</sup> UK Quality Code for Higher Education <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code>

<sup>2</sup> Further details of the conduct of annual reflective reviews can be found in the Handbook on Managing Taught Courses.

### 1.2.1 Introduction

Periodic review necessarily takes a broader view of the teaching provision than more regular reviews at a course level. The standard unit of periodic review has been determined by Senate to be the total provision (taught courses and research student provision) of a School. All Schools will normally be reviewed in this way at least once every six years.

Senate recognises that Council also conducts periodic reviews of Schools. Senate reviews would be distinct from these, as Council reviews encompass all aspects of a School's business and management. Senate reviews are restricted to scrutinising and evaluating the quality and standards of the academic provision and of the student experience, taking into consideration resource and staffing issues only where they impinge on that provision.

### 1.2.2 Types of periodic review

Senate further recognises that certain types of academic provision require a greater level of scrutiny that may not be captured at a School-level, or may cross School boundaries. It has therefore approved the following types of periodic review:

- a) **SENATE REVIEW OF A SCHOOL (SRS)**: to cover all learning and teaching delivered by a single School (i.e. all taught courses and individual modules which contribute to a named award of the University, and the general provision and support provided to all registered students, including research students).
- b) **FOCUSSED REVIEW (FR)**: particular types of provision to be reviewed at regular intervals (e.g. taught courses delivered with an academic partner) or reviews which may cover learning and teaching provision by more than one School (e.g. individual courses requiring significant co-ordination between Schools).
- c) **YEAR ONE PARTNERSHIP REVIEW (Y1PR)**: review of recently initiated teaching provision offered in conjunction with a partner organisation. It is expected that after the initial Y1PR such partnerships would undergo a Focused Review at least once every six years.
- d) **SPECIAL MEASURES REVIEW (SMR)**: not formally designated as recurring periodic reviews but to be applied if there are circumstances that require a regular and detailed intervention in an aspect of the University's academic provision. In these cases "periodic" may infer weeks or months rather than years, in contrast to the reviews outlined above.

### 1.2.3 General outline and conduct of periodic reviews

For the first three categories of review (SRS, FR and Y1PR), review panels will include a membership of Education Committee representatives or their nominees, Senate members, a student, and appropriate persons external to the University (where relevant). The review panel will be serviced by Education Services staff and will liaise with a specific nominated person from the School or area being reviewed.

The relevant Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Head of School) will be tasked with responding to the findings of the review panels for the SRS, FR and Y1PR reviews. A first response will be submitted to Education Committee shortly after the review, and a second made a year later (or six months later in respect of Y1PR). Upon receipt of these responses, Education Committee will decide if any further action is required.

By their nature, Special Measure Review panels will require bespoke membership, as the reviews represent more a programme of intervention. Education Committee will ask at least one Course Director from the same School, and at least one from outside the School, to meet with the course

team in an ongoing and structured way to help them prepare and progress an action plan. Administrative resource will be provided by the relevant School.

The action plan and regular updates will be presented to Education Committee until Education Committee, and the Head of School and Director of Education are all satisfied that the taught course is operating as it should and that no recurrence of issues are likely to present themselves.

This Handbook outlines in full the general conduct of all reviews, which in all cases requires the production of appropriate self-assessment briefing documents and the provision of standard sets of documentation, supported by other relevant material requested by the review panel or thought to be of relevance by those being reviewed.

### **1.3 Administrative arrangements**

The administrative arrangements for all Senate reviews will include support from Quality Assurance and Enhancement (for the general conduct of the review and its progression prior to and after completion) and from the area being reviewed (i.e. the School, course team or service department). In broad terms, administrative support should be provided by these two areas as outlined below.

A member of staff appointed by the Academic Registrar will provide Secretarial support to the review panel. Duties will include:

- (i) liaising with review panel members to agree how to proceed with the review. This will include a decision on how many meetings will be required and with whom. The Secretary is also responsible for passing this information to the area being reviewed;
- (ii) assisting external members with accommodation and parking arrangements, and expense claims;
- (iii) liaising with an identified administrative contact within the area being reviewed to ensure that appropriate documentation is provided to the review panel;
- (iv) taking notes of all meetings of the review panel where possible. In cases where the panel divides and holds separate meetings concurrently, it may be necessary for review panel members to compile appropriate notes;
- (v) producing, with the review panel, the final report; and
- (vi) sending the final review panel report to the area being reviewed to allow it to identify any factual inaccuracies and provide a response to Education Committee.

The area being reviewed will be responsible for a number of administrative arrangements:

- (i) identifying a key administrative contact to liaise with the Secretary;
- (ii) agreeing dates and times of meetings with the review panel members and the Secretary;
- (iii) organising the provision of documentation to be made available to the review panel; and
- (iv) arranging meetings that the review panel has requested, including booking meeting rooms, inviting and briefing relevant staff and students who the review panel wish to meet, and providing other facilities as required, such as telephone, printer, PC etc. Reasonable costs will be met by the relevant School.

## 2 Senate review of a School (SRS)

### 2.1 Introduction

A Senate review of a School (SRS) should cover all of the learning and teaching delivered by one of the four Schools of the University: this would include all taught courses and individual modules which contribute to a named award of the University, and the general provision and support provided to all registered students, including research students. The review process is likely to vary from school to school in detail, but will be conducted against common terms of reference (outlined in Section 2.3) and rules of engagement. The detailed conduct of a review will be discussed and agreed in advance with the relevant Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School), to ensure local structures and needs are taken into consideration, and to allow flexibility in the light of developing School structures.

### 2.2 Overall process and timeline

The conduct of a SRS takes two years: this includes a year of setting up and conducting the review itself, followed by a year in which the School will review and instigate any recommendations outlined in the report of the review panel. SRS reviews will be instigated at the start of the academic year, with the bulk of meetings between a review panel and staff and students of the School towards the end of the academic year, usually in June and July.

The general procedure for a SRS shall be as follows:

- Education Committee confirms with the School that it will be reviewed;
- the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education), the Academic Registrar (or appropriate deputies) and Quality Assurance and Enhancement will meet with the Head of School and School's Director of Education to discuss how the standard terms of reference (see Section 2.3) will be applied for their School, whether to include additional terms of reference, and how the School will present a self-evaluation at the outset to the appointed review panel;
- Quality Assurance and Enhancement will discuss (with the School, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education), the Cranfield Student Association (CSA) and others) nominations for the review panel and have a final panel confirmed by Education Committee. The membership of the review panel will be constructed along standard lines agreed in advance (see section 2.4);
- the School will produce its self-evaluation document, in an agreed format (see Section 2.5 for further guidance on what this might contain). This document should be both reflective and self-critical and should aim to help the review panel to identify where it should focus its attention. It is not intended that the briefing document be extensive (20-30 pages in length) as it will be supplemented with a range of supporting documentation (see Section 2.6);
- the review panel will receive the documentation and review it, to identify which areas of the provision it could usefully explore in more detail, and to consider how to undertake its further engagement with the School. The review panel may also consider at this point whether it requires changes or additions to its membership to conduct the review and discuss this with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) for approval;
- the review panel may decide for themselves how best to manage their investigations. It will articulate any further documentation it would like to receive and outline any meetings it may wish to have with relevant staff and students. It may also decide whether it may or may not need to form "sub-panels" to focus on specific areas within a School (e.g. a specific department, a set of courses, research student provision, the School's academic strategy etc.);

- the level of engagement with the School will normally entail a single “School visit day” in which all meetings will be scheduled, but in certain cases meetings may need to be scheduled over several separate days depending on the scope of the review and the availability of key members of staff;
- after the review panel has concluded all meetings and discussions, the Chair and Secretary will meet with the Head of School to convey its initial findings;
- a full report containing the review panel’s findings and recommendations will be sent to the Head of School for factual corrections and amendments. The Head of School will also be asked to make an initial response to the final agreed report, for consideration at Education Committee;
- Education Committee will review the report and the School response and articulate (if required) or approve a clear action plan for the School;
- the Head of School will be asked to make a further response to Education Committee one year after the review has taken place to report on progress. In exceptional circumstances, Education Committee may request this report to be submitted earlier if they have particular concerns about any aspect of the School’s provision;
- upon receipt of this second response, Education Committee will then decide if any further action is required. Once Education Committee are satisfied with the outcome of the action plan it will be considered that the conclusion of the process has been reached.



This timeline is also represented in the following table:

	EDUCATION COMMITTEE	SCHOOL	REVIEW PANEL
<b>Jun</b>	SRS for forthcoming year to be reviewed and the School notified	School confirms acceptance of being taken forward for review	
<b>Sep</b>	Confirmation of SRS. PVC-E, Academic Registrar, Head of School, DoE and Secretary meet to confirm terms of reference		
<b>Sep - Oct</b>	Officers instigate set-up of review panel	School prepares self-evaluation briefing document and supporting documents	
<b>Nov</b>	Confirms review panel membership and ToR		Secretary begins to arrange review timetable
<b>Dec</b>			
<b>Jan</b>			Secretary collates paperwork and organises the initial review panel meeting
<b>Feb</b>		Responds to panel requests and provides documentation	Meets to review documentation and highlight areas of focus, including any further information required and meetings to be held
<b>Mar – May</b>		Secretary arranges meetings between School and review panel	Panel members prepare for meetings
<b>Jun - Jul</b>		School visits are held	
<b>Jul - Aug</b>			Report is prepared and relayed to Education Services
<b>Aug - Sep</b>		School submits corrections and/or a response to the report to Education Committee	
<b>Sep</b>	Receives report and agrees future action plan for School		
<b>Aug (+ 1 year)</b>		School submits a further response outlining actions taken since the review and plans for the future	
<b>Sep (+ 1 year)</b>	Receives updated response		

## 2.3 Standard terms of reference

The following terms of reference have been approved to apply to each SRS. They may be supplemented by additional terms of reference proposed and agreed by Senate, Education Committee or the relevant Head of School.

### A. To determine the effectiveness of arrangements in the following areas of provision:

#### I. the School's academic portfolio:

- a. the management and development of the academic provision for taught courses and for research students (i.e. the rationale behind the range of current and proposed courses);
- b. the range of teaching methods employed across the School and their relevance to the academic provision;
- c. the range of assessment methods employed across the School and their relevance to the academic provision;
- d. the compatibility of the range of assessment methods employed across the School with the University's Assessment and Feedback strategy;

#### II. the School's learning resources:

- a. the teaching infrastructure (including facilities and administrative support);
- b. staffing levels, expertise and development;
- c. provision to support student learning, including facilities, environment and on-line learning resources;

#### III. cross-School provision and interaction, including the range of provision, and academic and administrative arrangements:

#### IV. teaching provision in association with academic or industrial partners, including the range of provision, and academic and administrative arrangements:

#### V. student support, including students on taught courses and research students:

- a. provision of information and guidance, on induction and throughout registration;
- b. development of individual learning and monitoring of progression;
- c. development of intellectual environment (i.e. the culture and ethos of the learning environment);
- d. management of both short- and long-term research projects;

#### VI. continuous improvement of the student experience:

- a. oversight of academic provision by School committees and officers;
- b. development of internal student feedback mechanisms, and use of feedback outcomes;
- c. use of external feedback, including feedback from students (satisfaction surveys – internal and HEA) and advisors (industrial advisory panels etc.);

### B. To identify interesting and/or innovative approaches to learning, teaching and assessment, which could be disseminated more widely.

## 2.4 Review panel membership

The review panel for a SRS will normally consist of the following members:

- a. **Chairperson** – the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) or a member of Education Committee, appointed by Education Committee on behalf of Senate, providing that he or she is not directly connected with the School being reviewed.
- b. **Senate Members** – at least two members of Senate who are not directly connected with the School, appointed by Education Committee on behalf of Senate.
- c. **External Members** – at least two persons from outside the University, who are of an appropriate standing to participate in a review of the academic activity of the School, appointed by Education Committee on behalf of Senate, and on the recommendation of the Head of the School being reviewed. (It would not be inappropriate if one of the external members of Council was appointed in this capacity.)
- d. **Student Representative** – a member of the CSA Executive or student body who is not directly connected to the School, appointed by Education Committee on behalf of Senate, on the nomination of the CSA Executive.
- e. **Secretary** – normally a member of Quality Assurance and Enhancement, appointed by Education Committee on behalf of Senate, and on the nomination of the Academic Registrar. The role of the Secretary is to provide authoritative guidance on review procedures and on University Regulations and external frameworks, and to help the review panel produce a final report.
- f. **Observer** – an academic member of staff from the School, whose role is to explain and clarify School practices and liaise with the review panel, appointed by the Head of the School being reviewed. The role of the observer is to attend review panel meetings and to aid the review panel in understanding or contextualising information provided by the School. The observer may be excluded from internal discussions of the review panel, if the panel so direct, but should be present at their discretion at all other meetings.

## 2.5 Self-evaluation document from the School

### 2.5.1 General outline

A key document in the review process will be the self-evaluation document provided by the School. While there is no expectation that this document is provided in a rigid and structured format, it is strongly recommended that the advice outlined below is followed to help construct the documentation produced for the review panel.

A few key principles should be followed:

- the document should address or otherwise reference all of the agreed terms of reference for the review;
- the document should provide a clear overall picture of the School's learning and teaching provision and the measures and mechanisms that operate to ensure it is of a high standard;
- the document should, however, also outline how the School assures itself that these high standards are achieved, maintained and enhanced;
- therefore, the document should be both reflective and self-critical and not simply limit itself to describing the School's internal processes;
- the document should draw attention to areas of provision where the School feels an external view would be helpful or instructive;

- the document should include appropriate appendices to support its main content (either in terms of supplementary documents or references to information made easily available elsewhere).

There is no prescribed length for the self-evaluation document: while it should be comprehensive and comprehensible, it is not intended that the document be so long that the audit team is unable to review or assess it within a reasonable timeframe. To that end, as a guide, the main body of the self-evaluation document should be between 20-30 pages, depending on the size of the School and the complexity of the provision.

Section 2.6.1 also outlines other documentation that will need to be provided by the School. Most of these should be in existence already, and do not represent additional work to be undertaken solely for the purposes of periodic review.

### 2.5.2 Constructing the self-evaluation document

The self-evaluation document should be reflective and self-critical. A suggested initial approach to constructing the document would be to take each of the individual terms of reference in turn and consider the following questions:

- how do you interpret the term of reference? (i.e. what do you think it refers to in the local context?)
- what structures are in place to address the activity outlined in the term of reference?
- how do those structures work in practice?
- what evidence is there to demonstrate that those practices work?
- why do you think this is the correct approach?
- have you considered ways in which structures and practices may be improved?

The first three questions articulate and describe activity and the last three should help to demonstrate a reflective approach to how it is undertaken.

**Example:**

*Term of Reference A.1.a. the management and development of the academic provision for taught courses and for research students (i.e. the rationale behind the range of current and proposed courses)*

With reference to the questions above, the self-evaluation document could outline:

- reference to a list of taught courses and research student provision, and how it corresponds to the Theme/Centre structure of the School, and links to any partners outside the School;  
- a description of the role of the School in having an overall view of the provision (with reference to an educational strategic plan);
- what committees exist to manage the academic portfolio?  
- are their specific personnel appointed with duties in this area, and what are their roles and remits?
- illustrate with examples of how the structures above work (e.g. if a lecturer wishes to introduce a new taught course, how is this taken forward? If a Course Director wishes to make changes to the structure of their course, how is this managed? How does the School co-ordinate its general training for new research students?)
- you could make references to where these structures have proved effective in facilitating developments: this should be evidenced with real examples (in appendices or as references to existing minutes or other documentation);
- you could provide examples of where your structures and procedures uncovered and resolved problems (e.g. a course overlap with one in another School);  
- you could also provide examples of where your structures failed to identify issues that later arose, along with explanations about why this may not be a systemic problem;  
- you could cite particular student feedback (e.g. on research student training courses);
- articulate when and how changes have been introduced, and the reasons behind them (e.g. reviewing the membership of a particular committee; the structure of a course manual or a module descriptor etc.);  
- you could also provide a brief commentary on how your structures compare to those elsewhere in the University, or in other universities, outlining why those alternatives would

not work in practice for your School or how they augment the strengths within your School.

*Please note that this example is not intended to be exhaustive.*

**Example:**

Term of Reference A.II.b. staffing levels, expertise and development

With reference to the questions above, the self-evaluation document could outline:

- a. - reference to the internal structure of the School and the delegation of duties to individual line managers;
- b. - outline how requirements for individual courses or research supervision needs feed upward through the School in order to inform budgetary and resourcing decisions;  
- outline how staff development is monitored and who is responsible for ensuring that staff are appropriately trained and qualified (with respect to their duties in delivering and supporting learning and teaching);
- c. - how are these structures articulated within the School, to ensure all staff are aware of their individual responsibilities?
- d. - have the reporting lines and monitoring practices resulted in appropriate changes and developments? Can this be illustrated with real examples?
- e. - you could provide examples of where particular needs have been considered and resolved (e.g. staff turnover resulting in changes to course curricula; recruitment of specific members of academic or administrative staff to address a particular deficiency);  
- you could also provide examples of where your structures failed to identify issues that later arose, along with explanations about why this may not be a systemic problem;  
- you could cite particular feedback (e.g. from advisory groups or external examiners);
- f. - articulate when and how changes have been introduced, and the reasons behind them (e.g. reviewing the impact of staff changes on the academic portfolio; articulation of lecturer's duties in providing appropriate feedback to students etc.)  
- you could also provide a brief commentary on how your structures compare to those elsewhere in the university, or in other universities, outlining why those alternatives would not work in practice for your School.

*Please note that this example is not intended to be exhaustive.*

The document, where appropriate, should also be used as an opportunity by the School to highlight where additional support or improved services from other parts of the University would impact positively on the Schools' provision and the quality of the student experience.

Finally, in drafting the document, the authors should not be discouraged from highlighting to the review panel any areas that they feel the School may be relatively weak in. An honest self-appraisal demonstrates that the School has appropriate structures and processes for identifying concerns or issues quickly and effectively, even if their resolution is difficult or complicated.

## 2.6 Supporting documentation

### 2.6.1 Documentation provided by the School

Prior to its first meeting, the SRS review panel shall receive from the School:

- i. the **self-evaluation briefing document** of the School. As part of the document the School should provide detail on its **educational strategic plan**, or provide information on the strategy behind the academic portfolio of the School.

The document should further include (as appendices)

- a **full list of courses** delivered by the School, including provision for research students and short course for credit.
  - a **summary table detailing academic staff** including Recognised Teachers.
  - a **full list of any partnerships involving academic provision** that the School is involved in.
- i. an **analysis of student trends**, which should be based on statistics in SITS provided by Education Services, covering recruitment and outcomes.
  - ii. documentation relating to **research student provision and support**:
    - a. the School's student handbook (or equivalent) for research students.
    - b. a document outlining the current status and progress of each research student in the School (including, as a minimum, the supervisors, and date and outcome of last formal progress review). *[Please note that the names of students should not be given, so that this information can be shared with the CSA representative student panel member.]*
  - iii. documentation relating to **taught student provision and support** for one or more taught courses or programmes, nominated in advance by the Chair of the SRS review panel after discussion with the Head of School, including:
    - a. the taught course handbook (or equivalent).
    - b. the course specification and module descriptors (if these are not provided in the taught course handbook).
    - c. External examiner reports and responses (where available) for the previous three years.

The review panel should also have access to standard pre-existing supporting documentation:

- i. **summaries of ARR reports** for at least the previous three years (where they exist), and any commentaries on individual reports submitted by student representatives.
- ii. **a list of missing Annual Reflective Review (ARR) reports** for taught courses, for the last three years
- iii. **summary of external examiner reports and responses (where available)**, for the last three years, to include a list of missing external examiners reports.
- iv. **any final reports from accreditation bodies**, for current or recently-lapsed accreditation.

### 2.6.2 Documentation provided by the office of the Academic Registrar

Prior to its first meeting, the SRS review panel shall receive from the Academic Registrar, or members of his or her Department:

- i. a **report from Education Committee** prepared specially for the review, highlighting any matters raised about the School since its last review.
- ii. a **report from the Academic Registrar** prepared specially for the review, outlining his or her findings regarding appeals, complaints and cases of general or academic misconduct relevant to the School being reviewed.

### 2.6.3 Other documentation to be collected by the Secretary to the review panel

Prior to the review panel's first meeting, the Secretary shall request the following further documentation:

- i. a **report from the School student representatives**, if they choose to make one.

## 2.7 Report from the review panel

### 2.7.1 General outline

At the end of the process, the review panel shall produce a report for Education Committee to consider. The final report of the review panel will be subject to factual corrections proposed by the School, and will be accompanied by a response from the Head of School

The purpose of the review panel report is to provide assurance to Senate and Education Committee that the School is undertaking its roles and responsibilities in the delivery of a high standard of education provision and student experience (in relation to learning and teaching activities). It also serves to highlight to Senate and Education Committee any current or potential concerns or issues that may require immediate redress or future management. Finally, the report should also highlight good practice identified by the members of the review panel that are particularly commendable and/or worth disseminating more widely throughout the University.

The reports will be retained and may be used in future Senate or Council reviews, and as evidence in external audits, reviews or accreditation exercises.

### 2.7.2 Structure of the review panel report

The review panel is advised to structure its report to include the following sections:

- summary of main findings and broad conclusions;
- brief commentary on the review panel's investigations under each of the approved terms of reference; one or more sections outlining the areas in which the review panel focussed their investigations, and their detailed findings;
- a digest of commendations and recommendations for action or improvement;
- an appendix, outlining the evidence base used in the periodic review (i.e. a list of documents and meetings held).

There is no formal requirement for the review panel to adopt this structure, as it should feel free to provide a report that it feels best articulates its findings. Significant deviations from the above format, however, should be preceded with a clear explanation about the reasons for departing from the expected structure.

#### Summary of main findings

The report should be preceded with an executive summary, which captures the main elements of the report and its findings, and could be read as a standalone summary. It should include a broad overview of the review panel's assessment of the School's approach to the provision, maintenance and development of its educational provision.

#### Commentary on terms of reference

One of the objectives for the review panel will be to demonstrate that they have considered each of the terms of reference for the SRS (i.e. both the standard terms of reference outlined in section 2.3 above and any additional terms of reference for the review). It would be appropriate for the review panel to structure this section using the terms of reference as individual headings and outlining:

- a précis of how its investigations covered this term of reference (this will include reference to documentation received and meetings undertaken, including the nature of any exploratory discussions);
- a statement of whether the School's structures and procedures are exemplary, adequate or inadequate, with appropriate evidence;

- a list of any interesting and/or innovative approaches in that area, for which the School should be commended;
- any recommendations the review panel would like to make for either the School or other areas of the University to consider, including suggestions for appropriate courses of action.

The review panel is not required to provide an exhaustive account under each heading, but should include enough information in its report to demonstrate that its investigations covered that area of provision. It is acceptable for the review panel to make no commendations or recommendations, if they are satisfied that the School's activities are being appropriately managed.

#### Detailed investigations

In any review, the review panel will likely identify either particular aspects of the academic provision or specific issues or processes that they have decided to focus on in their discussions. It is therefore appropriate that the report covers these investigations in more detail and outside the context of the necessarily broad terms of reference.

Each report of detailed investigation should be structured in a similar manner above, with some indication from the review panel about why it was interested in exploring that area.

#### Digest of commendations and recommendations

To facilitate the School's consideration of the report, and its review by Education Committee, the report should include a summary or digest of commendations and recommendations in the report, with references to the main body of the text for reference.

#### Appendix

The appendix should include sufficient information for Education Committee to understand how the SRS was conducted by the review panel. It should outline the evidence base used in the review (i.e. a list of documents and meetings held). In order to facilitate the enhancement of future SRSs, the appendix may also include feedback or suggestions to Senate and Education Committee for improvement of the process, or outline ways in which the current review was conducted that could usefully be avoided or improved.

### **2.7.3 School response to the review panel report**

At the end of the review process, the Head of School will be invited in the first instance to consider the report and, if necessary, discuss any factual inaccuracies or ambiguities that should be amended for the final version. This may require further meetings between the Head of School and the Chair of the review panel, if such corrections are not straightforward.

Once a final version of the report has been agreed, the Head of School will be invited to produce a response to the report to Education Committee. There is no required structure or format for this response, but the Head of School should ensure that it acknowledges or otherwise comments on each of the commendations and recommendations made by the review panel. (There may be some which refer to activities or responsibilities outwith the School being reviewed, and this is an opportunity for the Head of School to support or otherwise comment on the points made.)

Where the number of recommendations is extensive or complex, it may be appropriate for the Head of School to include or append a formal action plan.

### **2.7.4 Final consideration by Education Committee**

The Head of School and the Chair of the review panel will be invited to Education Committee to discuss the report and the School response to it. In its discussions, Education Committee will either



approve the actions proposed by the Head of School, or agree with him or her alternative courses of action.

Where commendations and recommendations relate to activities or action required in other parts of the University, Education Committee will articulate how those will be followed up, and will manage future engagement with any progress required.

One year after the completion of the SRS and the agreement of any courses of action, Education Committee will conduct a progress review, through the submission of a statement or report from the Head of School. In most cases, it is unlikely that further meetings between Education Committee and the Head of School would be required, but Education Committee will reserve the right to invite the Head of School to attend for further discussion.

## 3 Focussed review (FR)

### 3.1 Introduction

Focussed reviews would be instigated by Education Committee, either to address monitoring exercises that form part of the University Laws and Regulations, or in response to a particular need. Examples of where Focussed reviews would take place on a regular cycle would be:

- learning and teaching provision involving significant contributions from a partner institution (e.g. joint provision between the University and another academic institution, or provision validated by the University in its entirety);
- reviews which may cover learning and teaching provision by more than one School (e.g. individual courses requiring significant co-ordination between Schools).

The review process for each Focussed review will vary considerably, with terms of references being set out at the point at which the review is instigated. Various standard sets of terms of reference have been developed over time (outlined in Appendices), which Education Committee may use as a starting point for outlining detailed and specific terms of reference. The detailed conduct of a review will be discussed and agreed in advance with the relevant parties, to ensure that the purpose of any review is clear at the outset and to ensure that all needs or restrictions are taken into consideration.

Focussed reviews will necessarily concentrate on issues or themes relating to learning and teaching. They may or may not involve engagement with or review of service departments within the University (e.g. library services, IT-related learning support, academic staff development). Any recommendations arising from Focussed reviews will be considered by Education Committee, which will restrict ongoing transmission of recommendations to the appropriate bodies within the University for further review or action.

### 3.2 Overall process and timeline

The conduct of a FR takes twelve months: this includes six months of setting up and conducting the review itself, followed by six months in which any recommendations approved by Education Committee are instigated or otherwise referred. FR reviews will likely commence at the start of the academic year, with the bulk of meetings arranged by a review panel in February and March (although Education Committee may implement a FR at any time in the academic calendar).

Education Committee will therefore keep under review a programme of FRs across the University, and determine at its first meeting in any academic year which reviews (if any) are to be conducted in the forthcoming cycle. Themes for Focussed review may be proposed by any member of staff or the CSA Executive, who will be asked to provide Education Committee with a rationale for their request.

The general pattern on a FR shall be as follows:

- Education Committee considers and confirms whether any FRs are to be undertaken in an academic year;
- in confirming a review, it shall consult with Quality Assurance and Enhancement to identify a Chairperson (Chair), appropriate terms of reference and to outline, where appropriate, what documentation it would expect to be included in any review;
- the Chair and Quality Assurance and Enhancement will then meet with the key parties to discuss how to interpret the agreed terms of reference (see Section 3.3), how an initial set of documentation (including any self-evaluation) will be produced and the deadlines for submission of the documentation for the appointed review panel;

- the Chair and Quality Assurance and Enhancement will discuss with key parties, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education), and the Cranfield Student Association (CSA) nominations for the review panel and have a final panel confirmed by Education Committee. The membership of the review panel will be constructed along standard lines agreed in advance (see section 3.4);
- documentation in the agreed format will be submitted and the review panel will review it, to identify which areas of the provision it could usefully explore in more detail, and to consider how to undertake further engagement with relevant people. The review panel may also consider at this point whether it requires changes or additions to its membership to conduct the review and discuss this with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) for approval;
- the review panel may decide for themselves how best to manage their investigations. It will articulate any further documentation it would like to receive and outline any meetings it may wish to have with relevant staff and students. It may also decide whether it may or may not need to form “sub-panels” to focus on specific areas;
- meetings may either be concentrated into a single day of investigations, or scheduled over several separate days depending on the scope of the review and the availability of key members of staff;
- after the review panel has concluded all meetings and discussions, the Chair and Secretary will co-ordinate the production of a full report containing the review panel’s findings. The content of the report may be shared with key parties for factual corrections and amendments, along with a request for a response to the final agreed report, for consideration at Education Committee;
- Education Committee will review the report and any responses and articulate (if required) or approve a clear action plan;
- Education Committee will receive a progress report on the action plan twelve months after the review has taken place. In exceptional circumstances, Education Committee may request this report to be submitted earlier if they have any particular short-term concerns;
- Education Committee will then decide if any further action is required. Once Education Committee are satisfied with the outcome of the action plan it will be considered that the conclusion of the process has been reached.

This timeline is also represented in the following table:

	EDUCATION COMMITTEE	QUALITY ASSURANCE & ENHANCEMENT	PROVIDERS	REVIEW PANEL
<b>Jun</b>	Discussion of any planned FRs for forthcoming year: relevant key parties ("providers") notified			
<b>Jul</b>	Confirmation of FR  Chair and QA&E meet to discuss and articulate terms of reference (ToR)  Chair and QA&E meet with key parties to interpret ToR and agree contacts and deadlines for submission of documentation		Confirm acceptance of being taken forward for review	
<b>Jul -Sep</b>		QA&E instigate set-up of review panel	Prepare initial documentation	
<b>Oct</b>	Confirms review panel membership and ToR			Secretary begins to arrange review timetable
<b>Nov</b>				Secretary collates paperwork and organises the initial review panel meeting
<b>Dec</b>				Meets to review documentation and highlight areas of focus, including any further information required and meetings to be held
<b>Jan - Feb</b>			Respond to panel requests and provide documentation  Secretary arranges meetings between relevant students and staff and the review panel	
				Panel members prepare for meetings
<b>Feb - Mar</b>			Meetings are held	
<b>Mar - Apr</b>				Report is prepared.
<b>May</b>		Submit report and response to Education Committee	Submit corrections and/or a response to the report to Education Committee via QA&E	
<b>June</b>	Receives report and agrees future action plan			
<b>June (+ 1 year)</b>	Receives updated response	Submit updated response to Education Committee	Submit further response(s) outlining actions taken since the review and plans for the future	

### 3.3 Standard terms of reference

By definition, there are no standard terms of reference for a FR. Education Committee has developed a range of “starting point” terms of reference with which to frame individual FRs. These are included as Appendices to this Handbook.

Terms of reference for any single FR shall be discussed with relevant parties across the University, but the final terms of reference shall be set and approved by Education Committee, or by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) if timescales do not permit a formal meeting.

### 3.4 Review panel membership

The review panel for a FR will normally consist of the following members:

- a. **Chairperson** – the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) or a member of Education Committee, appointed by Education Committee on behalf of Senate, providing that he or she is sufficiently independent of the FR taking place.
- b. **Senate Members** – at least two members of Senate who are not directly connected with the scope of the FR (wherever possible), appointed by Education Committee on behalf of Senate.
- c. **External Members** – at least one external member for reviews of taught provision delivered with academic partners, or for the review of an individual taught course. Education Committee may determine for itself who may be appropriate to nominate as an external member for any individual FR. It would not be inappropriate if one of the external members of Council was appointed in this capacity.
- d. **Student Representative** – a member of the CSA Executive or student body who is not directly connected to the scope of the FR (wherever possible), appointed by Education Committee on behalf of Senate, on the nomination of the CSA Executive. The student representative is expected to consult with and represent the views of students on the courses concerned.
- e. **Secretary** – normally a member of Quality Assurance and Enhancement, appointed by Education Committee on behalf of Senate, and on the nomination of the Academic Registrar. The role of the Secretary is to provide authoritative guidance on review procedures and on University Regulations and external frameworks, and to help the review panel produce a final report.

### 3.5 Conduct of the Focussed review

The conduct of any FR shall be under the direction of the appointed review panel. The broad outline is indicated in section 3.2 above.

Initially, the review panel shall receive and review documentation pulled together by the Secretary, who may delegate its production or collation to appropriate staff in one or more Schools.

Where documentation that needs to be produced specifically for the review (e.g. a self-evaluation by academic staff), it should be drafted in accordance with the principles and advice outlined in section 2.5 (for Senate Reviews of Schools), specifically any document should:

- address or otherwise reference all of the agreed terms of reference for the review;
- provide a clear overall picture of the learning and teaching provision under review, and the measures and mechanisms that operate to ensure it is of a high standard;

- be both reflective and self-critical and not simply limit itself to describing processes, procedures or data;
- draw attention to areas of provision where the author feels an external view would be helpful or instructive;
- include appropriate appendices to support its main content (either in terms of supplementary documents or references to information made easily available elsewhere).

Upon receipt of the initial documentation, the review panel will consider which areas of the provision it could usefully explore in more detail, and how to undertake further engagement with relevant people. This may involve requests for further documentation and specific meetings with staff and/or students.

Where a review includes provision from outside the University, the review panel will determine as soon as practicable (usually immediately or soon after their initial meeting) whether off-site visits will be necessary as part of their undertakings, and whether any off-site visit will require a formal tour of facilities (and what this may include). The costs of any off-site visit shall be met by the School(s) associated with the provision, which may or may not make arrangements to pass on or share costs with any partner. Guidance and report template for periodic off-site visits is available at <https://intranet.cranfield.ac.uk/EducationServices/Pages/Registryforms.aspx>

## **3.6 Report from the review panel**

### **3.6.1 General outline**

At the end of the process, the review panel shall produce a report for Education Committee to consider. The final report of the review panel will be subject to factual corrections proposed by key parties associated with the FR, and may be accompanied by additional commentaries or responses.

The purpose of the review panel report is to provide assurance to Senate and Education Committee that the learning and teaching provision and associated student experiences are of a high standard, and that those responsible for delivering the provision are undertaking their roles and responsibilities in an appropriate way. It also serves to highlight to Senate and Education Committee any current or potential concerns or issues that may require immediate redress or future management. Finally, the report should also highlight good practice identified by the members of the review panel that are particularly commendable and/or worth disseminating more widely throughout the University.

The reports will be retained and may be used in future Senate or Council reviews, and as evidence in external audits, reviews or accreditation exercises.

### **3.6.2 Structure of the review panel report**

The review panel is advised to structure its report to include the following sections:

- summary of main findings and broad conclusions;
- brief commentary on the review panel's investigations under each of the approved terms of reference; one or more sections outlining the areas in which the review panel focussed their investigations, and their detailed findings;
- a digest of commendations and recommendations for action or improvement;
- an appendix, outlining the evidence base used in the periodic review (i.e. a list of documents and meetings held).

There is no formal requirement for the review panel to adopt this structure, as it should feel free to provide a report that it feels best articulates its findings. Significant deviations from the above format, however, should be preceded with a clear explanation about the reasons for departing from the expected structure.

## Summary of main findings

The report should be preceded with an executive summary, which captures the main elements of the report and its findings, and could be read as a standalone summary. It should include a broad overview of the review panel's assessment of the School's approach to the provision, maintenance and development of its educational provision.

## Commentary on terms of reference

One of the objectives for the review panel will be to demonstrate that they have considered each of the terms of reference for the FR. It would be appropriate for the review panel to structure this section using the terms of reference as individual headings and outlining:

- a précis of how its investigations covered this term of reference (this will include reference to documentation received and meetings undertaken, including the nature of any exploratory discussions);
- a statement of whether the relevant structures and procedures are exemplary, adequate or inadequate, with appropriate evidence;
- a list of any interesting and/or innovative approaches in that area, which are worthy of commendation;
- any recommendations the review panel would like to make, including suggestions for appropriate courses of action.

The review panel is not required to provide an exhaustive account under each heading, but should include enough information in its report to demonstrate that its investigations covered that area of provision. It is acceptable for the review panel to make no commendations or recommendations, if they are satisfied that the School's activities are being appropriately managed.

## Detailed investigations

In any review, the review panel will likely identify either particular aspects of the academic provision or specific issues or processes that they have decided to focus on in their discussions. It is therefore appropriate that the report covers these investigations in more detail and outside the context of the necessarily broad terms of reference.

Each report of detailed investigation should be structured in a similar manner to that above, with some indication from the review panel about why it was interested in exploring that area.

## Digest of commendations and recommendations

To facilitate consideration of the report, and its review by Education Committee, the report should include a summary or digest of commendations and recommendations in the report, with references to the main body of the text for reference.

## Appendix

The appendix should include sufficient information for Education Committee to understand how the FR was conducted by the review panel. It should outline the evidence base used in the review (i.e. a list of documents and meetings held). In order to facilitate the enhancement of future FRs, the appendix may also include feedback or suggestions to Senate and Education Committee for improvement of the process, or outline ways in which the current review was conducted that could usefully be avoided or improved.

### **3.6.3 Responses to the review panel report**

At the end of the review process, the review panel, in consultation with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) (if appropriate) shall identify those persons who it feels should have an opportunity to comment on its findings. Each of these will be invited in the first instance to consider the report and, if necessary, discuss any factual inaccuracies or ambiguities that should be amended for the final version. This may require further meetings with the Chair of the review panel, if such corrections are not straightforward.

Once a final version of the report has been agreed, they will then be invited to produce a response to the report to Education Committee. There is no required structure or format for this response, but any response should acknowledge or otherwise comment on any of the directly-relevant commendations and recommendations made by the review panel.

Where the number of recommendations is extensive or complex, it may be appropriate for a response to include a formal action plan.

### **3.6.4 Final consideration by Education Committee**

Education Committee will receive and consider the report of the review panel and any responses: it shall then either approve any actions proposed, or agree alternative courses of action. Education Committee shall also articulate how each recommendation will be followed up, and will manage future engagement with any progress required.

Twelve months after the completion of the FR and the agreement of any courses of action, Education Committee will conduct a progress review, through the submission of statements or reports from relevant parties. Education Committee will reserve the right to invite specific members of staff or students to attend its meeting for further discussion.

- Once Education Committee are satisfied with the outcome of the action plan it will be considered that the conclusion of the process has been reached.



## 4 Year One Partnership review (Y1PR)

### 4.1 Introduction

Year One Partnership reviews will be instigated by Education Committee one year after initiation of a new partnership involving academic (award bearing) provision. These should be seen as a supportive framework to assist the Sponsoring School and its new Partner Institution to work collaboratively to ensure that:

- the learning and teaching provision and associated student experiences are of a high standard;
- those responsible for delivering the provision are undertaking their respective roles and responsibilities in an appropriate way.

The review process for each Year One Partnership review will vary considerably, with terms of reference being set out at the point at which the review is instigated. Various standard sets of terms of reference have been developed over time (outlined in Appendices), which Education Committee may use as a starting point for outlining detailed and specific terms of reference. The detailed conduct of a review will be discussed and agreed in advance with the relevant parties, to ensure that the purpose of any review is clear at the outset and to ensure that all needs or restrictions are taken into consideration.

Year One Partnership reviews will concentrate on the practicalities of supporting and delivering the partnership. The review will involve engagement with service departments within the University that are actively involved with the delivery of the partnership (e.g. education services, library services, IT-related learning support, academic staff development). Any recommendations arising from Year One Partnership reviews will be considered by Education Committee, which will restrict ongoing transmission of recommendations to the appropriate bodies within the University for further review or action.

### 4.2 Overall process and timeline

The conduct of a Y1PR takes approximately twelve months (dependent upon the nature of the partnership) : this includes six months of setting up and conducting the review itself, followed by six months in which any recommendations approved by Education Committee are instigated or otherwise referred.

The general pattern on a Y1PR shall be as follows:

- Education Committee considers and confirms whether any Y1PRs are to be undertaken in an academic year;
- in confirming a review, it shall consult with Quality Assurance and Enhancement to identify a Chair, appropriate terms of reference and to outline, where appropriate, what documentation it would expect to be included in any review;
- the Chair and Quality Assurance and Enhancement will then meet with the key parties to discuss how to interpret the agreed terms of reference (see Section 4.3), how an initial set of documentation (including any self-evaluation) will be produced and the deadlines for submission of the documentation for the appointed review panel;
- the Chair and Quality Assurance and Enhancement will discuss with key parties, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education), and the Cranfield Student Association (CSA) nominations for the review panel and have a final panel confirmed by Education Committee. The membership of the review panel will be constructed along standard lines agreed in advance (see section 4.4);

- documentation in the agreed format will be submitted and the review panel will review it, to identify which areas of the provision it could usefully explore in more detail, and to consider how to undertake further engagement with relevant people. The review panel may also consider at this point whether it requires changes or additions to its membership to conduct the review and discuss this with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) for approval;
- the review panel may decide for themselves how best to manage their investigations. It will articulate any further documentation it would like to receive and outline any meetings it may wish to have with relevant staff and students. It may also decide whether it may or may not need to form “sub-panels” to focus on specific areas;
- meetings may either be concentrated into a single day of investigations, or scheduled over several separate days depending on the scope of the review and the availability of key members of staff;
- after the review panel has concluded all meetings and discussions, the Chair and Secretary will co-ordinate the production of a full report containing the review panel’s findings. The content of the report may be shared with key parties for factual corrections and amendments, along with a request for a response to the final agreed report, for consideration at Education Committee;
- Education Committee will review the report and any responses and articulate (if required) or approve a clear action plan;
- Education Committee will receive a progress report on the action plan six months after the review has taken place. In exceptional circumstances, Education Committee may request this report to be submitted earlier if they have any particular short-term concerns;
- Education Committee will then decide if any further action is required. Once Education Committee are satisfied with the outcome of the action plan it will be considered that the conclusion of the process has been reached.

This timeline is also represented in the following table:

	<b>EDUCATION COMMITTEE</b>	<b>QUALITY ASSURANCE &amp; ENHANCEMENT</b>	<b>PROVIDERS</b>	<b>REVIEW PANEL</b>
<b>Jun</b>	Discussion of any planned Y1PRs for forthcoming year: relevant key parties ("providers") notified			
<b>Jul</b>	Confirmation of Y1PR  Chair and QA&E meet to discuss and articulate terms of reference (ToR)  Chair and QA&E meet with key parties to interpret ToR and agree contacts and deadlines for submission of documentation		Confirm acceptance of being taken forward for review	
<b>Jul -Sep</b>		QA&E instigate set-up of review panel	Prepare initial documentation	
<b>Oct</b>	Confirms review panel membership and ToR			Secretary begins to arrange review timetable
<b>Nov</b>				Secretary collates paperwork and organises the initial review panel meeting
<b>Dec</b>				Meets to review documentation and highlight areas of focus, including any further information required and meetings to be held
<b>Jan - Feb</b>			Respond to panel requests and provide documentation  Secretary arranges meetings between relevant students and staff and the review panel	Panel members prepare for meetings
<b>Feb - Mar</b>			Meetings are held	
<b>Mar - Apr</b>				Report is prepared.
<b>May</b>		Submit report and response to Education Committee	Submit corrections and/or a response to the report to Education Committee via QA&E	
<b>June</b>	Receives report and agrees future action plan			
<b>Dec</b>	Receives updated response	Submit updated response to Education Committee	Submit further response(s) outlining actions taken since the review and plans for the future	

### 4.3 Standard terms of reference

The characteristics of each academic partnership are unique and therefore, by definition, there are no standard terms of reference for a Y1PR. Education Committee have developed a range of “starting point” terms of reference with which to frame individual Y1PRs. These are included as Appendices to this Handbook.

Terms of reference for any Review shall be discussed with relevant parties across the University, but the final terms of reference shall be set and approved by Education Committee, or by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education), if timescales do not permit a formal meeting.

### 4.4 Review panel membership

The review panel for a Y1PR will consist of the following members:

- f. **Chairperson** – the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) or a member of Education Committee, appointed by Education Committee on behalf of Senate, providing that he or she is sufficiently independent of the Y1PR taking place.
- g. **Senate Members** – at least one member of Senate who is not directly connected with the scope of the Y1PR (wherever possible), appointed by Education Committee on behalf of Senate.
- h. **Student Representative** – a member of the CSA Executive or student body who is not directly connected to the scope of the Y1PR (wherever possible), appointed by Education Committee on behalf of Senate, on the nomination of the CSA Executive. The student representative is expected to consult with and represent the views of students on the courses concerned.
- i. **Secretary** – normally a member of Quality Assurance and Enhancement, appointed by Education Committee on behalf of Senate, and on the nomination of the Academic Registrar. The role of the Secretary is to provide authoritative guidance on review procedures and on University Regulations and external frameworks, and to help the review panel produce a final report.

### 4.5 Conduct of the Year One Partnership review

The conduct of any Y1PR shall be under the direction of the appointed review panel. The broad outline is indicated in section 4.2 above.

Initially, the review panel shall receive and review documentation pulled together by the Secretary, who may delegate its production or collation to appropriate staff in one or more Schools.

Where documentation that needs to be produced specifically for the review (e.g. a self-evaluation by academic staff on all sides of the Partnership) it should be drafted in accordance with the principles and advice outlined in section 2.5 (for Senate Reviews of Schools), specifically any document should:

- address or otherwise reference all of the agreed terms of reference for the review;
- provide a clear overall picture of the operation of the partnership, and the measures and mechanisms that are in place ensure it is of a high standard;
- be both reflective and self-critical and not simply limit itself to describing processes, procedures or data;
- draw attention to areas of provision where the author feels improvements could be made and an external view would be helpful or instructive;
- include appropriate appendices to support its main content (either in terms of supplementary documents or references to information made easily available elsewhere).

Upon receipt of the initial documentation, the review panel will consider which areas of the provision it could usefully explore in more detail, and how to undertake further engagement with relevant people. This may involve requests for further documentation and specific meetings with staff from both the host School and the Partner Institution and/or students.

For a Y1PR the review panel will determine as soon as practicable (usually immediately or soon after their initial meeting) whether off-site visits will be necessary as part of their undertakings, and whether any off-site visit will require a formal tour of facilities (and what this may include). The costs of any off-site visit shall be met by the School(s) associated with the provision, which may or may not make arrangements to pass on or share costs with any partner. Guidance and report template for periodic off-site visits is available at <https://intranet.cranfield.ac.uk/EducationServices/Pages/Registryforms.aspx>.

## **4.6 Report from the review panel**

### **4.6.1 General outline**

At the end of the process, the review panel shall produce a report for Education Committee to consider. The final report of the review panel will be subject to factual corrections proposed by key parties associated with the Y1PR, and may be accompanied by additional commentaries or responses.

The purpose of the review panel report is to provide assurance to Senate and Education Committee that the learning and teaching provision and associated student experiences are of a high standard, and that those responsible for collaborating in delivering the provision are undertaking their roles and responsibilities in an appropriate way. It also serves to highlight to Senate and Education Committee any current or potential concerns or issues that may require immediate redress or future management. Finally, the report should also highlight good practice identified by the members of the review panel that are particularly commendable and/or worth disseminating more widely throughout the University.

The reports will be retained and may be used in future Senate or Council reviews, and as evidence in external audits, reviews or accreditation exercises.

### **4.6.2 Structure of the review panel report**

The review panel is advised to structure its report to include the following sections:

- summary of main findings and broad conclusions;
- brief commentary on the review panel's investigations under each of the approved terms of reference; one or more sections outlining the areas in which the review panel focussed their investigations, and their detailed findings;
- a digest of commendations and recommendations for action or improvement;
- an appendix, outlining the evidence base used in the periodic review (i.e. a list of documents and meetings held).

There is no formal requirement for the review panel to adopt this structure, as it should feel free to provide a report that it feels best articulates its findings. Significant deviations from the above format, however, should be preceded with a clear explanation about the reasons for departing from the expected structure.

#### Summary of main findings

The report should be preceded with an executive summary, which captures the main elements of the report and its findings, and could be read as a standalone summary. It should include a broad

overview of the review panel's assessment of the School's approach to the maintenance and development of its educational provision with the Partner Institution.

#### Commentary on terms of reference

One of the objectives for the review panel will be to demonstrate that they have considered each of the terms of reference for the Y1PR. It would be appropriate for the review panel to structure this section using the terms of reference as individual headings and outlining:

- a précis of how its investigations covered this term of reference (this will include reference to documentation received and meetings undertaken, including the nature of any exploratory discussions);
- a statement of whether the relevant structures and procedures are exemplary, adequate or inadequate, with appropriate evidence;
- a list of any interesting and/or innovative approaches in that area, which are worthy of commendation;
- any recommendations the review panel would like to make, including suggestions for appropriate courses of action.

The review panel is not required to provide an exhaustive account under each heading, but should include enough information in its report to demonstrate that its investigations covered that area of provision. It is acceptable for the review panel to make no commendations or recommendations, if they are satisfied that the School's activities are being appropriately managed.

#### Detailed investigations

In any review, the review panel will likely identify either particular aspects of the academic provision or specific issues or processes that they have decided to focus on in their discussions. It is therefore appropriate that the report covers these investigations in more detail and outside the context of the necessarily broad terms of reference.

Each report of detailed investigation should be structured in a similar manner to that above, with some indication from the review panel about why it was interested in exploring that area.

#### Digest of commendations and recommendations

To facilitate consideration of the report, and its review by Education Committee, the report should include a summary or digest of commendations and recommendations in the report, with references to the main body of the text for reference.

#### Appendix

The appendix should include sufficient information for Education Committee to understand how the Y1PR was conducted by the review panel. It should outline the evidence base used in the review (i.e. a list of documents and meetings held). In order to facilitate the enhancement of future Y1PRs, the appendix may also include feedback or suggestions to Senate and Education Committee for improvement of the process, or outline ways in which the current review was conducted that could usefully be avoided or improved.

#### **4.6.3 Responses to the review panel report**

At the end of the review process, the review panel, in consultation with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) (if appropriate) shall identify those persons who it feels should have an opportunity to comment on its findings. Each of these will be invited in the first instance to consider the report and, if necessary, discuss any factual inaccuracies or ambiguities that should be amended for the final

version. This may require further meetings with the Chair of the review panel, if such corrections are not straightforward.

Once a final version of the report has been agreed, they will then be invited to produce a response to the report to Education Committee. There is no required structure or format for this response, but any response should acknowledge or otherwise comment on any of the directly-relevant commendations and recommendations made by the review panel.

Where the number of recommendations is extensive or complex, it may be appropriate for a response to include a formal action plan.

#### **4.6.4 Final consideration by Education Committee**

Education Committee will receive and consider the report of the review panel and any responses: it shall then either approve any actions proposed, or agree alternative courses of action. Education Committee shall also articulate how each recommendation will be followed up, and will manage future engagement with any progress required.

Six months after the completion of the Y1PR and the agreement of any courses of action, Education Committee will conduct a progress review, through the submission of statements or reports from relevant parties. Education Committee will reserve the right to invite specific members of staff or students to attend its meeting for further discussion.

Once Education Committee are satisfied with the outcome of the action plan it will be considered that the conclusion of the process has been reached.

## 5 Special Measures review (SMR)

As outlined above, Special Measures Reviews are not intended for regular reviews of academic provision but instead are instigated if Education Committee believes a proactive intervention is required. This may be instigated through a number of routes:

- concerns raised by the Director of Education, or by the relevant Head of School, about operational practices;
- concerns raised by significant numbers of students, or by the Cranfield Students' Association, as a result of unresolved formal or informal complaints about the quality or standards of the academic provision or associated learning support;
- concerns raised by the Academic Registrar, if it comes to his or her attention that activity (or lack of activity) may represent a reputational risk to the University.

Unlike standard reviews of learning and teaching, SMRs act to examine operational activities over an extended period of time, with a view to providing recommendations for the course team to take forward to address any alleged shortcomings. This period of time is likely to be a few weeks, but may continue if matters remain unresolved.

In setting up a SMR panel, Education Committee will appoint one of its members as Chair. It will also appoint at least one Course Director from the same School, and at least one member of academic staff from outside the School, to meet with the course team in an ongoing and structured way to help them review any alleged concerns or deficiencies. Administrative resource will be provided by the relevant School.

The scope of any SMR, and any associated terms of reference of the panel, will be agreed by Education Committee, in consultation with the relevant Head of School. The SMR panel will be expected to draw up an action plan, which will be agreed with the course team and the Head of School.

While an SMR is in progress, the Chair of the SMR panel will provide verbal updates at Education Committee, and will submit any draft or agreed action plans. The SMR panel will exist until Education Committee, and the relevant Head of School and relevant Director of Education are all satisfied that the area(s) of provision is operating as it should and that no recurrence of issues are likely to present themselves.

Education Committee may reserve the right to instigate a Focussed Review following a Special Measures Review.



# Appendix A Focussed Review: template 1

## Review of a single taught course

### A.1 Introduction

The following terms of reference and suggested set of documentation apply to a review of a single taught course (rather than the provision associated with a “unit” within the University).

### A.2 Terms of reference

A. To determine the effectiveness of arrangements in the following areas of provision:

I. the provision made by the course team:

- a. the accuracy of formal and student-focussed documentation relating to the course, including the course specification documents, module descriptors, any statements of provision and annual monitoring statements, student handbooks, and other guidance documents;
- b. the arrangements for the monitoring, review and development of the course, including the structures in place to manage input from any partners as appropriate;
- c. the day-to-day management and administration of the taught course;
- d. the range of teaching methods within the taught course, their relevance to the academic provision and their appropriateness to any local or cultural contexts;
- e. the range of assessment methods within the taught course, their relevance to the academic provision and their appropriateness to any local or cultural contexts.
- f. the compatibility of the range of assessment methods employed across the course with the University’s Assessment and Feedback strategy;

II. learning resources:

- a. the teaching infrastructure (including facilities and administrative support);
- b. staffing levels, expertise and development;
- c. provision to support student learning, including facilities, environment and on-line learning resources.

III. student support:

- a. provision of information and guidance, on induction and throughout registration;
- b. development of individual learning (including personal development) and monitoring of progression;
- c. development of intellectual environment (i.e. the culture and ethos of the learning environment);
- d. management of both short- and long-term research projects.

IV. continuous improvement of the student experience:

- a. oversight of the taught course by School committees and officers;
- b. development of internal student feedback mechanisms, and use of feedback outcomes;
- c. use of external feedback, including feedback from students (satisfaction surveys – internal and HEA) and advisors (industrial advisory panels etc.).

B. To identify interesting and/or innovative approaches to learning, teaching and assessment, which could be disseminated more widely.

## A.3 Suggested set of initial documentation

### A.3.1 Documentation provided by those responsible for the course

Prior to its first meeting, the FR review panel shall receive:

- i. a **self-evaluation briefing document** prepared by the course team to include detail on the relevant Schools educational strategic plan, or provide information on how the taught course contributes to the strategy behind the academic portfolio of the School
- ii. a **full list of academic staff involved in the course delivery**, with an indication of which are Recognised Teachers.
- iii. an **analysis of student trends**, which should be based on statistics in SITS provided by Education Services, covering recruitment and outcomes.
- iv. documentation relating to the taught course, including:
  - a. the taught course handbook (or equivalent).
  - b. the course specification and module descriptors (if these are not provided in the taught course handbook).
  - c. a sample of examination papers and assignment questions, and related guidance for examiners and markers (e.g. model answers, marking schemes, and thesis marking guidelines).
  - d. a sample of records of examiners' marks and comments.
  - e. examination board minutes for the last three years.

The review panel should also have access to standard pre-existing supporting documentation:

- i. **Annual Reflective Review (ARR) reports**, including any commentaries on individual reports submitted by student representatives, for the previous three years.
- ii. **Summary of external examiner reports and responses (where available)**, for the previous three years.
- iii. **any final reports from accreditation bodies**, for current or recently-lapsed accreditation.
- iv. Approved minutes of any relevant committee, limited to the previous three years.

### A.3.2 Documentation provided by Education Services

Prior to its first meeting, the FR review panel shall receive from the Academic Registrar, or members of his or her Department:

- i. a **report from Education Committee** prepared specially for the review, highlighting any matters raised about the taught course.
- ii. a **report from the Academic Registrar** prepared specially for the review, outlining his or her findings regarding appeals, complaints and cases of general or academic misconduct relevant to the taught course being reviewed.

### A.3.3 Other documentation to be collected by the Secretary to the review panel

Prior to the review panel's first meeting, the Secretary shall request the following further documentation:

- i. a **report from the School student representatives**, if they choose to make one.

# Appendix B Focussed Review: template 2

## Review of learning and teaching provision involving significant contributions from a partner institution.

### B.1 Introduction

The following terms of reference and suggested set of documentation apply to a review of the teaching provision offered in conjunction with a partner organisation, and corresponding to the categories of either “programme validation” or “joint provision”. It is anticipated that such partnerships would be reviewed once every six years.

### B.2 Terms of reference

#### A. To determine the effectiveness of arrangements in the following areas of provision:

##### I. the taught courses offered within the partnership:

- a. the accuracy of formal and student-focussed documentation relating to each taught course, including the course specification, module descriptors, any statements of provision and annual monitoring statements, student handbooks, and other guidance documents;
- b. the arrangements for the monitoring, review and development of each taught course, including the structures in place to manage input from any partners as appropriate;
- c. the day-to-day management and administration of each taught course;
- d. the range of teaching methods within the taught course(s), their relevance to the academic provision and their appropriateness to any local or cultural contexts;
- e. the range of assessment methods within the taught course(s), their relevance to the academic provision and their appropriateness to any local or cultural contexts.
- f. the compatibility of the range of assessment methods employed across the courses within the partnership with the University’s Assessment and Feedback strategy;

##### II. learning resources:

- a. the teaching infrastructure (including facilities and administrative support);
- b. staffing levels, expertise and development;
- c. provision to support student learning, including facilities, environment and on-line learning resources;
- d. the accuracy of any formal articulation of the roles and responsibilities of each partner in the areas outlined in II.a-c above.

##### III. student support:

- a. provision of information and guidance, on induction and throughout registration;
- b. development of individual learning (including personal development) and monitoring of progression;
- c. development of intellectual environment (i.e. the culture and ethos of the learning environment);
- d. management of both short- and long-term research projects;
- e. the accuracy of any formal articulation of the roles and responsibilities of each partner in the areas outlined in III.a-d above.

##### IV. continuous improvement of the student experience:

- a. oversight of all provision by School committees and officers, including the effectiveness of any articulated monitoring arrangements of partner provision;
- b. development of internal student feedback mechanisms, and use of feedback outcomes;
- c. use of external feedback, including feedback from students (satisfaction surveys – internal and HEA) and advisors (industrial advisory panels etc.);
- d. the accuracy of any formal articulation of the roles and responsibilities of each partner in the areas outlined in IV.a-c above;
- e. assessment of the comparability of the overall provision to students with identical or similar provision elsewhere in the University.

B. To identify interesting and/or innovative approaches to learning, teaching and assessment, which could be disseminated more widely.

### B.3 Suggested set of initial documentation

#### B.3.1 Documentation provided by those responsible for the partnership

Prior to its first meeting, the FR review panel shall receive:

- i. a **self-evaluation briefing document** usually prepared jointly by those leading the partnership to include information on how the partnership contributes to the school's educational strategic plan.
- ii. **documentation covering the partnership** arrangements (e.g. legal contracts or Memoranda of Understanding, statements of roles and responsibilities, annual operating statements for the previous three years (where these exist), any School-level monitoring reports, any reviews of risk assessments).
- iii. a **full list of courses** covered by the partnership.
- iv. a **full list of academic staff involved in the partnership and delivery**, including staff of the University and staff of the partners, with an indication of which are Recognised Teachers
- v. an **analysis of student trends**, which should be based on statistics in SITS provided by Education Services, covering recruitment and outcomes.
- vi. documentation relating to **research student provision and support** (where it exists):
  - a. the partner's student handbook (or equivalent) for research students.
  - b. a document outlining the current status and progress of each research student in the partnership (including, as a minimum, supervisors, and date and outcome of last formal progress review).
- vii. documentation relating to **each taught course covered by the partnership**, including:
  - a. the taught course handbook (or equivalent).
  - b. the course specification and module descriptors (if these are not provided in the taught course handbook).
  - c. a sample of examination papers and assignment questions, and related guidance for examiners and markers (e.g. model answers, marking schemes, and thesis marking guidelines).
  - d. a sample of records of examiners' marks and comments.
  - e. examination board minutes for the last three years.
  - f. Annual Reflective Review (ARR reports) for the last three years.
  - g. Summary of external examiners reports for the last three years and responses (where available).
  - h. Approved minutes of any relevant committee, limited to the previous three years.

#### B.3.2 Documentation provided by Education Services

Prior to its first meeting, the FR review panel shall receive from the Academic Registrar, or members of his or her Department:

- i. a **report from Education Committee** prepared specially for the review, highlighting any matters raised about the partnership since its last review.
- ii. a **report from the Academic Registrar** prepared specially for the review, outlining his or her findings regarding appeals, complaints and cases of general or academic misconduct relevant to the taught courses in the partnership being reviewed.

### **B.3.3 Other documentation to be collected by the Secretary to the review panel**

Prior to the review panel's first meeting, the Secretary shall request the following further documentation:

- i. a **report from the School student representatives**, if they choose to make one.

# Appendix C Year One Partnership Review

## Review of learning and teaching provision involving significant contributions from a partner institution one year after the initiation of a new partnership

### C.1 Introduction

The following terms of reference and suggested set of documents apply to a Year One Partnership Review. In most cases only a subset will be required. It is anticipated that after the initial Y1PR such partnerships would undergo a Focussed Review at least once every six years.

### C.2 Terms of reference

#### A. To determine the effectiveness of arrangements in the following areas of provision:

##### I. the taught courses offered within the partnership:

- a. the accuracy of formal and student-focussed documentation relating to each taught course, including the course specifications, module descriptors, any statements of provision and annual monitoring statements, student handbooks, and other guidance documents;
- b. the arrangements for the monitoring, review and development of each taught course, including the structures in place to manage input from any partners as appropriate;
- c. the day-to-day management and administration of each taught course.

##### II. learning resources:

- a. the teaching infrastructure (including facilities and administrative support);
- b. staffing levels, expertise and development;
- c. provision to support student learning, including facilities, environment and on-line learning resources;
- d. the accuracy of any formal articulation of the roles and responsibilities of each partner in the areas outlined in II.a-c above.

##### III. student support:

- a. provision of information and guidance, on induction and throughout registration;
- b. development of individual learning (including personal development) and monitoring of progression;
- c. development of intellectual environment (i.e. the culture and ethos of the learning environment);
- d. management of both short- and long-term research projects;
- e. the accuracy of any formal articulation of the roles and responsibilities of each partner in the areas outlined in III.a-d above.

##### IV. continuous improvement of the student experience:

- a. oversight of all provision by sponsoring School committees and officers, including the effectiveness of any articulated monitoring arrangements of partner provision;
- b. development of internal student feedback mechanisms, and use of feedback outcomes;
- c. use of external feedback, including feedback from students (satisfaction surveys – internal and HEA) and advisors (industrial advisory panels etc.);

- d. the accuracy of any formal articulation of the roles and responsibilities of each partner in the areas outlined in IV.a-c above;
- e. assessment of the comparability of the overall provision to students with identical or similar provision elsewhere in the University.

B. To identify interesting and/or innovative approaches to learning, teaching and assessment, which could be disseminated more widely.

### **C.3 Suggested set of initial documentation**

#### **C.3.1 Documentation provided by the Partner Institution**

Prior to its first meeting, the Y1PR review panel shall receive:

- i. a **partnership-evaluation briefing document** prepared by the partnership institution should address the points outlines in Section C.2 above and include any changes that either have been, or could be, made to the roles and responsibilities shared between the partners and any School-level monitoring reports.
- ii. a **full list of courses** covered by the partnership.
- iii. a **full list of academic staff involved in the partnership**, including staff of the University and staff of the partners, with an indication of which are Recognised Teachers and identifying any changes since the Course Validation.
- iv. documentation relating to **research student provision and support** (where it exists):
  - a. the partner's student handbook (or equivalent) for research students.
  - b. a document outlining the current status and progress of each research student in the partnership (including, as a minimum, primary supervisor, and date and outcome of last formal progress review).
- v. documentation relating to **each taught course covered by the partnership**, including:
  - a. the taught course handbook (or equivalent).
  - b. the course specification (s) and module descriptors.
  - c. a sample of examination papers and assignment questions, and related guidance for examiners and markers (e.g. model answers, marking schemes, and thesis marking guidelines).
  - d. a sample of records of examiners' marks and comments (if available)
  - e. examination board minutes (if available).
  - f. external examiners report (if available).
  - g. a sample of student feedback.
  - h. an analysis of student performance to date.

#### **C.3.2 Documentation provided by the sponsoring School.**

- i a **partnership-evaluation briefing document** prepared by the relevant Sponsoring School should include any changes that either have been, or could be, made to the roles and responsibilities shared between the partners and any School-level monitoring reports.

#### **C.3.3 Documentation provided by Education Services**

Prior to its first meeting, the Y1PR review panel shall receive from the Academic Registrar, or members of his or her Department:

- iii. a **report from Education Committee** prepared specially for the review, highlighting any matters raised about the partnership since its inception.
- iv. a **report from the Academic Registrar** prepared specially for the review, outlining his or her findings regarding appeals, complaints and cases of general or academic misconduct relevant to the taught courses in the partnership being reviewed.

### C.3.4 Other documentation to be collected by the Secretary to the review panel

Prior to the review panel's first meeting, the Secretary shall request the following further documentation:

- ii. a **report from the Partner Institution student representatives**, if they choose to make one.

<b>Owner</b>	Academic Registrar
<b>Department</b>	Education Services
<b>Implementation date</b>	September 2019
<b>Approval by and date</b>	Academic Registrar, August 2019
<b>Version number and date of last review</b>	Version 2.4; August 2019
<b>Next review by</b>	July 2021