# Appendix 3: The ILR guide

This guide provides ILR panel members with a list of topics to be considered when assessing, using their academic and professional experience and judgement, the overall appropriateness, quality and standard of a proposal to re-approve a taught programme. It also provides panel members with themed headings which may be used to set out the points they wish to discuss with the programme teams and students during meetings.

Panel members may find it helpful to enrol on the University Moodle Course which has been developed to support panel members: https://moodlecommunity.napier.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=588

As external panel members may be unable to access the Moodle course, we have produced supplementary guidance specifically for external panel members and this is available to access from Quality Framework’s related resources.

1. **General comment and feedback on the Self-Evaluation Report and programme documentation.**
2. first overall impression of the provision, for example, anything that you think is missing or anything that has pleased, surprised or disappointed you
3. any perceived areas of good or innovative practice, strengths and achievements
4. any areas where you consider further development or improvement would be of benefit
5. any concerns relating to the accuracy of the published information relating to the programmes under review.
6. any comments or reflections on how the programme teams have prepared for the review
7. any additional information that you would like to request in advance of the review.
8. **Specific comment on the following:**
9. **How has the programme team demonstrated the programme’s contribution to the implementation of the University Strategy**

Specific points the panel may wish to consider include:

1. Do you have a clear sense of the programmes with local ownership and a holistic view of the student journey from enquiry to completion?
2. How clear is the contribution of the programmes to key strategic deliverables, aligned to the Gold Standard Curriculum, for example:
* How has the programme team articulated that curriculum design has been student-focused?
* How is citizenship and community integrated into the programme?
* How has digital and information literacy been integrated into the programme?
* How is inclusion integrated into the programme?
* How is research/practice integrated into the programme?
* How is sustainability integrated into the programme?
* How is global outlook demonstrated within the programme?
* How is employability integrated into the programme?
1. **How have the programme teams demonstrated their approach to safeguarding academic standards?**

Specific points the panel may wish to consider include:

1. How have the programme teams demonstrated that they take appropriate account of external reference points in setting the academic standard of the provision?
* [The framework for qualifications of higher education institutions in Scotland](https://staff.napier.ac.uk/services/dlte/quality/qualityframework/Pages/section2forms.aspx?sfvrsn=bc4af981_10)
* relevant qualification and/or subject [benchmark statements](https://staff.napier.ac.uk/services/dlte/quality/qualityframework/Pages/section2forms.aspx)
* professional, statutory or regulatory body requirements where appropriate.
1. The appropriateness of the intended learning outcomes required to achieve the final awards (and any exit awards available to students who do not complete the programmes).
2. The extent to which the proposed learning, teaching and assessment approaches enable students to achieve the programme and exit award learning outcomes.
3. Has sufficient evidence been provided in relation to the effectiveness of the approaches in place for quality assurance and enhancement for the provision under review?
4. **How have the programme teams demonstrated the quality of learning opportunities for students?**

Specific points the panel may wish to consider include:

1. The overall quality of the proposed student learning experience including academic and pastoral support and students’ wider educational needs.
2. The mechanisms to enable students to provide the programme teams with systematic feedback on their learning experience, and in closing the feedback loop with students accordingly.
3. The mechanisms to ensure that learning resources are accessible to students and sufficient to enable them to achieve the learning outcomes.
4. How effective is the provision in supporting the strategic objective of providing students with a personalised learning experience through individual support?
5. How do the programme teams ensure that students develop graduate attributes and employability skills during their programmes of study?
6. **How have the programme teams demonstrated the impact of professional service departments on enhancing provision?**

Specific points the panel may wish to consider include:

1. To what extent do the programme teams utilise resources and expertise beyond the programme teams to the benefit of their students?
2. The mechanisms in place to work in partnership with the professional service departments to support the enhancement of provision and support.