



## INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW (ILR) OF TAUGHT PROGRAMMES

### CONTENTS

Outline of the procedure .....	2
Preparing for review .....	4
Engaging students in Institution-led review .....	7
Proposing changes to the provision .....	7
School scrutiny of programme specifications and module descriptors .....	8
The Institution-led review panel .....	9
Meetings of the Institution-led review panel .....	9
Selecting the Institution-led review panel .....	9
Information to be made available to an Institution-led review panel .....	10
The Institution-led review event .....	11
Appendix 1: ILR panel: Key dates and activities .....	14
Appendix 2: Indicative ILR agenda (for an event scheduled to last a single day) .....	15
Appendix 3: The ILR guide .....	16



## Outline of the procedure

1. Institution-led review of taught programmes has been designed to meet the expectations of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education and in particular the common practices requiring us to review our core practices for standards and quality regularly and to use the outcomes to drive improvement and enhancement. It also takes account of a number of guiding principles set out within the accompanying Advice and Guidance sections. In addition, the processes set out within this section are the University's methodology for ensuring that all provision is reviewed on a cycle of not more than six years in accordance with Scottish Funding Council key characteristics of institution-led review ([SFC guidance 2017-2022](#)).
2. At Edinburgh Napier, all taught award or credit-bearing programmes must be formally reviewed in accordance with this procedure and within six academic years from the date of initial approval or, where applicable, the previous formal review event. The institution-led review of the supervision of research students and the research student experience is not within the scope of this procedure, and is overseen by processes set out within the Research Degrees Framework.
3. Institution-led review provides an opportunity to explore in-depth the contribution made by the programmes to the School and University strategic objectives, and to consider the approaches made by the programme teams to enhance the provision. Institution-led review focuses on the approach taken by programme teams to ensure that provision continues to meet the academic standard for an award of the University as defined in the Academic Regulations, that the proposed learning, teaching and assessment approaches continue to enable students to achieve the learning outcomes and that the programme continues to provide students with access to high quality learning experiences. It is an 'enhancement-led' approach to review, meaning it is not about finding problems or criticizing individuals, but is about continuous improvement, and celebrating and sharing good practice.
4. Institution-led review has been designed to facilitate the consideration of programmes and suites of programmes. It should consider the programmes in all modes of study and locations in which they are delivered, for example the review should consider UK-based programmes alongside the transnational education (TNE) or distance-learning iterations of the programmes. In addition, if elements of the programmes are offered by the University as standalone provision for continuing professional development (CPD), this should also be considered within the scope of the review.
5. Institution-led review must be evidence-based and take full account of the outcomes of any monitoring or review activities, including accreditation, re-accreditation, or monitoring activities undertaken by professional, statutory or



regulatory bodies, which have taken place since the date of initial approval or, where applicable, the previous formal review event. It should be used to evaluate the effectiveness of University annual monitoring and review activities and how these inform the ongoing enhancement of the provision.

6. It is unlikely that proposals from more than one subject area will be able to be considered at the same Institution-led review event.
7. Preparation for Institution-led review will commence at least twelve months prior to the review with a formal planning meeting initiated by the DLTE Quality & Standards Manager associated with the School to ensure that staff involved in leading the preparation for the review are clear on the process and the required outputs and to agree interim milestones and check-points to enable ongoing support to be provided throughout the preparation phase.
8. Prior to coming forward for institution-led review, all programme specifications and modules must be considered by the School to ensure they continue to meet both University and external expectations. This process is typically overseen by a sub-Committee of the School Learning, Teaching & Assessment Committee, and must take place in the 12 months prior to the Institution-led review.
9. The successful outcome of Institution-led review will be that all programmes under review are re-approved. The panel will agree the period of approval which must not exceed six academic years from the date of the review event. The review will also seek to identify aspects of positive practice which should be shared within the School, University and, where appropriate, within the wider sector. As part of an enhancement-led approach, it is anticipated that areas for further development will also be identified through the review, and programme teams will be expected to take these forward during the following review cycle, and report formally on progress a year following the review.
10. The schedule for reviews for 2021/22 to 2025/2026 academic sessions has been agreed by Quality & Standards Committee. Any deviation or changes to this schedule must be agreed in advance by the Committee, as the schedule is reported annually to the Scottish Funding Council and to the Quality Assurance Agency. The schedule is published on the Department for Learning & Teaching Enhancement's website [<https://staff.napier.ac.uk/services/dlte/quality/qualityframework/Pages/qualityframework.aspx>].

[Back to Contents](#)



## Preparing for review

11. Each School is responsible for the oversight and management of preparation for Institution-led review, and will be supported by the Department of Learning & Teaching Enhancement, and colleagues within the School Support Service. During the course of each academic year, an annual discussion will take place at the School Learning, Teaching & Assessment Committee to discuss the forthcoming School review schedule and progress made following Institution-led reviews, including any School-wide themes which have emerged. The Head of Quality & Enhancement should be invited to attend for this item.
12. Formal preparation for each Institution-led review should commence at least twelve months prior to each review event with a preparatory meeting initiated by the Quality & Standards Manager, and jointly led by the School Head of Learning and Teaching (this may be delegated to the School Academic Lead for Quality), and the Quality & Standards Manager. The preparatory meeting is likely to include the School Academic Lead for Quality; Head of Subject and programme leader(s) for the provision (or representatives of the programme leaders as appropriate). There should also be representation from the School Support Service, both from quality and programme administration. For TNE and Global Online provision, it is recommended that colleagues from International Programmes and the Global Online support team attend, as appropriate. Guidance to inform this meeting is available from the [Quality Framework Section 2 Forms page](#). The meeting is intended to confirm the scope of the review (to ensure all relevant provision is included), to begin to explore the operational elements involved in preparing for the review, to define specific roles and responsibilities and to ensure that programme leaders responsible for preparing for the review fully understand the processes set out within this section of the Quality Framework. Areas for discussion will also include wider engagement of the programme teams; external expertise to be drawn upon; student engagement. There will also be initial discussions regarding the possible format and duration of the review event.
13. During the preparation meeting, a number of touchpoint opportunities will be agreed to ensure ongoing support is provided to the programme teams by the Head of Learning & Teaching/School Academic Lead for Quality, Quality & Standards Manager and School Support Officer in advance of the review and to agree the approach to be taken to the School scrutiny.
14. Programme teams are required to produce a single self-evaluation report to inform the review. As programmes under review will typically have been offered to students for a period of up to six academic sessions, there will be a body of existing evidence and data which programme leaders should draw upon to



inform the self-evaluation report. This evidence will be made available to the panel on SharePoint in advance of the review and will include:

- A record of discussions and actions from the School scrutiny of programme specifications and module descriptors, with confirmation that required actions have been completed
- Updated and School-approved programme specifications for all provision under consideration
- Updated and approved module descriptors for all relevant modules within the programme structures under consideration (module descriptors for all compulsory modules should be available)
- Programme annual reports for all programmes under consideration for the whole review cycle (6 years)
- A sample of module evaluation reports from the previous 12 months with a cover sheet explaining reasons this selection was chosen
- Cognos programme performance data for all provision under consideration<sup>1</sup>
- Key features of the student population (for example, student gender balance across programmes; proportion of direct entrants; proportion of widening participation students, proportion of international students etc.)
- A sample of minute extracts from School meetings where programme changes have been considered and approved during the review period
- Minutes from Programme Boards of Studies and evidence of actions from Student-Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs) for the review period
- External examiner reports, and, if applicable, responses to them
- Industry liaison panels (if applicable)
- Collaborative programme first year review reports (if applicable)
- Professional, statutory and regulatory body reports (if relevant)
- Most recent MyProgramme documents

---

<sup>1</sup> Some links to cognos data

[Programme Performance Dashboard](#) allows you to run an information set for a selected range of programmes around Student Performance and Experience

[ILR Student Profile](#) provides the student profile information specified in the ILR documentation

For benchmarking on Student Outcomes information you could use our [Student Outcomes Dashboard](#) which although it reports at an aggregate level will allow you to filter the information down to look at a subset of programmes or subjects.

If you need to drill down to look at performance on a specific module you can use our [Module Performance Dashboard](#).



- Screenshots/demo of programme Moodle pages for provision under consideration (read only access to the Moodle course and links would be helpful)

A template to support the production of the self-evaluation report is available from the [Quality Framework Section 2 Forms page](#) and includes further detail regarding the evidence-base. The report should be reflective, self-critical and evaluative, rather than descriptive.

15. During the preparation phase ahead of the review, the programme team should 'step back' and use the evidence base to reflect upon what is working well with the programme and on areas for development which would be helpful to explore during the review. To support this reflection during the preparation phase the following is an indicative list of topics which programme teams may wish to consider when reflecting on the programme(s). It is neither exhaustive nor mutually exclusive:
- a) the continuing purpose of the programme within the context of the University's Strategy, including alignment with the developing Gold Standard Curriculum Framework
  - b) the continuing alignment of the programme against specific aspects of the UK Quality Code, for example Subject Benchmark Statements; the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Frameworks (SQCF) and confirmation that the programme design and learning outcomes are consistent with these external reference points.
  - c) the continuing currency and validity of the programme in light of developments in research, professional and industry practice and pedagogy (including the use of technology in learning and teaching).
  - d) the continuing effectiveness of the mechanisms to enable students to provide the programme team with systematic feedback on their student learning experience.
  - e) the continuing quality of learning resources including provision of information technology, library or specialist equipment.
  - f) the contribution and role of professional support services to the quality of the student experiences
  - g) changes in the external environment such as requirements of professional, statutory and regulatory bodies.
  - h) whether students are attaining the intended learning outcomes and whether the assessment regime enables this to be appropriately demonstrated.



- i) ensuring that all students have an equal opportunity to achieve the intended learning outcomes and that consideration has been given to inclusive Learning Teaching & Assessment approaches.
- j) the effect of changes made to the programme since its formal approval and how student learning has been enhanced as a result.

## Engaging students in Institution-led review

16. The University is committed to ensuring that students are provided with opportunities to engage in formal and informal dialogue on the enhancement of their learning experience and to engage with, and inform preparation for the review.
17. Programme teams must consider how best to involve students and recent alumni during the development of the Institution-led review self-evaluation report and information set. Guidance for students about preparing for review is provided within the [Quality Framework Section 2 Forms page](#). Good practice in terms of gathering evidence includes utilising student focus groups or SSLC meetings to review and receive feedback on programme material, both of which can be conducted online using digital platforms. Bespoke questionnaires can be issued to students to elicit feedback and suggestions on programme enhancement. It is good practice to differentiate between the views of different categories of students where these are likely to be significant, for example part-time and full-time students; or the views of direct entrants. Programme teams may find [Engaging students in Institution-led Review: a practice guide for universities and students' associations](#) useful (published by sparqs – student partnerships in quality Scotland).
18. Students' views gathered during the preparation for Institution-led review should be explicitly included within the self-evaluation report.

## Proposing changes to the provision

19. Institution-led review is intended to explore how programme teams manage the ongoing enhancement of the provision. It is possible that in preparing for review, programme leaders may identify enhancements that they wish to make to the programme specification or module descriptors to be considered and approved as part of the review. These changes should be clearly identified and referenced within the self-evaluation report. It is also acknowledged that programme teams may wish to use the review to explore potential enhancements for the future with the review team (as part of an ongoing enhancement-approach), and these





should be included within the six year vision set out within the self-evaluation report. There is no requirement for programme teams to present substantive changes to programmes coming forward for review, if the evidence indicates that the provision is operating well and providing a high quality student experience in-line with University Strategy.

20. Programme teams are however responsible for ensuring that the programme specifications and module descriptors for the provision are complete and up-to-date and are in accordance with University requirements in advance of the review. These must have been considered by the School prior to the review event.

[Back to Contents](#)

## **School scrutiny of programme specifications and module descriptors**

21. The purpose of the School scrutinising programmes and modules in advance of the Institution-led review is to ensure that the programme specifications and constituent module descriptors are complete and accurate and meet University and external expectations. It is recommended that the School also uses this as an opportunity to offer peer-feedback on the self-evaluation report, prior to it being signed off by the Head of Learning & Teaching.
22. There is some flexibility in the approach that can be taken to School scrutiny. This should be discussed and agreed with the SAL Quality and Quality & Standards Manager associated with the School during preparations for the review.
23. The outcome of School scrutiny helps to reassure the programme team, School Head of Learning & Teaching, School Academic Lead for Quality and the School Learning, Teaching & Assessment Committee that the quality and standard of the proposed taught award or credit-bearing programme meets Academic Regulations and Quality Framework expectations.
24. To enable the documentation to be finalised after local consideration, it is recommended that this takes place a minimum of 60 working days before the date of the Institution-led review event.
25. There is no requirement for formal minutes to be taken, though a record of discussions and actions agreed should be retained and made available as part of the evidence-base for the review together with confirmation that actions have been completed.

[Back to Contents](#)





## The Institution-led review panel

### Meetings of the Institution-led review panel

26. When scheduling the review, it is important that consideration is given to the timing of the review event to ensure that students are able to engage with the review (for example, within term-time).
27. The convenor of the review panel, in liaison with the convenor of Learning, Teaching, Assessment & Student Experience Committee, the convenor of the relevant School Learning, Teaching & Assessment Committee and the Head of Quality & Enhancement, reserves the right to cancel an Institution-led review event should inadequate or incomplete documentation be available 20 working days before the agreed date for the event.

### Selecting the Institution-led review panel

28. The Head of Quality & Enhancement will appoint a review panel, in consultation with the School Head of Learning & Teaching and with programme teams whose programmes are going forward for review. The School Head of Learning & Teaching will liaise with the Quality & Standards Manager associated with the School to arrange for individual review panel members to be briefed on their role. An online course intended for all panel members is also available for self-enrolment via this [link](#).
29. A standard Institution-led review panel must consist of:
  - a) a convenor (typically a senior member of academic staff from another School) who has undertaken training in convening review panels offered by the Department of Learning & Teaching Enhancement
  - b) at least one external academic peer with subject expertise relevant to the programmes under review
  - c) a student from a different subject area to the programmes under consideration
  - d) an academic peer from another subject area (typically a member of an Academic Board sub-committee or a colleague who has achieved fellowship of the HEA), and ideally from a different School to the convenor
  - e) a professional service colleague (typically a member of an Academic Board sub-committee or a colleague who has achieved or is seeking fellowship of the HEA (including Associate Fellowship)



- f) a member of the Department of Learning & Teaching Enhancement, nominated by the Head of Quality & Enhancement, who serves as an active panel member and report author.

If a programme team would find it beneficial to have additional panel members, for example representatives from industry or the professional, statutory or regulatory body, this should be discussed during the preparation for the review.

The event will also be supported by a member of the School Support Service ('School Support Officer') who will provide operational support for the preparation for the institution-led review, liaising with the Quality & Standards Manager and Head of Learning & Teaching to ensure timescales are met, and will provide support during the Institution-led review event, including ensuring programme teams, students, and alumni are able to join for scheduled meetings.

In the spirit of transparency and to support colleagues preparing for review, each Institution-led review event will also permit one observer to sit alongside the panel members. The observer would typically be a programme leader from an area preparing for review during the next 12–18 months. While the observer will receive the same data set as the panel and will attend the same meetings, this individual is not a member of the review panel and is not involved in the decision-making processes. Requests to participate as an observer should be directed to the Head of Quality & Enhancement.

- 30. Given the purpose of the Institution-led Review, the event will always be arranged as a synchronous meeting. Comments will be invited from panel members in advance and the School Support Officer will ensure that all comments received are shared with the convenor and report author (Quality & Standards Manager) before the event as part of the collective decision-making process. Comments should not be shared with the programme teams.

[Back to Contents](#)

### **Information to be made available to an Institution-led review panel**

- 31. School Support Officer will circulate the following information set to panel members a minimum of 20 working days before the agreed date for the review event:
  - a) an agenda for the meeting of the Institution-led review panel, previously discussed and agreed with the convenor, report author (Quality & Standards Manager) and School Academic Lead for Quality
  - b) a list of panel members



- c) the following documents which have been approved for circulation by the Head of Learning & Teaching:
    - i) a self-evaluation report for the provision under consideration
    - ii) programme specifications for all provision under consideration which meets University expectations
    - iii) Electronic access should also be provided to the evidence base on which the self-evaluation report draws upon, as listed in paragraph 14 above, and in the self-evaluation report template
  - d) the record of discussions and actions following School consideration of programme specifications and module descriptors, and confirmation that actions have been met
  - e) the meeting minute from the original approval event or, where applicable, the outcome of the previous Institution-led review event
  - f) the [Institution-led review guide, and guides for external and student panel members.](#)
32. A minimum of five working days before the agreed date for the review event, panel members will provide the School Support Officer with a brief written commentary of points they wish to explore during the review. This list should be informed by the Institution-led review guide, which is attached as [Appendix 3](#). These comments should be shared with the convenor by the School Support Officer.
33. Panel members' individual written comments should not be shared with the programme teams, but may be shared with other panel members in advance of the review event at the convenor's discretion to inform the detailed agenda.

### **The Institution-led review event**

34. A typical Institution-led review programme should include:
- a) a meeting with current students
  - b) A meeting with key stakeholders, such as recent alumni or industry links (if appropriate)
  - c) a meeting, or series of meetings, with the programme teams (which may include the programme administrator; subject librarian or other colleagues directly involved in the delivery and support of the programme) and school



representatives (as appropriate) to clarify any points arising from panel members' initial scrutiny of the information set

- d) a tour of specialist learning and teaching facilities relevant to the proposal (if appropriate)
  - e) a series of private meetings of the panel to discuss and plan topics for discussion with students and staff, and to agree the outcome of the review
  - f) a meeting with the programme teams to provide initial feedback on the outcome of the review.
35. The agenda for each Institution-led review event will be produced by the School Support Officer, in consultation with the convenor, the report author (Quality & Standards Manager) and the School Academic Lead for Quality. The agenda should be based on the indicative event programme attached at [Appendix 2](#).
36. The Institution-led review event provides an invaluable forum for the discussion of the curriculum and the quality of the student experience with subject experts. It is intended to provide an opportunity to showcase areas of strength and innovative practice within the programmes. The review should also explore areas where there could be improvement and to support the programme teams in taking this work forward, as part of an enhancement-led approach. The meetings within the review should be conducted in a professional and collegiate manner in the spirit of support.
37. Using the Institution-led review guide the panel will assess, using their academic and professional experience and judgement, whether University expectations for the academic standard and quality of the student learning experience for a taught award or credit-bearing programmes are met. The panel will also provide comment and feedback on the overall appropriateness, quality and standard of the provision under review. In confirming the re-approval of the programmes, the panel may decide to make conditions or recommendations where necessary. Conditions would need to be met and signed off by the panel convenor within an agreed time-period. In the unlikely event that the panel deems that a programme, or programmes cannot be re-approved the panel will provide the programme team/s with precise feedback on the matters to be addressed before the decision can be reconsidered. In such cases the panel convenor will provide the Dean of School, Head of Learning & Teaching, and the Head of School Support Service with the reason for this decision being made and precise feedback on the matters to be addressed before the decision can be reconsidered at a re-convened review panel. Should the School take the decision to withdraw a programme or programmes, then the procedures set out in [Quality Framework Section 3: Withdrawal of provision](#) would apply.



38. The panel will agree commendations as an outcome from the review, identifying and confirming areas of positive and innovative practice and will explore how these might be effectively shared within the School, University and wider sector. In addition, the panel will make recommendations, identifying areas for future enhancement. During 2021/22, commendations aligned to the Gold Standard Curriculum will be drawn upon by the Gold Standard Curriculum Project Team to inform decisions around awarding Gold Standard Status.
39. The draft report will be produced by the Department of Learning & Teaching Enhancement within 10 working days of the review event and issued to the convenor and panel members for approval to circulate. The draft report will then be circulated to the programme teams for feedback on factual accuracy. Following this, and confirmation by the convenor, the final report should be circulated to the programme teams, the School Academic Lead for Quality, School Head of Learning & Teaching, copied to the convenor, School Support Officer, and the clerk to the University Quality & Standards Committee. Thereafter it should be considered by the School Learning, Teaching & Assessment Committee at the first scheduled meeting after the event. The Committee will discuss identified areas of good or innovative practice, strengths and achievements or areas for further development. Schools should also consider the most effective mechanisms to share the reports with students on the programmes, for example discussion at Student-Staff Liaison Committees.
40. The final report will also be presented to the University Quality & Standards Committee by the School representative (normally the School Academic Lead for Quality) with a view to disseminating relevant information University-wide. Key themes from the reports will be drawn out for inclusion in the annual report to the Scottish Funding Council.
41. Each Institution-led review will be subject to a follow-up event around 12 months following the review. A small panel, composition of which to be determined by the Head of Quality & Enhancement, drawing on members of Quality & Standards Committee and the Department of Learning & Teaching Enhancement colleagues will meet with the Programme Leaders, School Head of Learning & Teaching (or School Academic Lead for Quality) and other relevant members of the programme teams to discuss progress made following the review and ongoing development. Notes from this meeting will be taken by the Quality & Standards Manager, reported to Quality & Standards Committee and retained alongside the report.

[Back to Contents](#)



## Appendix 1: ILR panel: Key dates and activities

This table has been produced to provide a quick reference point of the key dates and associated activities leading up to a meeting of an institution-led review (ILR) panel.

DATE	ACTIVITY
A minimum of 12 months prior to the anticipated ILR panel	Preparation Meeting The DLTE Quality & Standards Manager linked to the School, with the School Head of Learning & Teaching and School Academic Lead for Quality, will meet with programme leader(s) and other key members of staff to discuss the process and its expectations, and consider specific roles and responsibilities. This is intended to be a supportive conversation to ensure that review is as effective as possible.
Periodically during the following 10-12 months	Touchpoints agreed during the preparation will ensure that the programme team(s) remain on track.
A minimum of 60 working days before the date of an ILR panel.	The programme specifications and module descriptors for provision under review complete internal scrutiny overseen by the School Academic Lead for Quality.
A minimum of 30 working days before the date of an ILR panel	Programme teams complete actions required by the School Scrutiny panel.
A minimum of 20 working days before the date of an ILR panel.	The Head of Learning & Teaching confirms that actions have been completed as required and authorises the release of the programme information set to panel members.
A minimum of 20 working days before the date of an ILR panel.	The School Support Officer ensures that the information set is complete and makes it available to all panel members via SharePoint or alternative secure method
A minimum of 5 working days before the date of an ILR panel.	ILR panel members send their comments on the proposal to the School Support Officer to share with the convenor and report author (Quality & Standards Manager).
Day 0	ILR event
A maximum of 10 working days after the date of an ILR panel.	Department of Learning & Teaching Enhancement (DLTE) ensures that the report is drafted and sent to the convenor and panel members for approval.
A maximum of 20 working days after the date of an ILR panel.	DLTE ensures that a final report has been sent to the programme team(s) for comment on matters of factual accuracy.
A maximum of 30 working days after the date of an ILR panel.	DLTE issues the final report, and liaises with key stakeholders regarding any outstanding conditions or actions to be met and to confirm timescales for completion.
12 months following ILR event	A small panel meets with the programme team(s) to discuss activities undertaken following the ILR



## Appendix 2: Indicative ILR agenda (for an event scheduled to last a single day)

9:00-9:15	Review panel convenes
9:15-10:30	Private discussion – the panel meets to confirm the topics to be covered during the event and content for the final report.
10:30	Students join meeting
10:35-12:00	The panel meets with a representative sample of students from the programmes under review (maximum of 12 individuals).
12:00-12:45	Private discussion - the panel meets to discuss the outcome of the meeting with students and to confirm topics to be covered during the meeting with the programme teams.
12:45-13:15	Break
13:15-13:30	Panel reconvenes
13:30	Programme teams join the meeting
13:35-15:30	The panel meets with the programme teams to discuss the provision under review.
15:30-15:45	Break
15:45-16:45	Panel to reflect on the outcome of the meetings with the programme teams and students. This will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• considering whether the matters highlighted by panel members during the initial meeting have been addressed appropriately</li><li>• identifying possible achievements, areas of good and innovative practice and strengths to be included in the review report</li><li>• identifying possible conditions or recommendations to be made in the review report.</li></ul>
16:45	Programme teams rejoin the meeting
16:50-17:15	The panel meets with the programme teams to provide initial feedback on the outcome of the review.

NB. This is a sample agenda. Specific agendas will be determined for each ILR.





## 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.

- a) first overall impression of the provision, for example, anything that you think is missing or anything that has pleased, surprised or disappointed you
- b) any perceived areas of good or innovative practice, strengths and achievements
- c) any areas where you consider further development or improvement would be of benefit
- d) any concerns relating to the accuracy of the published information relating to the programmes under review.
- e) any comments or reflections on how the programme teams have prepared for the review
- f) any additional information that you would like to request in advance of the review.

### 2. Specific comment on the following:

#### a) 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:

- i) Do you have a clear sense of the programmes with local ownership and a holistic view of the student journey from enquiry to completion?



- ii) 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?

**b) How have the programme teams demonstrated their approach to safeguarding academic standards?**

Specific points the panel may wish to consider include:

- i) 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](#)
  - relevant qualification and/or subject [benchmark statements](#)
  - professional, statutory or regulatory body requirements where appropriate.
- ii) 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).
- iii) The extent to which the proposed learning, teaching and assessment approaches enable students to achieve the programme and exit award learning outcomes.
- iv) 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?

**c) How have the programme teams demonstrated the quality of learning opportunities for students?**



Specific points the panel may wish to consider include:

- i) The overall quality of the proposed student learning experience including academic and pastoral support and students' wider educational needs.
- ii) 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.
- iii) The mechanisms to ensure that learning resources are accessible to students and sufficient to enable them to achieve the learning outcomes.
- iv) How effective is the provision in supporting the strategic objective of providing students with a personalised learning experience through individual support?
- v) How do the programme teams ensure that students develop graduate attributes and employability skills during their programmes of study?

**d) How have the programme teams demonstrated the impact of professional service departments on enhancing provision?**

Specific points the panel may wish to consider include:

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

