Policy and Procedure for Learning and Teaching Review

Purpose

1. The University is responsible for the standards of awards made in its name and for providing the learning opportunities and learning experiences necessary to enable students to achieve those standards. At Newcastle University, the periodic review of our taught undergraduate and postgraduate programmes is called Learning and Teaching Review. Learning and Teaching Review (LTR) is a crucial and invaluable element of the University’s quality assurance and enhancement framework. It is a supportive, development-led review of a subject area that takes place every six years with the aims of enhancing the programme/s, providing a robust mechanism for assuring and recording their quality and standards, and re-approving the provision. LTR is carried out with a team of up to three academic staff from other academic units/Faculties, along with at least one external subject specialist from a different university, and a student representative.

2. The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) expects universities to be able to demonstrate that:

   a. Effective, regular and systematic processes exist for the monitoring and review of programmes.
   b. Deliberate steps are taken to use the outcomes of programme monitoring and review processes for enhancement purposes.
   c. Processes, roles and responsibilities for programme monitoring and review are clearly defined and communicated.
   d. Processes for programme monitoring are reviewed and enhanced where necessary.

3. The design of this policy takes full account of the Expectation and Indicators of sound practice within section B8 of the QAA’s UK Quality Code on programme monitoring and review.

Policy and Principles

4. The University regards annual and periodic review (in our own terminology – Annual Monitoring and Review – AMR; and LTR) as two parts of the same process of continuous improvement and enhancement of provision. LTR and AMR are intertwined in that the AMR reports provide a foundation and sources of evidence for the academic unit to use in the self-evaluative SWOT for LTR.

5. LTR applies to all taught provision at Newcastle University, both undergraduate and postgraduate, and to all modes of provision, including joint and combined honours degrees, educational partnerships (collaborative provision), credit accumulation & transfer and distance learning. It normally takes place at least once every six years for each subject area, although a subject area may be brought forward to an earlier date by the chair of University Education Committee either on the recommendation of the relevant Faculty Dean or at the discretion of the chair of University Education Committee.
6. LTR is an opportunity for the subject area to step back from the day-to-day delivery of a programme or suite of programmes, and, drawing on a range of internal and external inputs and factors, reflect on whether programmes remain current, viable and are effectively taught. Thus, the academic unit will wish to examine the current quality of provision, think about the evolution of the programmes over the previous six years, and identify opportunities for further development and enhancement.

7. LTR is concerned with the two key elements of quality management: quality assurance and quality enhancement. For quality assurance purposes, the LTR ensures that the quality and standards of academic provision are robust. In meeting this purpose, there are a range of external and internal reference points that provision under review must meet. These will be reviewed by the LTR panel both on the visit day(s) and in the QA summary beforehand. A ‘QE and Technology Enhanced Learning’ summary, prepared by the Learning and Teaching Development Service (LTDS) in advance of the visit day(s), will draw on the subject area’s eLearning and curriculum enhancement activity, and will help to support discussions of quality enhancement during the visit.

8. The following documents are key external and internal reference points for each individual LTR:


   b. Relevant subject benchmark statements.

   c. Where relevant, the requirements of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies.

   d. The University’s Education Strategy.

   e. For undergraduate programmes, the Newcastle Offer.

   f. For taught postgraduate programmes, the Statement of the Taught Postgraduate Offer.

   g. The University’s Assessment and Feedback Principles.

In relation to the University Education Strategy, LTRs will pay particular attention to the ways in which research and teaching are linked by academic units within their taught programmes.

9. LTRs require a wide range of academic staff as well as students to be involved in the process of reflection and to be available on the review visit day(s). For programmes with educational partnerships and/or flexible provision, additional involvement from off-campus students and/or staff will be included in the review process.

10. Joint and combined honours degrees are included in LTR. However, to avoid duplication of effort, for such provision the University distinguishes its review of the degree management from a review of programme content, as follows:
a. Programme content, including modules taken by joint and combined honours students, is included in the review of the relevant subject area. In such cases, the LTR should pay particular attention to how the needs of joint and combined honours students are addressed in subject teaching.

b. The review of the management of joint or combined honours degrees will take place in the LTR of the subject which owns the award, or in the case of joint and combined honours programmes run by a Faculty, in separate joint or combined honours LTRs. In this latter case, the LTR will concentrate on the student experience, student support, and the management of these degree programmes. Areas that should not need to be covered are Teaching, Learning, Assessment, Staff and Learning Resources, which will have been considered within the subject areas’ LTRs.

11. Off-campus provision, including programmes run internationally, is included in LTR. The academic quality and standards of learning and teaching provision delivered off-campus will be reviewed as part of the LTR for the owning subject area.

12. The University uses the following criteria to determine the unit of LTR review: the unity of the subject area, the formal academic governance structure (i.e. Board of Studies and any associated committees/groups, and the structure and organization of student support and those administrative processes that support learning and teaching. The Pro-Vice Chancellor for Education makes the final decision in individual cases on the precise unit of review.

13. The standard length of an LTR visit is one day. However, visit duration is variable up and down according to a number of parameters, including: total number of students, number of taught programmes, significant taught provision delivered through educational partnerships, significant flexible provision (e.g. work-based learning, full-scale e/distance learning, placement provision), and recent PSRB engagement. These factors will not be used mechanistically; rather, a holistic judgement will be reached as to the proposed duration of each review taking these factors into account. The final decision on the duration of each review will be made by the PVC for Education.

14. The Review Team is comprised of an LTR chair, at least one additional academic member of staff, at least one external subject specialist, a student representative, and a member of LTDS who acts as the Review Team secretary. The Review Team, particularly the designated Chair, acts as a ‘critical friend’ to the subject area in helping it to identify areas of effective practice as well as challenges and offering commendations and recommendations for the programme/s.

15. LTR makes use of at least one external member in order to provide an independent viewpoint and a broader perspective. The external member of the Review Team is always a subject specialist and, much like an external examiner, is able to confirm whether or not the University should have confidence that the standards of the programme/s are appropriate. Occasionally, it will be necessary to appoint more than one external subject specialist, but this will depend on the nature of the provision being reviewed.
16. All academic staff and student reviewers and administrative staff involved in LTR are offered training in the purposes of LTR and in the constructive manner of engagement with the subject area that is expected. This positive engagement aims to ensure that LTR fosters continuous enhancement of provision.

17. The outcome of LTR is a formal report, written by the LTR secretary and agreed by the Review Team, outlining the deliberations and conclusions of the review visit and highlighting areas of commendable practice such that these can be effectively disseminated. The report also sets out recommendations for the subject area, Faculty and University as well as timelines for implementation. The report is issued to the subject area, the relevant Faculty Education Committee Secretary and the Taught Programmes Sub-Committee (TPSC) as soon as it is finalised.

18. The appropriate Board(s) of Studies in the academic unit is responsible for developing and implementing an action plan in response to the recommendations made by the LTR Review Team. LTDS is responsible for holding a meeting with the subject area to provide support in developing the action plan and to suggest potential avenues for disseminating effective practice.

19. Faculty Education Committees are responsible for ensuring that subject areas address the recommendations in LTR reports and responding to any recommendations that have been made to the Faculty.

20. TPSC is responsible for considering whether to reapprove programmes on behalf of University Education Committee, responding to any recommendations in LTR reports to the University, signing off on behalf of University Education Committee on the completion of LTRs (including follow-up), and identifying examples of effective practice for dissemination.

**Procedures**

21. LTDS is responsible for creating the 6-yearly cycle of periodic programme review, publishing the academic semester and approximate visit length of each LTR at least 12 months in advance in consultation with the relevant Heads of School. The programme of LTRs is developed by LTDS working with Faculty Deans, with units of review determined based on the unity of the subject area in question and the formal academic governance structure, as well as the structure and organisation of student support and administrative processes that support learning and teaching. The duration of the review visit will be determined by LTDS, working with Faculty Deans, and will be based on a holistic judgment of the factors listed above. The final decision in individual cases on the precise unit of review and the duration of the visit rests with the PVC for Education.

22. In light of the requirements of professional and accrediting bodies who undertake their own rigorous assessments of programmes, the University undertakes to dovetail the schedule for LTR with accreditation visits where possible. Positive judgements in PSRB reports and effective follow-up of any recommendations (as demonstrated through reports to Faculty Education Committee and TPSC) could reduce the number of lines of enquiry that a Review Team will have, therefore possibly reducing the length of, or need for, particular meetings
during the visit. Academic units should reflect on PSRB engagement and requirements when completing the SWOT.

23. LTDS is responsible for maintaining a list of potential Review Team members and LTR chairs. The pool of chairs should include faculty deans of Learning and Teaching and two members of academic staff from each Faculty, nominated by the relevant deans. Members of staff may not chair LTRs of provision within their own ‘home’ academic unit. LTDS is also responsible for creating and updating a list of academic staff who are willing to be members of a Review Team. Each member is asked to serve for three years, in order to gain experience in LTR, but is not normally expected to participate in more than one LTR in any given academic year. No member of academic staff will be asked to serve on a Review Team considering provision within their ‘home’ School. Training is offered for new members once per academic year, and a meeting of all Review Team Chairs takes place annually in the summer term, following all the LTRs for that academic year.

24. LTDS are responsible for organising the LTR, alongside a member of administrative or academic staff from the subject area.

25. LTDS liaises with the subject area to agree on an external member (or members) of the Review Team (see LTR External Guidelines). The external member(s) must be approved by the relevant Chair of Faculty Education Committee.

26. The LTR Secretary, along with the Chair of the Review Team and ideally the other Review Team members (except the external), arranges an informal visit to the subject area 3-6 months in advance of the LTR visit in order to explain to academic and support staff the purposes of LTR and the requirements of the SWOT.

27. Academic units are responsible for preparing a self-evaluative, length-limited SWOT analysis about the nature of their taught provision, organised according to the principles outlined in Annex 1. In developing the SWOT, the academic unit should draw on an evidence base such as the following: previous AMR reports, aims and intended learning outcomes (as contained in programme specifications and module outlines), degree programme handbooks and other information provided to students, external examiners’ reports, committee minutes, relevant management information (for example on recruitment, retention and student achievement), PSRB engagement, and student questionnaire results (e.g., module evaluation results, National Student Survey and Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey). LTDS is responsible for offering further support to units preparing to write a SWOT.

28. The LTR Secretary stipulates a deadline by which the subject area must submit the SWOT, at least six weeks before the date of the review visit. The LTR Secretary and LTR Chair may review and provide feedback on a draft of the SWOT before this time.

29. The LTR Secretary is responsible for liaising with the relevant Faculty Learning and Teaching Support Team and the academic unit to compile the documentation for the QA Summary, and will set a deadline for the submission of the required documentation. The required documentation is set out in Annex 2. The LTR Secretary will complete the QA summary, based on the compiled documentation, and will send this to the academic unit for factual
30. The academic unit is also responsible for selecting several representative modules and sending this information to LTDS so that members of the Review Team can be given Blackboard access to those sites. The academic unit will also have to request Blackboard access for the external member(s).

31. LTDS is responsible for providing a QE and Technology Enhanced Learning summary (see Annex 3 for a list of items that may be included). This should be completed approximately six weeks before the date of the review visit and will be sent to the academic unit for factual verification – and in case the unit wishes to provide supplemental information – before it is circulated to the review team.

32. The relevant library liaison is responsible for completing a Library summary report, to be submitted by the deadline set by the LTR Secretary.

33. The LTR Secretary, with the Administrative Support Team (AST) in LTDS, is responsible for compiling all necessary documentation, including the SWOT, QE & TEL summary, QA summary, Library summary and a brief factual statement on the scope of the review (e.g. programmes under review, number of students). The AST will circulate all documentation to the entire Review Team approximately four weeks before the visit date.

34. The AST arranges a briefing meeting of the LTR Secretary and Review Team approximately two weeks prior to the visit day in order to discuss themes and possible avenues of inquiry, having read the SWOT, QE & TEL summary and QA summary. These themes are relayed to the subject area ahead of the visit day and are used by the LTR Secretary and Chair to agree the structure of the visit day (i.e., the number, length, attendees and focus of each meeting).

35. The Review Team visits the subject area on the designated day and discusses with members of staff, liaison staff and students the topic areas as agreed in the briefing meeting. The SWOT, QA summary, and QE & TEL summary provide a starting point for these discussions, and meetings must cover, but are not confined to, discussions of standards, teaching, learning, assessment (including the links between research and teaching), student support, and resources. The duration of individual meetings (including separate meetings with undergraduate and taught postgraduate students) is determined by the Review Team, but meetings should be no longer than one and a half hours in length and followed by a break of at least 15 minutes so that the Chair can summarise items to be included in the report as commendations or recommendations. At the end of the day, the Review Team Chair provides oral feedback on the conclusions of the visit.

36. The LTR Secretary writes up the findings in a draft report (using the structure set out in Appendix 4) which outlines the deliberations and conclusions of the review visit, highlights areas of commendable practice, makes recommendations and includes timelines for implementation. The report is then agreed by the Review Team and is submitted to the subject area no later than four weeks following the visit day.

37. Once the subject area has corrected any factual inaccuracies, the LTR Secretary should
populate the action plan with the recommendations before submitting the report to TPSC, and to the relevant Faculty Education Committee Secretary and the subject area for information. The Secretary to TPSC will ensure that the report is considered at the next available meeting of the Sub-Committee. At this meeting TPSC will review the report and:

a. Consider whether the programme(s) considered in the LTR continue to meet the University’s criteria for taught programmes as set out in the programme approval policy, and should be re-approved.

b. Identify urgent issues for action or reference to University Education Committee.

c. Consider any recommendations to the University (TPSC is responsible for contacting relevant central departments for responses to these issues, and ensuring that TPSC receives timely reports on progress in respect of these recommendations).

d. Identify any exemplary practice which it considers worthy of sharing and consider the most effective means of dissemination. These items will be identified on the LTDS website, which will offer brief details of exemplary practice, with sufficient information to allow interested parties to follow up on any matters of interest.

TPSC will then report to University Education Committee on the consideration of the report, and all decisions on programme re-approval will be reported by University Education Committee to Senate. TPSC will highlight to University Education Committee on any issues of institutional significance that have arisen, with University Education Committee in turn reporting on these to Senate as necessary.

38. Approximately a month after the visit, subject areas will be offered a follow-up meeting with members of LTDS and the Faculty Education Committee Secretary, which will have been scheduled at the time of the review. The Faculty Education Committee Chair may also attend this meeting if they wish to do so. This meeting has no formal standing (it would not be a decision- making meeting, and it will not be minuted), but it gives providers the opportunity to discuss any issues arising from the report recommendations and, where it would be helpful, allow providers to discuss their initial ideas on how to respond to report recommendations. Members of LTDS and the Faculty Education Committee Secretary will also be able to identify any resources and/or examples of effective practice that providers might find useful in responding to report recommendations.

39. The Board of Studies in the subject area is responsible for creating an action plan based on the recommendations in the report. *(Note that the subject area, when first contacted about the LTR, should arrange a meeting of the Board of Studies for 5-6 weeks following the Visit Day).*

40. Within two months of the visit day, the academic unit sends the report and the agreed action plan to the Secretary of the relevant Faculty Education Committee, copying in the LTR Secretary, for consideration at the next available Faculty Education Committee meeting. Faculty Education Committees should determine whether the subject area’s response has been appropriate and consider whether there is exemplary practice
highlighted that can be disseminated across the Faculty. Faculty Education Committees must also address any recommendations to the Faculty and agree actions, deadlines, and parties responsible. LTDS will be responsible for following up on any University level actions identified in the report.

41. Follow-up in the next academic year will be addressed in a year-on action plan update from the Board of Studies responsible for the programmes reviewed, sent to Faculty Education Committee for consideration one year after the original action plan was submitted. The Secretary of Faculty Education Committee is responsible for ensuring that this follow-up report is in on the agenda for an appropriate Faculty Education Committee meeting. Faculty Education Committee is also responsible for providing a year-on update to any Faculty actions. LTDS are responsible for providing an update on any University level actions. These year-on reports, together with an extract from the minutes of Faculty Education Committee detailing its consideration of the report, are forwarded to TPSC which is responsible for reporting to University Education Committee that appropriate follow-up has taken place. Faculty Education Committee or TPSC may follow up any special concerns identified with the subject area.

42. The Secretary to TPSC will produce a matrix showing how all recommendations – whether to the subject area, the School, the Faculty, or the University – have been addressed. This will be reported to University Education Committee in an annual report on all LTRs. A separate final report on actions taken in response to recommendations made to the University will be fed back to subject areas (and the relevant Faculty Education Committee) whose reviews included such recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document last modified by LTDS, September 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This document is primarily intended for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff in academic units supporting Learning and Teaching Review; Learning and Teaching Review Team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ltds@ncl.ac.uk">ltds@ncl.ac.uk</a> ; T: 0191 20 88491/83978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 1  
**Guidelines for the SWOT analysis**

Despite its length-limited format, all aspects of taught provision should be reflected upon in the SWOT — alongside the standard provision, this should include the management of joint and combined honours degrees, educational partnerships, CATS, placement activity, and distance learning.

The key objective of the SWOT is to consider the internal and external factors that affect the learning and teaching on the unit’s programmes and courses; to identify the positive aspects and strengths of the provision; and to consider how best to mitigate the current weaknesses and internal/external threats.

**Format**

The final SWOT should be no more than five pages of A4, including one introductory page and one page for each of the four elements (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats). The SWOT should reference specific examples and evidence of the points made (e.g. reference to a student survey as evidence of satisfaction with resources), but the subject area is not expected to submit this evidence unless asked to do so. The SWOT should also note the impact of each point and how the unit may respond to it in the future. Academic units should use the following template:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supporting evidence</th>
<th>Impact (so what)</th>
<th>How to build on this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Strengths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lists of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats should be as specific as possible. The SWOT should use precise, verifiable statements and reference the evidence base; it should avoid generalities such as citing ‘an intellectually vital and flexible learning environment and quality teaching’ as a Strength or listing ‘more resources’ as an Opportunity.

**Introductory Page**

The introductory page should include essential background information that the panel members need to know about the subject areas. This should always include a list of programmes and the number of students on each programme. It may also be desirable to include a brief ‘history’ of the subject area, including recent or anticipated changes in programme structure.

**Initial Questions for SWOT**

The following questions, organised according to the headings in the SWOT, provide a framework for beginning to think through the four categories. They are by no means restrictive, and units are encouraged to think of the four categories as broadly as necessary to be relevant to their discipline and taught provision.
Strengths (Internal to the Academic Unit)

All strengths should be things that are specific to your academic unit (when measured against comparators or similar programmes); if all of your comparators have the same element, then it is a necessity and not strength.

- What advantages does your School/subject area have (i.e. over comparators)?
- What do you do better than anyone else?
- What unique or effective resources can you draw upon that others cannot?
- What do people (students/parents/teachers/other academic colleagues) in your market see as your strengths?
- What factors mean that you recruit, retain and develop students?
- What do your students and alumni remember and recommend about your provision?

Weaknesses (Internal to the Academic Unit)

Weaknesses should be specific to the academic unit, and should not reference external threats (this will come later). All weaknesses should be things that are unique to your academic unit, in the sense that other comparators will not all struggle with the same thing.

- What could you improve?
- What can and should you avoid doing in the future?
- What are people (students/parents/teachers/other academic colleagues) in your market likely to see as weaknesses?
- What factors lose you student recruitment?
- What factors result in a less successful and/or rewarding student learning experience?
- Are there areas where your comparators are succeeding and you are not?

Opportunities (External to the Academic Unit)

Opportunities should be external factors or situations that the academic unit wants to take advantage of in the future. Although you should not reference things already happening with the academic unit, you may include items that are either within the broader University or in the external environment. The SWOT table should explain how you will respond to the opportunities available and how they will have an impact on learning and teaching.

- What good opportunities can you spot in your discipline (e.g. funding, research opportunities, increase in student numbers, local initiatives, etc.)?
- What interesting trends are you aware of?
- What changing technologies could have a positive impact on your provision?
- Are there opportunities within the University that you have not previously taken advantage of, but which you could use in the future?
Threats (External to the Academic Unit)

Like Opportunities, Threats should be primarily external factors or situations to which the academic unit must respond. These may include factors within the broader University or in the external environment.

- What obstacles do you face? Are these new obstacles?
- What are your competitors doing that may be a threat to your success?
- Are external PSRB quality standards or specifications for your programmes and courses changing?
- Is technology changing and threatening your position, e.g. in student or industry expectations?
- Has the workplace shifted its expectations, so that you need to change how you prepare students?
- Could any of your weaknesses seriously threaten learning and teaching?

Suggested Process for Developing the SWOT

There is no required process for developing the SWOT, so the academic unit may choose to nominate an individual or individuals who are responsible for preparing it. You may wish to involve a group of colleagues in the brainstorming process, and then have one person write up the notes from the meeting in the required format. If you do organise a brainstorming session, you may wish to invite a facilitator (for example members of LTDS are available to do this) to help structure the session and make the most of your discussions. The LTR Secretary will communicate this opportunity to the academic unit early in the LTR process.

Activity One: Brainstorming Strengths

To get started, brainstorm responses to this question: *Considering our existing and any planned developments, what do we do well in learning and teaching?*

You may ask participants to brainstorm responses in advance of the session and come prepared to discuss them; you could also start the session with this activity. Either way, what matters is that you start to list the areas, resources, people, external links, etc. that you feel mark you out from similar subject areas in other universities. At this stage, you don’t need to worry about evidence; this can be added later.

Activity Two: Analysis of External Factors

The second activity asks participants to consider factors in the external environment that may impact learning and teaching. Although there are no requirements to do so, you may wish to divide the environment according to the acronym PEST: political, environmental, social, and technological. You may also wish to think both about the near environment in other parts of the University and the farther world outside the University.

Again, this activity could be done before the session or at the beginning of the session; either way, the goal is to generate ideas and suggestions that will be refined later. In addition to thinking about the external factors, you should note initial ideas about how they will impact the
subject area and what might be done in response.

**Activity Three: SWOT Analysis**

Once you have your ideas in place, you can move onto the formal SWOT analysis. At this stage, you can begin (as a large group, in teams, or individuals) to populate the table, noting each key element (Strength, Weakness, Opportunity or Threat) along with supporting evidence, impact, and responses to be taken. Informal notes are completely fine at the initial stage, although the final submission should conform to the format noted above.
Annex 2  Evidence required for the Quality Assurance summary

This documentation will be used by the Secretary for the QA summary and circulated to the Review Team at least four weeks before the visit day. Documentation will be sourced centrally wherever possible (e.g. from web pages and LTDS records), from Faculties, and from academic units. All documents should be titled so that they match the list below as closely as possible, and so that the titles are as specific as possible (including dates and committee names). LTDS will compile all documentation listed below, following the procedure outlined above.

Centrally-Held Documentation

1. Programme specifications and programme regulations
2. Annual Monitoring and Review Reports for the last 3 years
3. External examiners’ reports and Board(s) of Studies responses for the last 3 years
4. National Student Survey results and/or PTES results for the last 3 years
5. Report on Educational Partnerships, produced by LTDS
6. Rolling DLHE data for the past three years, split into UG and PGT
7. Degree classification information, held in report to University Education Committee by Planning
8. School/subject-area Moderation and Scaling policies
9. Accreditation reports from professional, statutory and regulatory bodies (if applicable) and action plans (if required by the PSRB or Faculty Education Committee)
10. Admissions figures (including Percentage ABB+ entrants, percentage international students, and number of students from low participation neighbourhoods) (from Marketing & Student Recruitment)
11. Qualifications and Credit Framework (and FHEQ)

https://www.ncl.ac.uk/ltds/assets/documents/qsh-nuqcf-pol.pdf and
https://www.ncl.ac.uk/ltds/assets/documents/qsh-fheq-summary.pdf

Faculty-Held Documentation

1. List of exemptions from standard University policies (i.e. feedback turnaround, late submission, moderation and scaling)
2. RPL and Credit Transfer statements for the past 1 year
3. Student : Academic Staff Ratio

Documentation Provided by the Academic Unit

1. Programme handbooks
2. Minutes of the following meetings for the last full academic year and any from the current academic year:
   a. Boards of Studies (UG and PGT)
   b. Student-Staff Committee(s)
   c. Boards of Examiners (including Module Moderation Boards, if relevant)
   d. School Learning and Teaching Committee (or equivalent)
   e. School Management Board (or equivalent)
f. Staff Meetings

3. Access to a select number of Blackboard module and/or Community sites, including any student-facing School or subject area Community [the module or Community codes should be sent to LTDS, and the academic unit should arrange a Blackboard log-in for the external(s)].

4. Evidence of peer dialogue, including a local policy and a list of staff observed in the past 12 months.

5. Statement on CATS and CPD provision (if relevant), including:
   a. Number of students registered onto CPD modules and/or CATS programmes
   b. Number of students taking CPD modules without being registered

6. Placement handbooks, records of students on placement over the past 1 years (including name of placement supervisor and placement dates), and sample of placement learning agreements

7. Relevant materials for Flexible and Distance Learning (where relevant), including handbooks for these students and access to any Blackboard or online materials

8. Staffing workload model, showing how learning and teaching duties are allocated and taken into account

9. Diagram of the unit’s committee structure

10. Ethics policy and examples of paperwork used for UG and PGT research projects

11. Examples of instances in which students have been granted RPL
Annex 3  Evidence expected for the QE and TEL Summary

A member of LTDS will prepare a QE and TEL Summary for each review, to be circulated to the Review Team along with the SWOT and QA summary. The following items are just representative, since the nature of provision will vary according to each unit and discipline.

Recommendations / Commendations

There will be a top-level summary of the pertinent points from our analysis. The LTR panel receive a large amount of documentation, and it is very likely that this is the only section that will be looked at in any detail.

Learning and Teaching Overview

While we will undertake evidence gathering on the following areas, this information won’t necessarily be added into the final report, unless there are areas worth noting.

1. Innovation Fund winners and titles of projects - (Review back to the date of the last LTR)
2. Learning and Teaching conference and/or seminar contributions - (Review back to the date of the last LTR)
3. Teaching Awards - NTF, CATE, VC’s Education Excellence awards (since the last LTR)
4. Case Studies available on the LTDS database - only highlighting the case studies we want to highlight to the panel – (since the last LTR)

Blackboard Overview

The Blackboard review will examine approximately 20% of Blackboard sites in the subject area. The School will supply a list of modules to explore that should cover all stages and programmes.

Blackboard Baseline

1. Does the subject area use a standard template for Blackboard sites?
2. Does the subject area comply with the Blackboard Baseline?

Beyond the Baseline

3. Are there examples of the unit using Blackboard tools (e.g. discussion boards, wikis) to enhance student engagement?
4. Are there examples where the unit has posted and/or responded to student feedback (e.g. module evaluations, SSC minutes)?

Electronic Management of Assessment

1. Does the unit use Turnitin for plagiarism checks or for electronic marking through Turnitin Feedback Studio?
2. Does the unit use the OLAF service for online exams? Does the unit run its own online exams?
3. Are there examples of feedback on assessments being provided through Blackboard (either generic or individual student feedback)?

4. Are there any other activities relating to EMA? For example, WebPA activities, participation in UniWise pilots.

ReCap

1. What proportion of lectures in the unit is recorded? What proportion is made available to students?
2. What proportion of available videos has been viewed by students?
3. How are students using the recordings (e.g. taking notes)?
4. Is there evidence of innovative use of recordings (e.g. flipped classrooms)?
5. Are any staff or students using Personal Capture features?

ePortfolio

1. How many meeting slots have been offered and booked?
2. Is there any evidence of notes being added to meetings?
3. Are there examples of additional features (e.g. blog entries and comments, graduate skills framework, CV builder) being used by students?
Annex 4  Structure of LTR reports

All LTR reports will be written using the following structure and headings:

1. Introduction
2. Overall judgment
3. Exemplary practice commendations
4. Effective practice commendations
5. Recommendations for enhancement by the subject provider
6. Recommendations to the Faculty
7. Recommendations to the University
8. Student Support
9. Student Opinion/Voice
10. Teaching provision, assessment and feedback, quality management and enhancement
11. Links between teaching and research
12. Recruitment/admissions, induction, employment

Appendix 1 Quality assurance summary

Appendix 2 Quality enhancement and technology enhanced learning summary
Annex 5  List of Acronyms

AMR – Annual Monitoring and Review
AST – LTDS Administrative Support Team
CATS – Credit Accumulation and Transfer Scheme
LTDS – Learning and Teaching Development Service
LTR – Learning and Teaching Review
PSRB – Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body
QA – Quality Assurance
QAA – Quality Assurance Agency
QE – Quality Enhancement
RPL – Recognition of Prior Learning (previously known as APL or AP(E)L)
SWOT – Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
TEL – Technology-Enhanced Learning
TPSC – Taught Programmes Sub-Committee