



School Review Procedures

1. Context

This document outlines the specific elements of the quality review process for Schools at Trinity College Dublin (TCD) and should be read in conjunction with the [General Procedures for Quality Reviews](#).

The Procedure seeks to integrate the requirements of the [QQI Core Statutory Quality Assurance Guidelines \(Core April 2016\)](#), the Topic-specific [QQI Blended Learning Programme Guidelines \(BLP March 2018\)](#), [Ireland's Framework for Good Practice for Research Degree Programmes](#) and the [Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area](#) (ESG Part 1 May 2015). It reflects information requested under the College's action plan in response to the [HEA Gender Equality Report](#) and the [College's Diversity & Inclusion Strategy](#) and provides links to relevant [Academic Policies](#).

This revision aims to capture recent developments and lessons learned from the Covid-19 pandemic, the transition to remote, hybrid and blended learning and associated changes to assessment and examination practices; and the adoption of new online platforms and tools. Across Trinity, Schools are also participating in the Human Capital Initiative (HCI) and the Microcredentials Pilot. These Schools have much to contribute to the emerging quality assurance, nationally and internationally, around Continuous Professional Development and education provision that does not lead to Awards.

Schools that are subject to Professional Statutory Regulatory Body accreditation are informed that Trinity College has endorsed the [QQI Accreditation Principles](#)¹ and they should refer to the link below to check if the body that accredits their School's programmes has endorsed the Principles. Schools are directed to the [Annual Quality Report \(AQR\) to QQI](#) that details Trinity's Institutional-level Quality Assurance procedures and quality enhancement activities and to [Continuous Quality Improvement Reports](#) for information on the National Student Survey.ie

¹ [Endorsement of Principles for Professional Engagements with Education Providers \(qqi.ie\)](#)

(formerly ISSE), Undergraduate/Postgraduate Taught and the Postgraduate Research (PGR) survey reports and the [Resources](#) page for Good Practice Guidelines and weblinks to national and international quality documents when completing the Self- Assessment Report.

2. Purpose

2.1 These procedures set out broad guidelines for the review of a School and any associated Research Centres, and aims to facilitate a critical self-assessment of the School by the Head of the School, School staff and students, associated Trinity Research Institutes, collaborative partners, Associated Colleges and the relevant Faculty Dean.

2.2 The purpose of the review is:

- to provide a structured opportunity for a School to critically reflect on its activities and plans for development in the context of the School and College strategic plans and other strategic initiatives;
- to benefit from a constructive commentary by external reviewers to College that are experts in their field at a senior academic level;
- to ensure that quality and standards in teaching, research and administration are being maintained and enhanced, and that any areas of concern are identified and addressed;
- to promote the enhancement of the School's provision as part of a strategy for continuous quality improvement.

3. Scope

3.1 This procedure applies to quality reviews of Schools at Trinity College Dublin and addresses;

- The internal quality assurance of the School under review.
- The involvement of the School in College-level strategic initiatives such as the Global Relations Strategy, Human Capital Initiative, Microcredentials Programme and the Trinity Education Project.
- Comparisons with similar Schools in benchmarked Institutions nationally (where appropriate) and internationally.

3.2 Where a School has primary financial and administrative responsibility for a Trinity Research Centre (TRC), the review of the TRC will be included in the quality review of the School.

3.3 Where a School is engaged in Dual, Joint, other collaborative programmes in Ireland or transnationally, those programmes will form part of the scope of the review subject to the commencement date of the programme and the relevant clause in the approved agreement.

- 3.4 In addition to a standard Quality Review, Schools in agreement with the relevant Faculty Dean, have the option of a strategic review or thematic review. If such an option is chosen the nomination and selection process for the External Review team, the Terms of Reference for the review and the content of the Self-Assessment Report (SAR) reflect this focus (for more information refer to Appendix 2).

4. Benefits

Reviews of Schools:

- 4.1 Afford the School the opportunity to evaluate their own operation and performance in a structured way.
- 4.2 Allow the University to evaluate how well the School's strategic and research plans are aligned with those of College.
- 4.3 Fulfil the University's commitment to the quality assurance of its education and research provision.
- 4.4 Demonstrate alignment with the guidelines set out under the Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012, and the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) Part 1.

5. Procedure

- 5.1 The Quality Office will write to the Head of School in Trinity Term (approx. 18 months prior to the review) to notify them that the School is scheduled for review and requesting nominations for reviewers. Prior to submitting the completed nomination forms to the Quality Office, the list of potential nominees should be reviewed by the Faculty Dean for shortlisting.
- 5.2 The Quality Office will work with the Head of School and the Faculty Dean to agree Terms of Reference (TOR) for the review.
- 5.3 The School is asked not to contact potential nominees to garner their interest in participating in a quality review (this task will be conducted by the Quality Office). In considering nominees, it is important that no nominee has a close association with the School or its staff in a personal or professional capacity within a timeframe of 5 years, to avoid the perception of or an actual conflict of interest.
- 5.4 The list of nominees is informed by the scope of the review and should be balanced in terms of geography, gender and experience (see [General Procedures for Quality Reviews](#) section 5.5). Nominees should come from top-ranked Universities (QS World Rankings) and be comparable to Trinity in terms of institutional size i.e. student numbers,

comprehensiveness of provision, research intensiveness etc. Where relevant, nominees should comprise representatives from the business/professional sectors e.g. employer representative, student/graduate representative.

- 5.5 The [Reviewer Nomination Form](#) (available via the Quality Office website) should provide sufficient background information about the nominee to allow an informed decision to be made by the Selection Panel. If background information is not available on the internet or through other public information sources, candidates will be contacted by the Quality Office to request a Curriculum Vitae.
- 5.6 Prior to submitting the completed nomination forms to the Quality Office, the list of potential nominees should be reviewed by the Faculty Dean for shortlisting. On receipt of shortlisted nominees, the Quality Office will provide the short-list to the Selection Panel, who will select three to four Reviewers and reserve candidates.
- 5.7 The Quality Office will liaise with selected candidates to confirm the composition of the review team, liaise with the School and with the relevant College Officers to identify suitable dates and align these with the Reviewers' preferences.
- 5.8 An Internal Facilitator will be appointed by the Quality Office, in consultation with the School. Information on the appointment and role of the [Internal Facilitator](#) can be found on the Quality Office website.
- 5.9 Where the Faculty Dean is a member of a School or Trinity Research Institute (TRI) under Review, the nomination of a Pro-Dean will be sought from the Faculty Dean. The Pro-Dean cannot be a member of the School or Trinity Research Institute (TRI) undergoing review or of a School involved in multidisciplinary provision of School programmes but may be from another School within the Faculty. The nomination of the Pro-Dean must be approved by the Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer before the appointment is confirmed.
- 5.10 The Pro-Dean represents the role of the Dean at the meetings with College Officers and the Review Team but does not have a role in responding to or implementing the report. The Faculty Dean is expected to meet with the Review Team with respect to Faculty and School Finances and can attend School related meetings as a member of academic staff.

Development of the Self-Assessment Report (SAR), the Terms of Reference for the review and the Review Schedule.

- 5.11 It is recommended that the School establish a coordinating group to plan and manage the activities leading up to the Review. The coordinating group should be chaired by the Head of School and may include the Heads of Discipline (for multidiscipline schools), Director of Research, Directors of Teaching & Learning, senior administrative and technical support staff.

- 5.12 The Self-Assessment Report (SAR) forms the principal source of information for the External Review team prior to their arrival on-site. Its development is based on the outcome of a self-review and critical evaluation. It should have a strategic focus, be forward looking, and provide an appraisal of the School's activities and strategy, and the quality assurance processes that support these activities. When the review is strategic, this will inform the structure and format of the SAR.
- 5.13 A SWOT analysis should be conducted with various internal audiences including student and staff groupings, relevant partner Schools, Trinity Research Centers (TRC) and Trinity Research Institutes (TRIs), any Associated Colleges/collaborative partners with whom the School has links/partnerships. The purpose of the SWOT is to facilitate a critical assessment and self-review of the School's strategy, governance, structure, education and research provision, internal and external relationships, and resources. Tips on conducting a [SWOT analysis](#) can be found on the Quality Office website. The [Five Phases of Quality Assurance Tool](#) (Maastrich University) found on the Quality Office website may be a place to start the discussion within the School.
- 5.14 The outcomes of the SWOT analysis and analysis of data on the various activities of the School, including outcomes of professional and statutory accreditation reviews, research theme reviews, partnerships/collaborations, international recruitment, student module evaluation, National Student Survey.ie and International Student Barometer (ISB) surveys over a period of five years inform the development of the SAR. Further information on data requirements is outlined in Appendix 3. Supports available from the Library for Schools undergoing Quality Reviews can be found [here](#).
- 5.15 The main body of the SAR should be between 30-60 pages (excluding the appendices) and conform to [Trinity's visual identity handbook v2](#) in terms of how the University is referenced. The SAR is organised under the following chapter headings (for detailed guidance refer to Appendix 2):
1. Introduction/Overview;
 2. School Strategy and Planning;
 3. Organization and Management;
 4. Assessment of Undergraduate Education;
 5. Assessment of Postgraduate Education;
 6. Assessment of Research Impact – include Research Centres, if appropriate;
 7. Resources;
 8. Administration;
 9. Relationships and external engagement.
- 5.16 The Faculty Dean and Faculty Finance Partner must sign off on financial data in the SAR.

- 5.17 The Faculty Dean, as outlined in the [Quality Policy Statement](#), must also be consulted and agree if the School is seeking recognition of alternate statutory accreditation quality processes.
- 5.18 As the process to develop the SAR comes to completion, the process to develop the schedule for the on-site visit commences. The Quality Office will lead the process for development of the Schedule in agreement with the School and School Administrative Manager. The principles to be followed in the development of the schedule of meetings can be found in the [General Procedures for Quality Reviews](#).
- 5.19 The final draft of the SAR, with the appendices and the schedule of meetings, are to be submitted to the Quality Office six weeks prior to the review date. The Quality Office will arrange for proofreading of the final draft prior to its dissemination to the Review team.
- 5.20 The School is asked not to invite or make any arrangement to meet with individual members of the Review Team during their time in College for the purpose of the review. Reviewers are asked to comply with a [Code of Conduct for Reviewers](#) which can be found on the Quality Office website.
- Further [advice on co-ordinating a review](#) and [tips on conducting a review](#) can be found on the Quality Office website.

Follow-up Processes

- 5.21 Detail on the post review processes can be found in the General Procedures for Quality Reviews. In summary:
- 5.21.1 The draft review report is due to be submitted within three weeks of the site visit. Feedback on factual accuracy is provided by the School and the Faculty Dean and is made available to the Review team for submission of a final report within a further three weeks.
- 5.21.2 The Head of School and the Faculty Dean are invited to formally respond to the final report and review recommendations. The report, along with formal responses from the Head of School and the Faculty Dean, are considered by the Quality Committee and then by the University Council.
- 5.21.3 An Implementation Plan is then prepared (see template in General Procedures for Quality Reviews) and submitted to the Quality Committee and to the University Council.
- 5.21.4 Within twelve months of Council approval of the Implementation Plan, a Progress Report is submitted to the Quality Committee and then to Council.
- 5.21.5 The Review Report and responses are published on the Quality Office website.

Appendix 1: Terms of Reference for School Reviews (Generic)

Context: Academic activities in education and research Trinity College Dublin, the University of Dublin are performed in one of three Faculties:

- (i) Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences, which is comprised of 12 Schools;
- (ii) Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics, which is comprised of eight Schools; and
- (iii) Health Sciences, which is comprised of four Schools.

Each School is led by a Head of School who is responsible for the effective general management of the School, for ensuring the provision of academic leadership and strategic vision, and for the quality of the student experience.

Purpose of a School Review is to:

- (i) to provide a structured opportunity for a School to critically reflect on its activities and plans for development in the context of the school and college strategic plans and other strategic initiatives;
- (ii) to benefit from a constructive commentary by external reviewers to College that are experts in their field at a senior academic level;
- (iii) to ensure that quality and standards in teaching, research and administration are being maintained and enhanced, and that any areas of concern are identified and addressed;
- (iv) to promote the enhancement of the School's provision as part of a strategy for continuous quality improvement.

Terms of Reference for a School Review:

The Review Team is invited to assess and make recommendations to the University on the following:

- i. School Strategy in terms of its fitness-for-purpose to respond to the College strategies, the internal and external environment, emergent risks and opportunities in the relevant discipline, nationally and internationally.
- ii. The quality of the School's teaching and learning provision, learning resources and learning environment (internal and external to campus) that underpin the delivery of:
 - a. undergraduate programmes, curriculum and graduate attributes
 - b. postgraduate taught programmes, curriculum and graduate attributes
 - c. postgraduate research programmes, postdoctoral development
 - d. other types of provision e.g. continuous professional development, microcredentials, short courses etc.
- iii. The quality of the School's research strategy, including any Research Centres within the School, participation in College Research Themes and engagement with Trinity Research Institutes.
- iv. Resources available to the School to deliver on its academic mission (Financial, Facilities, Human).
- v. The effectiveness of the School's governance, management and administration structures in delivering and supporting the achievement of its strategy and mission.

Notes:

- i. The above TOR are generic and form the basis for consultation with Schools to customise the TOR for individual School reviews.
- ii. The TOR for strategic and thematic reviews ~~are~~/will be different from those outlined above.

Appendix 2: Approach to the Self-Assessment Report (SAR)



The Self-Assessment Report (SAR) provides the opportunity for Schools to reflect on the internal quality assurance and improvement approaches that support the function and activities of the School, its contribution to College, to students and stakeholders and in the public domain.

The content of the SAR and appendices will be shaped by the scope and Terms of Reference of the review as agreed by the Head of School and Faculty Dean:

- a **standard** review: looks at the quality assurance processes that support all aspects of a School's governance, management, research, teaching, operations, administration and resourcing, as outlined in the next section;
- a **strategic** review: provides an opportunity for the School to focus on a specific strategy or challenge. The differentiating feature of this type of review is that it sets a specific action for the review team and context for the recommendations arising from the review report;
- a **thematic** review: the differentiating feature of a thematic review is that it occurs across College, or reviews an area of interest or interdependencies across a number of Schools. The recommendations arising from the review report inform Faculty and individual School planning.
- whether **recognition of alternate statutory quality review processes** has been approved under:
 - Quality Policy Statement (March 2021)
 - QQI's Accreditation Principles, endorsed by Trinity in June 2021

Chapter 1: Introduction:

The introductory chapter should set the context of the School at the time of the Review. It should address the following and act in part as an executive summary to the report.

- Short introduction to Trinity College Dublin and the evolution of the School;
- Brief overview of the consultative process undertaken to complete the SAR;
- Key areas the School would like the Review Team to focus on in the review, as identified for example using a SWOT analysis and linking to the Terms of Reference;

- A concise update on the implementation of recommendations arising from the most recent review (as per Table 1 below) and comment if the recommendation continues to impact on the School.

Table 1: Update on recommendations arising from the previous review

Recommendation	Status C-I-NP	Comment by School

Key: C-completed; I-incomplete; NP-not progressed/School did not agree to recommendation

The Appendices for the introductory chapter should include:

- a high-level organisational chart outlining the School structure and reporting lines;
- a summary profile of all programmes offered by the School (UG and PG) leading to Awards on the [National Framework of Qualifications](#) (NFQ) as per Table 2 below (refer College Calendar or UG Prospectus).

Table 2: Award Profile

Programme name	Award	NFQ level	ECTS	Duration	Intake/Quota	Total student numbers-all years

- a summary profile 'other provision' including any HCI - continuous professional development, microcredential, stand-alone modules, extramural, MOOCs, summer school programmes, - not leading to Awards on the NFQ;
- the student profile in the School to include the information outlined in Table 3 below:

Table 3: Student Profile as per most recent HEA Return (all cohorts)

Male	Female	UG<23 years	UG >23 - Mature	UG – Access*	PGT	PGR	Other Provision	Irish	Other EU	NEU

*Key: *Access – HEAR, DARE, TAP,*

Chapter 2: School Strategy and Planning:

This chapter should outline where the School is at the time of review in terms of its Strategic Planning cycle. The School's Strategic Plan is a key document that informs the Quality Review Process and should be included in full in the Appendices to the SAR. It is recommended that the School reviews and updates its Strategic Plan (including its Research Plan) prior to commencing the self-assessment process.

Of interest to the review team are:

- an assessment of whether the School is achieving its objectives.
- alignment of the School strategic direction with the College's Strategic Plan.

- School response in its strategic planning process to College-wide initiatives such as the Trinity Education Project, the Global Relations strategy, the E3 project, HCI, Microcredentials, on-line Education, and Athena Swan Awards.
- identification of risks or trends (national and international) that may impact on the School strategy and attainment of strategic goals e.g. emergence of competitor programmes, difficulties attaining clinical sites for required professional placements, risks associated with partnerships and new types of provision;
- participation by staff, students and other stakeholders to the School strategic planning process;
- action plans responding to professional accreditation or other internal/external reviews;
- any strategic proposals on which Reviewer opinion is to be sought.
- key partnerships the School has entered into in order to pursue its academic / research mission as outlined in Table 4 below and include in the Appendices:

Table 4: Partnership Profile

Partner details	Type of Arrangement E-SA-AA-D-J-C-R-O	Programmes titles	Student Numbers by cohort year

Key: E-exchange; SA-Study Abroad AA-Articulation Arrangement; D-dual award; J-joint award; C-collaborative; R-research; O-other e.g. multidimensional.

Chapter 3: Organisation and Management:

This chapter should outline the School quality assurance processes that support the leadership, management and operations of the School. Key inclusions in the Appendices are an organisational chart or organogram and Terms of Reference for and membership of decision-making structures/committees, including gender and diversity profile of membership.

Of interest to the review team are:

- an evaluation of the effectiveness of the School's organisational, management and decision-making structures/committees, including the relationships with Disciplines (for multidisciplinary Schools), associated Trinity Research Centres (TRCs) and Trinity Research Institutes (TRIs);
- the extent to which School quality assurance policies, procedures and protocols are documented and embedded in the management of School functions and adhered to by staff, students, contractors and visitors to the School;
- the extent to which students and external stakeholders e.g. employers/industry, linked providers and collaborative partners are involved in School decision-making e.g. student representation on School committees, staff-student liaison committees, partnerships governance structures;
- specific roles and responsibilities of School staff with respect to quality assurance of education, research and the student experience e.g. Erasmus/Study abroad, Disability Liaison, Placement /Internships(refer Appendix 4), Instructional Design (Blended/Online), Year Coordinators, Safety Officer etc;

- how staff are kept informed of changes in regulations, policies and procedures and how the outcome of key School, Faculty and College-level decision-making processes are disseminated within the School.
- Action taken by the School with respect to the [Student Partnership Policy](#).

Chapter 4: Assessment of Undergraduate Education:

This chapter should outline the quality assurance processes that support the provision of undergraduate education to students and ensure that the undergraduate learning experience meets the standards and requirements of College the NFAQ, and relevant statutory and accreditation bodies.

Key data for inclusion in the Appendices are an outline of all undergraduate programmes and awards offered by the School (see Table 2). On-line courses should also be outlined, in addition to information on the proportion of programmes that offer content through blended learning (flipped classroom, VLE etc.)

Of interest to the review team are:

- *An assessment of the undergraduate recruitment and admissions process (Core Std 3.2, ESG Std 1.4)* including access routes for widening participation groups, recognition of prior formal, informal and non-formal learning, as per the College Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Policy, recognition of foreign qualifications (NAIRC) and the recruitment processes used to secure international students e.g. Student Exchanges, Study Abroad, Education Recruitment Agents, Articulation Agreements, Dual/Joint Awards, other forms of partnership.
- *School response to drivers to review its undergraduate teaching programmes and curriculum (Core Std 3.3, ESG Std 1.9)* for example, in the context of the Trinity Education Project, what curriculum architecture applies to the School curriculum; what entry and exist pathways, 'open modules' and 'Trinity electives' can students avail off? Are there opportunities for student mobility, e.g. internships, Study Abroad built into the curriculum structure? Has the School received Council approved derogations in respect of the programme architecture or progression and Awards?
- *How the School enhances the student learning experience through pedagogically informed teaching methods, use of appropriate teaching strategies, the incorporation of generic or transferable skills and integrative and reflective learning into assignments (Core Std 3.2, 5.2, ESG Std 1.3).* Include reference to, for example, the use of different modes of curriculum delivery and pedagogical approaches, the incorporation of new technologies, student-led teaching into the curriculum, the facilitation of small group learning, the use of portfolios, the design and quality assurance of blended and on-line learning resources (BLP Std 4.2).
- *What is the School's strategy or approach to Assessment (Core Std 6.1, ESG 1.3)* e.g. Assessment of, for and as Learning and whether the School has reviewed its assessment methods to take into account the recommendations of the [TEP Assessment Framework](#) and the attainment of

Graduate Attributes. If so, the School should provide a summary of the outcome of that mapping exercise in the Appendices.

- *How the School provides feedback on assessed work to its undergraduate students (Core Std 6.1, ESG 1.3), as per the College's [Return of Coursework Policy](#) (20 days UG; 30days PG). Does the School have a standard feedback procedure and how is adherence to this procedure and the above policy monitored?*
- *What internal School processes are in place to support the integrity of the assessment process (Core Std 6.1) including:*
 - the internal processes around the development and security of examination questions e.g. encryption, secure storage and transfer, the provision of model answers and rubrics and the process for incorporation of feedback from external examiners regarding examination questions and other forms of assessment;
 - measures to reduce the predictability of exam questions by students e.g MCQs;
 - adherence by School staff to internal School guidelines and criteria for marking to include grade descriptors, consistency and transparency of marks, use of marking sheets, the process for resolution of internal marks, moderation of grades, annotation of scripts, anonymity of exam scripts, access by students to exam scripts;
 - practices regarding assessment and marking of individual and group projects, including by external markers;
 - the maintenance of records e.g. external examiner, exam scripts;
 - the publication of results.
- Does the curriculum provide for off-campus learning (Core Std 5.4) e.g. opportunities to study abroad, to undertake internships and professional placements? Outline the quality assurance frameworks that govern these opportunities, (refer Sample Checklist Appendix 4).
- *The processes in place to assure the quality of teaching in the School (Core Std 4.3, ESG Std 1.5), such as induction programmes, peer mentoring and opportunities for Continuous Professional Development, recognition through Deans Awards, Provost Teaching Awards etc. Are supports in place to manage and quality assure external contributions to teaching and learning in the discipline e.g. Adjuncts, Guest Speakers?*
- *Use of internal and external data sources on the quality assurance of teaching and learning e.g. progression and retention data, attainment by grade, degree classification, module and programme evaluations by students, survey data (the National Student Survey.ie (formerly ISSE) includes the UG/PGT and the Postgraduate Research Survey (PGR) survey reports, the International Student Barometer (ISB),) and Graduate Outcomes), External Examiners recommendations, accreditation bodies reports, advisory bodies and employer, industry or community representatives.*

- *The opportunities provided by the School to enhance the student experience through the provision of (Core Std 7.1, ESG Std 1.6):*
 - School–level student supports– e.g. student induction processes for international, visiting or Erasmus students; student services; provision of student facilities/amenities; referring students to teaching and learning supports (e.g. Maths helpdesk, S2D, SLD).
 - information for students (including information on the School website and in Blackboard), such as programme handbooks identifying core, pre-requisite and elective modules, and progression requirements, and where these can be accessed, information on Blackboard that complies with the minimum content requirements of the [VLE Policy](#);;
 - opportunities to be involved in the research activity of the School e.g. through attendance at seminars, conferences and by undertaking projects and internships.

- *How the School addresses plagiarism/academic integrity.* What measures does the School have in place to identify and address contract cheating/essay mills? Does the School comply with the College Policy on the use of Turnitin in Blackboard? Does the School refer students to the [Trinity Plagiarism Policy](#) or College Calendar regulation with respect to Plagiarism/academic misconduct? Do School handbooks contain Trinity’s specified section on plagiarism and are students required to complete a signed declaration to be submitted with all assessed coursework, declaring that they have completed the online tutorial and that the assignment/coursework submitted by them is their own work? Has the School implemented ‘proctoring software’ or alternate processes for online assessment /exams? Refer to the National Academic Integrity Network Guidelines and Lexicon.

- In summary, what are the main challenges facing undergraduate teaching and learning in the School and how these challenges are being addressed? How could undergraduate education in the School be improved?

Chapter 5: Assessment of Postgraduate Education

This chapter should outline the quality assurance processes that support the provision of postgraduate education to students and ensure that the postgraduate learning experience meets the standards and requirements of College, and provides postgraduate students with an opportunity to fully integrate with the research life of the School and to broaden their skills beyond their immediate subject area.

Of interest to the Review team are:

- *A profile of the postgraduate taught and research programmes and awards offered by the School, including those offered collaboratively or in partnership with other Schools or institutions, nationally and transnationally, or via blended (BLP Std 4.2) or online learning (Table 2).*

- *Recruitment and admission to the School’s postgraduate programmes (PGT and PGR) including access routes for widening participation groups, management of requests for recognition of prior learning as per the [Recognition of Prior Learning \(RPL\) Policy](#), international recruitment activity*

including recognition of foreign qualifications ([NAIRC](#)) and assessment of and supports for English-language competency for international PG students.

- *Effectiveness in attracting external funding for funded postgraduate positions* by the School and individual Supervisors within the School, and how the School/Supervisors engage with external funders?
- *Implementation of College's policies and procedures* at School level in relation to [Postgraduate Research Supervision Policy](#), the [Remote Supervision of Postgraduate \(Doctoral\) Students](#), the [Supervision of Research Students Best Practice Guidelines](#), [Trinity Plagiarism Policy](#) and [Policy on Good Research Practice?](#)
- *Model of Supervision that predominates in the School* e.g. does the School operate a single supervisor model or has it implemented Thesis Committees for PGR students? What model of supervision is used for PGT dissertation supervision e.g. does the School operate a 'mini-thesis' approach to PGT dissertations or group projects or creative works?
- *Structured PhD Programme* (Refer [National Framework for Doctoral Education](#).) How does the School communicate the requirements of the Structured PhD Programme and provide guidance to students on the taught module requirements and the availability of modules at Discipline/School/College level?
- *Mechanisms to monitor the progress of research students* ([RDP Std 3.4](#)) e.g. attendance at formal supervision meetings, annual reports and the confirmation process, mitigating the risk of non-completion, or of an unsatisfactory outcome e.g. major corrections, award of lower degree, failure.
- *Supervision of research (PGT and PGR)* ([RDP Std 6.1-6.4](#)) e.g. does the proportion of staff available to provide supervision for research dissertations and theses meet the needs of the School and of students? What is the supervision load per individual academic and is this monitored? Are gaps emerging in the content expertise of School staff to meet requests by students for research projects in new or emerging areas of interest? Does the School promote participation by staff with supervisory responsibilities in the [Research Supervision Development Programme?](#)
- *Methods by which the School acts to enhance the student experience* (refer [National Student Survey](#) (PGT) and [PGR Survey Reports](#)) ([RDP Std 6.5, 7.3](#)). Does the School offer high quality blended or on-line learning resources ([BLP Std 4.2](#))? Does the School provide opportunities for students to engage in collaborative learning, to teach or demonstrate, or commercialise their work? Are students offered opportunities to participate in professional development opportunities e.g. [Graduate Teaching Assistants?](#) Does the School seek to integrate its postgraduate taught and research students into the School/College community by engaging them in research seminars or networking events/conferences?

- *Resources available to PGT and PGR postgraduate students* such as studentships, designated work-study-bench space, equipment and other specialist resources necessary to conduct their research, and student amenities e.g. seminar and common rooms?
- An outline of the mechanisms in place for assuring the quality of postgraduate education in the School (*RDP Std 2.3*) (e.g. student feedback mechanisms, professional accreditation cycle, cycle of curriculum review, feedback from external examiners, feedback from employers, funding bodies, benchmarking with other institutions etc.).
- In summary, what are the main challenges facing postgraduate education in the School and how are these challenges being addressed? How can postgraduate education in the School be improved?

Chapter 6. Assessment of Supports for Research Activity and Impact

This chapter should outline the processes and strategy that support research in the School, and how they are monitored to ensure alignment with the School's and College's research targets and strategic goals.

Key data for inclusion in the Appendices are annual reports to funding bodies (e.g. SFI), annual reports from Research Centers to the Dean of Research, a profile of the research activity of the School by discipline, total grant funding and success rates of grant applications.

Of interest to the Review team are:

- *The key research groupings/themes* in which the School is currently involved, and the research facilities available to them. Include any Trinity Research Institutes (TRI) in which the School is a partner or any approved Trinity Research Centres associated with the School;
- *The School's research strategy* including an evaluation of its coherency and commentary on its alignment with the College Research Strategy, Research Themes, Ranking Strategy.
- A detailed analysis of the contribution of Trinity Research Centres for which the School has primary administrative and financial responsibility, answering the following questions:
 - What is the added value of having the Research Centre – in terms of Research Activity or Research Excellence?
 - If the Research Centre did not exist would anything different be happening?
 - Is there sufficient critical mass in terms of the number of people involved in the Centre? Is it a discernible entity?
 - Is there evidence of inter-disciplinarily in terms of joint teaching and joint publications?
- The link between the School's research and its teaching activities; what opportunities are available for research-active staff to be involved in undergraduate and postgraduate teaching, laboratory supervision and tutorials?

- *An evaluation of the School's research performance or impact* (including that as part of a TRI) and a description of how the School's research activities are disseminated both within College and beyond; include reference to the following where applicable:
- How the School measures its research activity/productivity, against e.g.
 - the Faculty's key performance indicators (KPIs) for research
 - discipline-specific frameworks e.g. - see Royal Irish Academy [Developing KPIs for the Humanities.](#)
 - national and international comparators, and uses the outcomes of such evaluations to continually improve performance and impact?
- Outline the social, cultural and policy impacts of the School's research.
- *How (where appropriate) the School demonstrates and supports innovation and entrepreneurship?* For example:
 - What mechanisms are in place to promote commercialisation of research and technology transfer?
 - How are campus-companies/spin-outs and technology transfer supported and developed by the School? What start-ups/spin-out companies have been generated from the School?
 - What systems are in place to support the management of intellectual property?
- *An outline of the main sources of research funding to the School.* Comment on the effectiveness of the School's research funding strategy and suggest ways in which the School's ability to successfully attract research funding could be improved. Does the School have a Research Programme Officer to support research grant application activities?
- *How the School ensures integrity and ethical practice in the conduct of its research* as outlined in the [Trinity Policy on Good Research Practice \(June 2021\).](#) What mechanism is employed to ensure that researchers complete Research Integrity training and are made aware of pathways to raise concerns of research misconduct? Provide in summary form a profile of proposals approved by the School's Research Ethics Committee per annum for the past five years and the outcome.
- *The quality assurance procedures in place around the delivery of research and support activities.* Is the School a participant in external professional or regulatory accreditation programmes? If the School or its associated research centers include laboratories, is there a Safety Statement/protocol and how is adherence to safety monitored and incidents managed? Has the School implemented the LabCup Chemical Safety System, where appropriate?
- *What are the main challenges facing research in the School* and how are these challenges being addressed? In what ways could the School research performance/impact be improved?

Chapter 7. Resources:

This chapter should outline the resources (financial, human and physical) available to the School to deliver on its mission and strategy and set the context for current and future levels of resourcing if these are anticipated to change. Key documents to include in the Appendices include financial information that should be sourced from and confirmed by the Divisional Finance Partner and Faculty Dean; Core HR data including Equality and Diversity data that should be sourced from the Division HR Partner and Space/Floor Plans available from Estates & Facilities Department.

Note: Information in this chapter will be used to meet College commitments under the HEA Gender Equality Plan and College Diversity & Inclusion Strategy.

Of interest to the Review team are:

- *An outline the School's funding sources* including those allocated through the Baseline Budgeting Model (BBM) and other sources of income that seek to ensure the sustainability of the School, including research grant income, self-funding activities e.g. Summer Schools, international student recruitment and partnerships.
- *An evaluation of the School's current financial situation* and its impact on the School's teaching and research provision and whether the resource allocation mechanisms in place in the School are appropriate. Include a copy of Income and expenditure statement in the Appendix.
- *School's current and projected staffing levels* as per the School's 3-year staffing plan. Evaluate whether the current and projected staff composition (by grade, gender, contract type and career stage) and expertise is appropriate to support the operations and activity of the School and the achievement of its strategic objectives. What action plans are in place to address gender, diversity, skill-mix and content expertise issues identified in the evaluation?
- *School Workload Allocation Model* for academic staff in respect of Teaching and Learning, Research, Administration, Supervision, Tutors etc.
- *Profile of academic staff qualifications* including PhD attainment, publications, grant income, workload, project supervision, research supervision, consulting projects and patents in the last five years. Provide this information disaggregated by gender, age-band, career stage.
- *Staff development* how development needs are identified and support the School's strategic plan, and in terms of individual aspirations with regard to teaching and research? Include mentoring and supports for young and early career academic staff, promotion, career and professional development opportunities for staff including access to sabbatical leave, opportunities to develop skills in the design and delivery of blended, elearning or online learning platforms.

- *Statistical data on staff* applying for promotion (Liaise with Faculty HR Partner) and comment on application and success rates by gender, grade, age-band and full-time/part-time status. Comment on how staff are encouraged and supported through this process?
- *HR policies* including if the School operates a family-friendly or flexible work -place practices. Comment on how these have been implemented, what proportion of staff have availed of such opportunities and have they succeeded in retaining staff in the school?
- *School environment* i.e. space occupied by the School including facilities spread across multiple sites, whether the space is fit-for-purpose for student, staff and stakeholder needs. Include reference to accessibility of teaching spaces, research spaces, office space, and social spaces.
- *Maintenance and replacement schedule for key equipment and infrastructure.* Is budget allocated to maintenance and replacement of key equipment and infrastructure? Are there Service Level Agreements related to this activity? How often is the effectiveness and value-for-money of these agreements reviewed or evaluated?
- *An assessment of the main challenges facing the resourcing of the School* and how they are being addressed?

Chapter 8. Administration:

This chapter should outline the quality assurance processes that support the effectiveness of the administration of the School including key systems and processes employed by staff to deliver its operations and respond to user, stakeholder and College needs, assure policy, legislative and regulatory compliance within the remit of the School and support School performance, decision-making and reporting.

Of interest to the Review team are:

- *administrative structures and resources* (administrative, technical and support staff) that support the operation and management of the School and its activities.
- *documents that support the efficient and effective administration of the School* (*Core Std 1.2*) e.g. Policies, Procedures, Standard Operating Procedures/Protocols, Annual Calendar, School Planning and Meetings.
- *information management and compliance* (*Core Std 8.1-8.7*) protocols on providing information to students /staff in accessible formats in accordance with the [Accessible Information Policy](#) e.g. Programme Handbooks, on managing data (store and secure) in accordance with the College [information compliance](#) requirements, European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), the [Records Management Policy](#) and [VLE Policy](#).
- *processes to support assessment and examinations* including accuracy of marking, entry of grades into SITS, the Court of Examiners (virtual and physical), and the Court of First Appeal.

- *key systems used to support the administrative functions* and the delivery of the service to students, staff and stakeholders including professional and statutory accreditation bodies and registration bodies linked to recognition of the school's programmes.
- *An assessment of the main challenges facing the administration of the School* and how these challenges are being addressed.

Chapter 9. Relationships and external engagement:

This chapter should include an assessment of the School's relationships and engagement with College and the wider society in Ireland and internationally. Key documents for inclusion in the Appendices are a calendar detailing activity by the School in the public domain, list of staff memberships of professional bodies, associations, membership of key College committees or staff holding College level positions, samples of marketing/communication resources.

Of interest to the Review Team are:

- access to information that communicates the role of the School, the programmes, research and subject experts available (*Core Std 9.1, ESG Std 1.8*): including information contained on the School website, social media platforms, publications and marketing resources and the cycle of review and update of same;
- *School's engagement in the wider community*, including with other educational institutions in Ireland and abroad (*Core Std 10.1-10.2*), industry, public agencies, professional and community bodies. How this engagement benefits the profile of the School, its staff and students and how these external relations are managed to ensure mutual benefits are achieved;
- *access to information in languages other than English*, if requested, to respond to the increasing diversity of the College student community, marketing activities in international fora;
- *an assessment of how the School evaluates its relationships* with external stakeholders and the general public and how these maybe improved or obstacles to their success, addressed.

Appendix 3: Suggested data for inclusion in the SAR

Data Requirements	Source
<p><i>Chapter 1-Introduction</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organisational chart including reporting lines • Table 2-Award profile of all programmes leading to an award on the NFQ • Profile of School education provision not leading to an award on the NFQ e.g. extramural, CPD, stand-alone modules, microcredentials • Table 3 Student Profile 	<p>School Administrator Academic Registry/SITS</p>
<p><i>Chapter 2 – Strategic Direction and Planning</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Strategic Plan, Teaching & Learning Strategy and Research Strategy showing alignment with, contribution to and impact of College strategies e.g. Global Relations Strategy, Innovation & Entrepreneurship Strategy, On-line Education Strategy, Diversity and Inclusion Strategy, Athena Swan targets, Trinity Education Project • School Risk Register • Table 4- Partnership Profile 	<p>See web links</p> <p>School Administrator, Global Officer or Global Engagement; Academic Registry</p>
<p><i>Chapter 3 - Organisation/management</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Committee structure, and Terms of Reference and links to principal committees of College • Profile of management, leadership and committee members (internal/external, gender/diversity) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Administrator
<p><i>Chapter 4 - Undergraduate programme data for previous 5 years:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undergraduate student profile and numbers: Quotas, CAO points, admission/enrolment statistics, new entrant data, year on year retention, exam results and attainment of Award by Class, progression and completion rates, gender profile, nationality. • Profile of undergraduate students who enter through non-CAO routes (TAP, HEAR, DARE, Mature, Direct entry, Non EU) • Handbooks providing module descriptors for taught programmes • Profile of programme delivery methods i.e. proportion of modules/programmes having an on-line/blended learning component (Note: access to VLE by external review team maybe requested). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SITS/ SL Annual Reports Admission Office/Academic Registry • Trinity Access Programme Mature Student Officer Academic Registry • School Administrator
<p><i>Chapter 4- Quality Assurance information for Undergraduate Programmes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undergraduate module survey data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Administrator • School administrator or Dir of T&L (UG)

Data Requirements	Source
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data from other student feedback mechanisms including staff:student liaison committees • Data from assessment/student evaluation of off-campus learning e.g. placements, internships, Erasmus exchanges etc. • External examiner report recommendations • Accreditation Reports (if applicable) • National Student Survey data • International Student Barometer (ISB) data • Disciplinary (Plagiarism) and Appeal data (Progression) • Progression and Retention data • Outcome of School's internal mapping of curriculum, assessment and workload undertaken as part of the TEP Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality Office • Global Officer Coordinator • Senior Lecturer Annual Reports/Academic Registry Annual Report
<p><i>Chapter 5 - Postgraduate data for previous 5 years:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Postgraduate student profile (gender, nationality) and numbers- Masters Register and PhD Register • Progression and retention data, • Degree classification and Award data • Confirmation rates, Completion rates by gender, nationality etc. • Studentship funds (numbers available and uptake of each) • Teaching Assistant data • National Student Survey Report PGT and PGR) • International Student Barometer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean of Graduate Studies Annual Report, Admissions Office/Academic Registry • Dir of T&L (PG) • School Administrator • Quality Office • Global Engagement Office
<p><i>Chapter 5 - Quality Assurance information for Postgraduate Programmes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Postgraduate module survey data-PGT and PGR • External examiner report recommendations • Handbooks providing module descriptors for PGT • Research handbook • Supervision workload 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty Administrator • School administrator • Quality Office
<p><i>Chapter 5 - Postgraduate Student supports</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Profile of generic modules/transferrable skills modules available to students within the school. • Profile of generic modules/transferrable skills modules available to students at faculty/College level • Profile of research seminars, conferences, networking events and student uptake of same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty Administrator • School administrator • Academic Registry

Data Requirements	Source
<p><i>Chapter 6 - Research:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annual reports from associated Trinity Research Centers - A summary table of grants and contract funding (active and pending) for each research theme/grouping associated with the School; - Research yield - Applications and outcome of funding grants from external funding bodies (proposals vs awards) –SFI, ERC, Horizon 2020 against funding strategy/targets and disaggregated by gender, career stage, age-band; See MyPiQA research metrics. - Copies of Research Staff profiles – from RSS; - Results of research impact evaluation exercises; - Profile of proposals approved by the School’s Research Ethics Committee per annum for the past five years and the outcome. • Evidence of support for start-up/entrepreneurial activity including student activity e.g. Launchbox; campus companies, knowledge transfer, IP, patents/licenses, industry contracts, collaborative projects; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dean of Research - Finance Service Division - TR&I - Library (RSS) - Director of Research - Director of Research • TR&I
<p><i>Chapter 7 - Finance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Summary financial statement outlining the School’s source of income, funding streams and expenditure; - Financial projections for the next 3 years; • BBM data • Prizes/awards received; • FTEs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School Administrator, Head of School, Faculty Finance Partner and Finance Service Division - School Administrator - School Administrator
<p><i>Chapter 7 – Staffing (as per Diversity &Inclusion Manager request):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff category by Gender (Academic, Admin, Research, Technical, Support) • Within staff category, analysis by grade level and gender (Academic Staff by Asst. Professor, Assoc. Professor, Professor In, Professor of • Contract type by gender (Fulltime/Part time, fixed term, permanent and indefinite duration staff • All staff breakdown by Age • All staff breakdown by Nationality <p><i>Other staffing data</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biographies of academic staff in the School to include publications, grant income, workload, project supervision, research supervision, consulting projects and patents in the last five years. • Staff:Student Ratio (FTSE data) • Staff development opportunities and profile of uptake • Profile of staff applying for and achieving promotion by gender, grade, age-band and contract type (full-time/part-time status) • Profile of staff availing of flexible work arrangements 	<p>Breakdown from HR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender • Division/Faculty, School and Cost Centre • Payscale • Employee status either contract or Permanent/Indefinite and Full/Part time • Age • Nationality • RSS • HR (Staff Office)/AR Annual Report • Faculty HR Partner Faculty Administrator

Data Requirements	Source
<p><i>Chapter 7 - Infrastructure:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maps showing School facilities and space • Space management plan including access; • Available resources/equipment/facilities (e.g. Laboratory equipment, Technical support for researchers, access to collaborators and partnerships, Shared spaces for staff /students) • Maintenance and replacement schedule • Service Level agreements with KPI's and reviews of attainment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building and Estates Office • School Administrator
<p><i>Chapter 8 - Administration:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copies of standard operating procedures (SOPs) and evidence of compliance with those of research partners/collaborators/suppliers • Copies of certification against quality standards such as ISO or AAALAC (Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care International) Accreditation or requirements of professional and/or regulatory bodies; • Service level agreements with units in College such as Comparative Medicine, Centre for Microscopy and Analysis, the Hazardous Materials Facility etc; • MOUs with external partners/collaborators • Research Ethics Approval Policy as per the College Policy on Good Research Practice (June 2021). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Administrator
<p><i>Chapter 9 - Relationships and external engagement:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public engagement activities such as open days, school visits, Science Gallery events, symposia etc. in which the School is involved • Professional activities undertaken by School staff such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Sponsoring or participating in conferences and symposia; -Editing academic journals and books; -Acting in advisory capacity on public commissions/boards/task force -Preparing special reports and working papers; -Member of an editorial board of a refereed journal etc; -Consultancy; -External secondment. • Links with other units within the University such as the Communications & Marketing Directorate, Trinity Research & Innovation, Launchbox, companies and suppliers, industry. • Table 4 Partnership profile 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Administrator/Head of School

Appendix 4: Sample Checklist for Professional Placements / Off-campus Learning

Purpose: The purpose of this checklist is to provide Schools with a means to quality assure off-campus learning /professional placements. In general, professional programmes are accredited by Professional & Statutory Accreditation Bodies. The QQI Core Statutory QA Guidelines (§5.4) includes a requirement to quality assure professional placements/off-campus learning.

Context: The context for Professional Placements/off-campus learning differs across disciplines and across Faculties. Placements may be established under a statutory framework, e.g. Pharmacy (APPEL); be historical or voluntary in nature e.g. clinical placements mediated through the Health Service Executive; placements in community or non-government sectors.

4.1 Governance of Professional Placements/Off-Campus Learning (inc Erasmus/Interships etc)

Please provide a short synopsis of the School/Programme (UG/PG) Professional Placements/Off-campus Learning, addressing the following:

<i>What governance arrangements support the establishment of Professional Placements/off-campus learning partnerships in the School/Programmes, e.g. legal statutory; formal Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)/Service Level Agreement (SLA), historical; voluntary; other?</i>	
<i>Are there documented criteria for selection acceptance and removal of a placement provider/off-campus learning partner? If so, what are they? Where are they documented?</i>	
<i>Is there a designated liaison point between the School /Programme and the placement/off-campus learning provider?</i>	
<i>Are there agreed communication protocols for dispute resolution/issue escalation? If so, what are they? Where are they documented?</i>	
<i>Are students covered by College Risk and Insurance/Provider while on placement in Ireland?</i>	
<i>What Risk and Insurance procedures apply for students travelling overseas?</i>	
<i>Records on governance arrangements and review are maintained in accordance with the College Record Management Policy</i>	

4.2 Quality Assurance

Please provide an overview of quality assurance processes that support professional placements/off campus learning:

<p><i>Is there a cycle of review to ensure governance arrangements are reviewed and updated to reflect any change in arrangements?</i></p>	
<p><i>Is there a cycle of visits to/evaluations of placement providers/off-campus learning sites to ensure the learning environment is fit-for-purpose, if so, how often do these visits/evaluations occur?</i></p>	
<p><i>Are there processes around the selection and training of, and role description for on-site tutors/mentors supervisors/preceptors?</i></p>	
<p><i>For Erasmus Exchanges has curriculum mapping being conducted to assure equivalence of academic standards in respect of the curriculum, assessment and examinations?</i></p>	
<p><i>Are learning resources available to students on professional placements quality assured to ensure they are fit-for-purpose?</i></p>	
<p><i>Is feedback from students collected on the placement / off campus learning experience e.g. Survey Monkey, focus groups, site-visits, student reps etc?</i></p>	
<p><i>What methods are used for giving feedback to students on issues they have raised regarding their placement / off-campus learning experience?</i></p>	
<p><i>What methods are used to gather feedback from placement providers /off-campus learning partners on their experience of Trinity students on placements?</i></p>	
<p><i>What methods are used for giving feedback to placement providers/ off-campus learning partners on student experience?</i></p>	

4.3 Do Policies/Procedures/Protocols exist at School/Programme level for:

<i>Student request for change of tutor/ preceptor/ mentor/supervisor?</i>	
<i>Student request for deferral of placement?</i>	
<i>Fitness to Practice Policy?</i>	
<i>Student complaints/ dispute/grievance resolution?</i>	
<i>Student attendance/ absences?</i>	
<i>Student request for special accommodation related to professional placement?</i>	

4.4 Teaching & Learning on Professional Placements/Off-Campus Learning (inc. Erasmus/Internships etc.)

<i>Are the expected learning outcomes/competencies expected from the placement/off campus learning arrangement documented? Where?</i>	
<i>Is there a formal student learning contract/compact?</i>	
<i>Is there a documented assessment strategy, defined progression requirements?</i>	
<i>Is information on placements/off – campus learning arrangement available in. student/programme handbooks, or on the School or programme website?</i>	
<i>Do students receive appropriate orientation/i n d u c t i o n that includes Health & Safety, and student conduct while on professional placement/off-campus learning?</i>	

4.5 Action Plan

Using the following template, what actions have been identified by the School or Programme in respect of quality assurance of Professional Placements/Off-campus Learning to be addressed.

Number	Action Required	Responsibility	Due date	Dependency	Review Status
1	Description	Person or Position Title		With other Actions required or Approval from e.g. HoS, Professional Body, Partner.	In-progress Completed Overdue

Appendix 5: Timeline and Process Map for School Quality Review		
TIMING	ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBILITY
<i>Trinity Term of academic year 18months prior to review</i>	<i>Head of School contacted and sent procedural documents and review guidelines. External reviewer nominations requested from the Head of School for approval by the working group of College Officers.</i>	<i>Quality Office</i>
<i>Michaelmas Term of academic year prior to review year</i>	<i>External reviewer nominations submitted by the Head of School for approval by the working group of College Officers. Following consideration by the working group, nominated reviewers are contacted formally by the Quality Office and invited to participate in the review process. Upon confirmation of a reviewer's acceptance of a role in the review process, dates for site visit will be agreed as soon as possible.</i>	<i>The Head of School/Quality Office</i>
<i>Hilary Term of academic year prior to review</i>	<i>An information session will be held to assist in the development of the School's Self-assessment document.</i>	<i>Quality Office</i>
<i>Ongoing in year of review</i>	<i>Self-assessment and support documentation prepared by the School.</i>	<i>Head of School</i>
<i>9 weeks before the site visit</i>	<i>Draft self-assessment and supporting documentation to be forwarded to the Quality Office for consideration prior to the planning meeting</i>	<i>Head of School</i>
<i>8 weeks before the site visit</i>	<i>Feedback given on draft documentation and review timetable</i>	<i>Head of School/Quality Office</i>
<i>7 weeks before the site visit</i>	<i>Review documentation, including a draft timetable, forwarded to the Quality Office for dispatching to the External Reviewers, College Officers and Internal Facilitator in electronic format.</i>	<i>Head of School /Quality Office</i>
<i>2 weeks before the site visit</i>	<i>Conference call with Reviewers takes place to discuss the self-assessment and the draft schedule</i>	<i>Quality Office/Reviewers</i>
<i>1 week before the site visit</i>	<i>Reviewers contacted to clarify final arrangements and confirm receipt of self-assessment pack.</i>	<i>Quality Office</i>
<i>2 days before site visit</i>	<i>Review timetable finalised.</i>	<i>Head of School/ Quality Office</i>
<i>1 day before site visit</i>	<i>School to set up 'base room' for the duration of the review, where possible.</i>	<i>Head of School</i>
DATES OF REVIEW	<i>SITE VISIT CONDUCTED - Reviewers interview staff, students and stakeholders and consider contents of report and its recommendations</i>	
<i>Post Review</i>	<i>Refer to General Review Procedures</i>	