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 which outline the generic elements of the process for reviews of Schools, Programmes, Administrative/Support areas and Research Institutes.

2. Purpose

2.1 This procedure sets out broad guidelines for the review of a School, which aims to facilitate a critical self-assessment of the School by the Head of the School, School staff and students, 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;

3.2 Where a School takes 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.

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 Fulfil the University’s commitment to the quality assurance of its education and research provision;

4.3 Demonstrate alignment with the guidelines set out under the Quality and Qualifications (Education and Training) Act 2012, and the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG-Appendix 1).

5. Procedure

5.1 The School will establish a co-ordinating group to plan and manage the activities leading up to the Review. The co-ordinating 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.

5.2 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.

5.3 A SWOT analysis should be conducted with various internal audiences including student and staff groupings, relevant partner Schools, Trinity Research Centres (TRC) and any Associated Colleges 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, activities, internal and external relationships, and resources.

5.4 A critical evaluation of the School’s current activities and strategic direction should be carried out, drawing on the outcomes of the SWOT analysis and analysis of data on the various activities of the School. The optimal period for data analysis is five years. The data
requirements to inform the self-assessment are outlined in Appendix 3. The relevant Dean and Faculty Finance Partner must sign off on financial data included in the SAR.

5.5 The School should prepare a self-assessment report based on the outcome of the above activities. The main body of the SAR should be between 20 -50 pages (excluding the appendices). The format of the SAR is outlined in Appendix 2 and includes the following suggested headings:

1. Introduction;
2. Strategic Direction 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. Relationships and external engagement;

5.6 The on-site visit by the external reviewers occurs over 2-3 days and a draft schedule of meetings for the visit is agreed with the Quality Office prior to the review date. A template for the schedule of meetings and the principles to be followed in its development can be found in the General Procedures for Quality Reviews.

5.7 The Quality Office will provide a review of various drafts of the SAR and draft schedule. The final draft of the SAR with appendices and the schedule is to be submitted to the Quality Office eight weeks prior to the review date. The quality office will arrange for proofreading of the final draft of the SAR prior to its dissemination to the Review team.

5.8 A timeline detailing the key phases/deliverables for a review of a School can be found in Appendix 4.

5.9 A template for the Reviewers’ report can be found in Appendix 5;

5.10 Follow-up processes are detailed in the General Procedures for Quality Reviews.

Part 1: Standards for internal quality assurance

1.1 Policy for quality assurance
Institutions should have a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of their strategic management. Internal stakeholders should develop and implement this policy through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.

1.2 Design and approval of programmes
Institutions should have processes for the design and approval of their programmes. The programmes should be designed so that they meet the objectives set for them, including the intended learning outcomes. The qualification resulting from a programme should be clearly specified and communicated, and refer to the correct level of the national qualifications framework for higher education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area.

1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment
Institutions should ensure that the programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in creating the learning process, and that the assessment of students reflects this approach.

1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification
Institutions should consistently apply pre-defined and published regulations covering all phases of the student “life cycle”, e.g. student admission, progression, recognition and certification.

1.5 Teaching staff
Institutions should assure themselves of the competence of their teachers. They should apply fair and transparent processes for the recruitment and development of the staff.

1.6 Learning resources and student support
Institutions should have appropriate funding for learning and teaching activities and ensure that adequate and readily accessible learning resources and student support are provided.

1.7 Information management
Institutions should ensure that they collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management of their programmes and other activities.

1.8 Public information
Institutions should publish information about their activities, including programmes, which is clear, accurate, objective, up-to-date and readily accessible.

**1.9 On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes**
Institutions should monitor and periodically review their programmes to ensure that they achieve the objectives set for them and respond to the needs of students and society.

These reviews should lead to continuous improvement of the programme. Any action planned or taken as a result should be communicated to all those concerned.

**1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance**
Institutions should undergo external quality assurance in line with the ESG on a cyclical basis.
Appendix 2: Format of the Self-Assessment Report (SAR)

Headings and suggested questions to be addressed in 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.*

1. **Introduction:**
   1.1 Set the context of the School at the time of the Review.
   1.2 Implementation of recommendations from the previous review – closing the loop.
   1.3 Process undertaken to complete the SAR document;
   1.4 Key areas the School would like the External Review Team to focus on in this review.
   1.5 School-led recommendations for consideration by the Review Team.

2. **Strategic Direction and Planning:**
   2.1 Outline the mission and strategy of the School as articulated in its Strategic Plan.
   2.2 Evaluate whether the School is achieving the objectives outlined in its Strategic Plan.
   2.3 Describe how the School’s strategic direction is aligned with the College’s Strategic Plan.
   2.4 Outline how College initiatives such as E3, the Strategy for Innovation & Entrepreneurship, the Global Relations Strategy, the On-line Education Strategy etc. are impacting on the School’s strategic planning.
   2.5 Describe how the School identifies and acts upon emerging national and international trends/risks that may affect the future activities and operations of the School.

3. **Organisation and Management:**
   3.1 Describe the organisational and operational structure of the School, including:
   - the relationships across component Disciplines (for multidisciplinary Schools) and with associated Trinity Research Centres (TRCs), where applicable;
   - the School’s decision-making structures;
   - the extent to which students and external stakeholders e.g. employers/industry are involved in School decision-making;
   3.2 Evaluate whether the current organisational and management structures facilitate the optimum operation of the School and enable it to fulfil its mission;
   3.3 Outline any plans or recommendations for change in order to improve organisational structures and management in the future.
4. **Assessment of Undergraduate Education:**

4.1 Outline the undergraduate programmes and awards offered by the School, including those offered as part of any two-subject moderatorships, inter-disciplinary, multi-School and multi-Faculty arrangements. Include also any collaborative programmes and awards with linked providers, Associated Colleges and any transnational provision with which the School is involved. Provision or involvement with on-line courses and MOOCs should also be outlined.

4.2 Provide an overview of the School’s undergraduate recruitment and admissions process, including access routes for non-traditional learners and recognition of prior and informal learning.

4.3 Outline how the School revises and updates its undergraduate teaching programmes to reflect, for example, the latest research/thinking in the discipline, the changing needs of society, the appropriateness of the learning environment and of the support services available for students on the programme, student progression and completion data, and feedback from students, external examiners, accreditation bodies and advisory bodies etc.

4.4 Describe how the School enhances the learning experience through innovation in teaching methods and the use of appropriate teaching strategies. Include reference to, for example, the use of different modes of curriculum delivery, the use of new technologies in teaching, incorporation of research-led and student-led teaching into the curriculum, teaching scholarship, flexible learning pathways etc.

4.5 What mechanisms are used by the School to evaluate its teaching provision? Include reference to annual module and course evaluations/surveys, student representation and feedback mechanisms etc.

4.6 Outline the opportunities provided for professional development of teaching staff, supports and training provided for junior and senior staff to further develop their teaching skills and upskill in new technologies, opportunities for peer mentoring etc.

4.7 What supports and learning resources are provided by the School to enhance the student experience? Include reference to student induction processes for international, visiting or Erasmus students; teaching and learning supports, including IT and Library; Student Services; Student complaints processes; Student facilities/amenities; Information for students including website, publications, Blackboard etc.

4.8 What opportunities are provided for undergraduate students to be involved in the research activity of the School, to study abroad, to undertake placements, student exchanges, to get involved in outreach activities?
4.9 Provide an assessment of the following outcomes of teaching & learning:

- Student exam results and completion rates.
- Progression paths of students following graduation.
- External contributions to teaching & learning in the discipline.

4.10 What are the main challenges facing undergraduate teaching and learning in the School and how are these challenges being addressed?

4.11 In what ways could undergraduate education in the School be improved?

5. **Assessment of Postgraduate Education:**

5.1 Outline 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.

5.2 Provide an overview of the School’s postgraduate recruitment and admissions process, including access routes for non-traditional learners and recognition of prior and informal learning, and the recruitment processes used to secure international students.

5.3 Outline the mechanisms in place at School level to monitor the progress of research students. Evaluate how well the College’s procedures in relation to supervision of research students are implemented at School level and what mechanisms are in place to facilitate confidential student feedback on the quality of research supervision. Evaluate whether the proportion of staff available to provide supervision for research dissertations and theses meets the needs of the School and of students.

5.4 Outline the mechanisms in place for assuring the quality of postgraduate education in the School (e.g. student feedback mechanisms, professional accreditation cycle, cycle of curriculum review, feedback from external examiners, feedback from employers, benchmarking with other institutions etc.)

5.5 How are the School’s postgraduate programmes linked to the School’s Research Strategy and College Research Themes?

5.6 How are the School’s postgraduate students supported to develop transferable skills though for example undertaking generic taught modules, opportunities to publish their work and present it at national/international conferences, opportunities to demonstrate/tutor, opportunities to commercialise their work etc.?

5.7 What are the main challenges facing postgraduate education in the School and how are these challenges being addressed?

5.8 In what ways could postgraduate education in the School be improved?
6. **Assessment of Research Activity**

6.1 Outline 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;

6.2 Evaluate the coherency of the School’s research strategy and comment on its alignment with that of the College.

6.3 Include a detailed analysis of the contribution of Trinity Research Centres for which the School has primary administrative and financial responsibility, answering the following questions:

   6.3.1 What is the added value of having the Research Centre – in terms of Research Activity or Research Excellence?
   6.3.2 If the Research Centre did not exist would anything different be happening?
   6.3.3 Is there sufficient critical mass in terms of the number of people involved in the Centre? Is it a discernible entity?
   6.3.4 Is there evidence of inter-disciplinarily in terms of joint teaching and joint publications.

6.4 Describe 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?

6.5 Evaluate the School’s research performance or impact (including that as part of a TRI) and describe how the School’s research activities are disseminated both within College and beyond; include reference to the following where applicable:

   6.5.1 How does the School measure its research activity/productivity against the College’s key performance indicators (KPIs) for research?
   6.5.2 How does the School benchmark its research against that of national and international comparators and use the outcomes of such evaluations to continually improve performance and impact?
   6.5.3 Outline the social, cultural and policy impacts of the School’s research;

6.6 Describe how the School demonstrates and supports innovation and entrepreneurship? For example:

   6.6.1 What mechanisms are in place to promote commercialisation of research and technology transfer?
6.6.2 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?

6.6.3 What systems are in place to support the management of intellectual property?

6.7 Outline 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.

6.8 How does the School ensure integrity and ethical practice in the conduct of its research as outlined in the TCD Policy on Good Research Practice? 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.

6.9 What are the quality assurance procedures in place around the delivery of research and support activities e.g. is the School a participant in external professional or regulatory accreditation programmes?

6.10 What are the main challenges facing research in the School and how are these challenges being addressed?

6.11 In what ways could the School research performance/impact be improved?

7. Resources:

7.1 Finance & Funding:
- Outline the School’s funding sources including those allocated through the Annual Budgetary Cycle (ABC) and other sources of income.
- Evaluate and comment on the School’s current financial situation and its impact on the School’s teaching and research provision;
- Evaluate whether the resource allocation mechanisms in place in the School are appropriate.

7.2 Staffing:
- Outline the School’s current staffing levels and projected staff numbers as per the School’s 3-year staffing plan. Evaluate whether the current and projected staff composition and expertise is appropriate to support the operations and activity of the School and the achievement of its strategic objectives.
- Outline academic staff qualifications including publications, grant income, workload, project supervision, research supervision, consulting projects and patents in the last five years.
• How are staff development needs identified and supported in relation to the School’s strategic development, 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 sabbatical leave;

7.3 Infrastructure:
• Provide details on the space that the School occupies and an assessment of whether it is fit for purpose; Include reference to teaching spaces, research spaces, office space, and social spaces.

7.4 What are the main challenges facing the resourcing of the School and how are these challenges being addressed?

8. Administration:

Provide an assessment of the administrative structures in place in the School to support the following activities. Include information on the duties and roles of administrative staff.

8.1 Academic cycle/calender of School administration;
8.2 Management of recruitment activities and events - open days, school visitations;
8.3 Provision of module selection advice;
8.4 Examinations;
8.5 Court of First Appeal;
8.6 Systems to support School administration.
8.7 What are the main challenges facing the administration of the School and how are these challenges being addressed?

9. Relationships and external engagement:

Provide an assessment of the School’s relationships and engagement with College and the wider society. Include comment on:

9.1 Appointment of School staff to senior College positions, College committees and professional bodies;
9.2 Contributions of staff and students to public debate and formulation of public policy;
9.3 Engagement with the public through seminars and extra-mural programmes;
9.4 Local outreach activities of the School;
9.5 External relations with the wider community, including other educational institutions in Ireland and abroad, industry, public agencies, and professional bodies;
10. Communication & Marketing

Outline how the School communicates:

10.1 With staff and students in the School;

10.2 With the wider College community and externally;

10.3 Assess the School’s Communication and Marketing strategy, if any;

10.3 Outline ways in which communication could be improved.
### Appendix 3: Suggested data for inclusion in the SAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Requirements</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation/management/strategy</strong></td>
<td>• School Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organisational chart including reporting lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Committee structure and links to principal committees of College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Strategic Plan, Teaching &amp; Learning Strategy and Research Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate programme data for previous 5 years:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Undergraduate student profile and numbers: Quotas, CAO</td>
<td>SITS/ SL Annual Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Admission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Profile of undergraduate students who enter through non-CAO routes (TAP, HEAR, DARE, Mature, Direct entry)</td>
<td>Trinity/ Academic Registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Handbooks providing module descriptors for taught programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Assurance information for Undergraduate Programmes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Undergraduate module survey data</td>
<td>School administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• External examiner reports</td>
<td>School administrator or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accreditation Reports (if applicable)</td>
<td>Dir of T&amp;L (UG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Irish Survey of Student Engagement (ISSE) data</td>
<td>Quality Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International Student Barometer (ISB) data</td>
<td>Global Officer Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postgraduate data for previous 5 years:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Postgraduate student profile and numbers- Masters Register and PhD Register</td>
<td>Dean of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Progression and retention data, exam results,</td>
<td>Annual Report,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Confirmation rates, Completion rates</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Assurance information for Postgraduate Programmes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Postgraduate module survey data-PGT and PGR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• External examiner reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Handbooks providing module descriptors for PGT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty Administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Requirements</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual reports from associated TRCs</td>
<td>• Dean of Research website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A summary table of grants and contract funding (both active and pending) for each research theme/grouping associated with the School;</td>
<td>• Finance Service Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research yield - Applications and outcome of funding grants from external funding bodies (proposals vs awards) –SFI, ERC, Horizon 2020 against funding strategy/targets.</td>
<td>• TR&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Copies of Research Staff profiles – from RSS;</td>
<td>• Library (RSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Results of research impact evaluation exercises;</td>
<td>• Director of Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Profile of proposals approved by the School’s Research Ethics Committee per annum for the past five years and the outcome.</td>
<td>• Director of Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of support for start-up/entrepreneurial activity including student activity such as Launchbox; campus companies, knowledge transfer, IP, patents/licenses, industry contracts, collaborative projects;</td>
<td>• Director of Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• TR&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Summary financial statement outlining the School’s source of income, funding streams and expenditure;</td>
<td>• School Administrator, Head of School, Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial projections for the next 3 years;</td>
<td>Finance Partner and Finance Service Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ABC data</td>
<td>• School Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prizes/awards received;</td>
<td>• School Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FTEs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic role/job-title and contract type (whether, for example, the staff are principal investigators (PIs), post-doctoral fellows, or students)</td>
<td>• Faculty Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Biographies of teaching staff</td>
<td>• Human Resources (Staff Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff:Student Ratio (FTSE data)</td>
<td>• School website, RSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic staff workload statistics</td>
<td>• Faculty HR Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maps showing School facilities and space</td>
<td>• Building and Estates Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Space management plan;</td>
<td>• School Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Available resources/equipment/facilities (e.g. Laboratory equipment, Technical support for researchers, access to collaborators and partnerships, Shared spaces for staff and students)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Data Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Requirements</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Copies of standard operating procedures (SOPs) and evidence of compliance with research partners/collaborators/suppliers;</td>
<td>School Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Service level agreements with units in College such as Comparative Medicine, Centre for Microscopy and Analysis, the Hazardous Materials Facility etc;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MOUs/SLAs with other internal and external partners/collaborators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research Ethics Approval Policy as per the College Policy on Good Research Practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relationships and external engagement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships and external engagement:</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Public engagement activities such as open days, school visits, Science Gallery events, symposia etc. in which the School is involved;</td>
<td>School Administrator/Head of School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional activities undertaken by School staff such as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sponsoring or participating in conferences and symposia;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Editing academic journals and books;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Acting in an advisory capacity on public commissions, boards and task forces;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Preparing special reports and working papers;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Member of an editorial board of a refereed journal etc;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consultancy;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- External secondment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Links with:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- other units within the University such as the Communications &amp; Marketing Directorate, Trinity Research &amp; Innovation, Launchbox - companies and suppliers;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communication and marketing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication and marketing:</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sample emails, newsletters, webpages etc.</td>
<td>School administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty Annual Quality Reports</td>
<td>Faculty Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• First Destination Survey</td>
<td>Careers Advisory Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality Review reports</td>
<td>Quality Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 4: Timeline for Quality Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMING</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Term of academic year 2 years prior to review</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Quality Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michaelmas Term of academic year prior to review year</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The Head of School/Quality Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary Term of academic year prior to review</td>
<td>An information session will be held to assist in the development of the School’s Self-assessment document.</td>
<td>Quality Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing in year of review</td>
<td>Self-assessment and support documentation prepared by the School.</td>
<td>Head of School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 weeks before the site visit</td>
<td>Draft self-assessment and supporting documentation to be forwarded to the Quality Office for consideration prior to the planning meeting</td>
<td>Head of School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 weeks before the site visit</td>
<td>Feedback given on draft documentation and review timetable</td>
<td>Head of School/Quality Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 weeks before the site visit</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Head of School/Quality Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 weeks before the site visit</td>
<td>Conference call with Reviewers takes place to discuss the self-assessment and the draft schedule</td>
<td>Quality Office/Reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 week before the site visit</td>
<td>Reviewers contacted to clarify final arrangements and confirm receipt of self-assessment pack.</td>
<td>Quality Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 days before site visit</td>
<td>Review timetable finalised.</td>
<td>Head of School/Quality Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day before site visit</td>
<td>School to set up ‘base room’ for the duration of the review, where possible.</td>
<td>Head of School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATES OF REVIEW</td>
<td>SITE VISIT CONDUCTED - Reviewers interview staff, students and stakeholders and consider contents of report and its recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Review</td>
<td>Refer to General Review Procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Template for Reviewers' Report

1. Executive Summary

1.1 Key findings of the review including overall assessment of the School;
1.2 Recommendations for improvement

Reviewers are asked to consider the following questions/issues in their report:

2. Strategic Direction and Planning

Reviewer opinion is sought on:
- the School’s achievement of objectives outlined in its Strategic Plan;
- alignment of the School’s strategic direction with the College’s Strategic Plan and other College-wide initiatives such as E3, the Strategy for Innovation & Entrepreneurship, the Global Relations Strategy, the On-line Education Strategy;
- identification and management of emerging national and international trends/risks that may affect the future activities and operations of the School;
- whether the School has a multi-annual vision and has made provision for succession planning both (financial and leadership);
- the school’s own recommendations in relation to review process.

3. Organisation and Management

Reviewer opinion is sought on:
- whether the organisational/operational and management structure of the School facilitates the optimum operation of the School and enables it to fulfil its mission;
- whether the School’s decision-making structures are functioning optimally;
- whether the reporting lines and relationships are effective.

4. Teaching & Learning

The Reviewers are asked to give an assessment, based on their own experience of other Schools of similar size and of international standing in this academic discipline, on the following inputs of teaching and learning in both undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes:

- content/level of the programmes and number of students;
- distribution of teaching across staff members;
- constructive alignment of curriculum, teaching methods, and assessment methods, and rationale for teaching and assessment methodologies used;
- adequacy of staff-student liaison in the School (formal and informal) in relation to teaching and learning;
- arrangements for curriculum review and revision, and quality assurance;
- methods used to evaluate teaching and learning in the School, and actions taken in response to student feedback;
- professional standing (e.g. accreditation by professional bodies, etc.);
- opportunities for study abroad, student exchanges, work/industry placements, internships;
- supervision and support for students on postgraduate taught and research programmes;
- funding available to students on postgraduate taught and research programmes;

The Reviewers are asked to give an assessment, based on their own experience of other Schools of similar size and of international standing in this academic discipline, on the following outputs of teaching and learning in both undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes:

- student exam results and completion rates;
- progression paths of students following graduation;
- external contributions to teaching and learning in the discipline.

5. Research Activity

Reviewer opinion is sought on:

- whether the School has a coherent research strategy that is aligned to College’s Strategic Plan and Research Themes;
- the distribution of research interests, plans and output across School members in a national/international context;
- the standing of the School in terms of published output relative to that of other Schools of international repute;
- the Schools’ performance in the last five years in raising external funding for research;
- the School’s success in commercialising its research;
- the number of research students, number of degrees awarded/completion times and the research output;
- the adequacy of supervision and supports provided for research students, and the funding available;
- the adequacy of student-staff liaison (formal and informal) in relation to research and the means by which students provide feedback about their research experiences in the School;
6. **Resources**

6.1 **Finance & Funding**
Reviewer opinion is sought on:
- the current funding model and whether it appropriately supports the School mission and strategy;

6.2 **Staffing**
Reviewer opinion is sought on:
- whether the current and projected staff composition and expertise are appropriate to support the operations and activity of the School and its Strategic Plan?
- the mechanisms in place to attract and retain staff and to plan for retirements;
- whether staff (including postgraduate students and postdoctoral fellows) are provided with adequate professional development opportunities and are sufficiently supported to help them to deliver on the School’s strategic plan

6.3 **Infrastructure**
Reviewer opinion is sought on:
- the suitability of physical infrastructure for teaching, research, and staff (e.g. laboratories, lecture/seminar rooms, equipment, office spaces, social spaces).

7. **Administration**
Reviewer opinion is sought on:
- whether there are appropriate administrative and operational procedures in place to support the effective running of the School?
- how the School is perceived by internal and external stakeholders in terms of the professionalism demonstrated through their interactions?

8. **Relationships and external engagements**
Reviewer opinion is sought on:
- the success of the School’s engagement with professional, public and civic bodies;
- the success of the School in influencing public policy/discourse through demonstration of thought leadership?
- other activities of the School that arise from the standing of its members, e.g. membership of government-appointed commissions, officership of learned/professional societies, editorship of academic publications, other achievements and standing arising from research work.

9. **Communication and Marketing**
Reviewer opinion is sought on:
- the School’s communication and marketing strategy, if any.