Internal Periodic Review 2020/21

Early preparation meeting briefing note

Internal Periodic Review of Informatics

24 October 2019 3-4pm

1. **Scope of the review** –

   - Previous review in February 2015 covered UG & PGT provision
   - Proposed scope for this review : UG & PGT provision
   - The review should include all credit-bearing provision, including:

     ➢ Provision delivered in collaboration with others,
     ➢ Transnational education
     ➢ Work-based provision and placements
     ➢ online and distance learning provision (such as lifelong learning courses),
     ➢ joint degrees
     ➢ CPD.
     ➢ MOOCs (credit bearing)
     ➢ Any provision which provides only small volumes of credit
     ➢ Study abroad opportunities, Student Exchange programmes and Scholarships should be taken into consideration.
     ** should we include DSTI in this review? ** not included in PGR review

2. **Any new programmes, collaborations since the previous review that should be considered**?

3. **Accreditations** - any accreditations that we should be aware of, timing of review v's accreditation, opportunities for streamlining especially in relation to documentation?

4. **University standard remit** – attached for information.

5. **Subject specific remit items** – start to think of possible items for consideration. Seek input from students (see below).

   For the remit meeting, Schools/subject areas including the student body are asked to propose a short list for discussion and agreement of a maximum of 2 items for the review to consider.
   In proposing these items, Schools/Subject areas are encouraged to engage with the College Office Academic Policy Officer/Quality Officer in these discussions to ensure strategic oversight and awareness of College priorities.
   In addition, Schools/Subject areas are encouraged to reflect on information to inform subject specific remit items such as student survey data, student feedback.

6. **Status of recommendations from previous review** – check that these have been actioned and that there are no outstanding items?

7. **Timing of review and length of review** –Normal practice is 2 days. It would be helpful to confirm semester preference asap.
   Reviews will be scheduled for semester 2 due to the ELIR taking place in Oct/Nov 2020.
   Please be mindful of the timing of the review in relation to key dates for the School such as assignment hand-ins etc

8. **Engagement with students in the review process** – Guidance documents for Schools and Students attached for information.
   - Seek input to remit items – invite Student Rep to remit meeting
   - Reflective report preparations
   - Participation in the review visit – any issues around student availability for review visit - see above
   - Communication of review outcomes – engagement with response to report

9. **Identification of Academic Lead** – it is essential that the appropriate person is appointed and that time is safeguarded to fulfil role requirements. Some Schools appoint an academic member of staff as the lead person with an administrative member of staff supporting the role.

10. **Nomination of externals** –
    - Externals should be nominated and appointed as early as possible in the process in order to set the date for the review.
    - Normal practice for 2 externals to be appointed.
    - Consider suitable externals in relation to subject specific remit items.
    - Nomination Form attached.

11. **Preparatory meetings:**
    - Briefing event for the Academic Lead and admin support : date tbc
    - Review information meeting – approx. 5 months prior to review
    - Remit meeting – approx. 4 months prior to review

12. **Reflective Report and supporting documentation** – The documentation is required **6 weeks prior to the review date** however this is the latest date for submission and it is helpful if documentation can be forwarded at the earliest opportunity -internalreviewsupport@ed.ac.uk

13. **Review schedule preparation** – a meeting will take place with Academic Lead, Convener and the review team administrator to discuss the schedule for the visit at the earliest opportunity.

14. **Room for the review** – availability issues may require booking of rooms at an early stage. Consider larger room for lunchtime student meetings and feedback session at the end of Day 2.

15. **Report and follow-on key dates**:
    The report identifies key strengths of the provision reviewed, together with commendations of good practice and recommendations for enhancement of the provision.

    10 weeks after the review**:** the report is completed following sign off and submitted to Senate Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) for formal approval.
    The report is circulated to the School, Head of College and to the areas who have been remitted recommendations.

    14 weeks after receipt of the report: the School/Subject Area makes a response to the Senate Quality Assurance Committee reporting on progress with all recommendations, including those remitted to other areas of the University for action.

    1 Year after receipt of the report: The School/Subject Area makes a further report to Senate Quality Assurance Committee on the progress towards the completion of all recommendations. An explanation of how each recommendation will be taken forward and the expected date for follow-up or completion should be recorded.

    The report and responses are published on the University website.

16. **Guidance and support available from Academic Services**:
    - Reflective report writing sessions & access to previous reports for reference purposes
    - Support for the Academic Lead including a task checklist is produced highlighting key dates in the process.
    - Wiki page for Academic Lead & Admin support role containing templates & general information https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=294618340