INTERNAL REVIEW GUIDANCE NOTES
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These notes provide guidance to Panel members and Departments undergoing review on the objectives, processes and protocols for Internal Reviews.

1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1. Internal reviews provide a means by which Schools and Departments can, in collaboration with members of the College community and contribution from the sector more widely, review and enhance the quality of their academic provision and the student experience. The College takes responsibility for the academic standards and quality of learning opportunities of the programmes it offers.

1.2. The periodic internal review of provision fulfils an important function of the College’s internal quality assurance and enhancement mechanisms, alongside annual programme quality monitoring, programme approval and amendment processes and the assurance of academic standards through the College Boards. This process is aligned with the Quality Assurance Agency’s (QAA) Quality Code Chapter B8 programme monitoring and review.

1.3. Where possible, the internal review process will use existing data and documentation to inform the key areas for consideration. Metrics developed by the College will help to identify areas of risk and good practice but these will be informed by the input of the Department and will not act as the sole driver in the formulation of the agenda. The College may decide to use the internal review process to explore key strategic objectives over a particular cycle of reviews; if these are to be used, these will be agreed by Teaching and Quality Enhancement Committee (TQEC).

1.4. Through these processes the College aims to take particular account of the requirements of students who reflect the diversity of protected characteristics and prior educational experience, and promote the development of inclusive practice. This supports the College aims to provide flexible higher education provision which meets the educational, cultural, personal and career needs of students of all ages, in particular those living and working in London and to enable adult students from diverse social and educational backgrounds to participate in our programmes.

1.5. The objectives of internal review are to:

- Assess and monitor academic standards, the quality of learning opportunities and the quality of the student experience across the College;
- Identify risks to standards and quality, ensure that appropriate, timely and strategic actions are taken to remedy any identified shortcomings, whether within the Department or the School or throughout the College;
- Ensure that programmes remain current and valid in relation to the College Common Awards Scheme and College policies, as well as to external reference points (e.g. Subject benchmark statements, the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ), the QAA’s UK Quality Code for Higher Education) and any Professional Regulatory and Statutory Body requirements;
- Critically evaluate the continuing effectiveness of the curriculum and the mechanisms for recruitment and retention, academic support, teaching quality, assessment and feedback and student experience for taught and research programmes;
- Reflect on data and practice around equality, diversity and inclusivity;
- Review the processes by which Departments and Schools use existing quality assurance and enhancement mechanisms to identify risks and opportunities and to take action, including through dialogue with the College, to ensure the quality of provision;
- Identify and share quality enhancement through disseminating good practice through internal reviews to Departments, Schools and the College and using these to inform strategic discussion/developments across the College.

1.6. Internal reviews of taught and research programmes (including external programmes of the University of London of which Birkbeck is the Lead College) normally should be carried out once every four years. Wherever possible an internal review should be scheduled as preparation for scrutiny by an external body such as in advance of a professional body accreditation visit.
1.7. Review Panels report their recommendations and commendations to TQEC at the conclusion of the process, alongside a response from the Department and other required parties. School Teaching and Quality Enhancement Committees (STQEC) are expected to give full consideration to review reports which fall under their remit and feed back on any emerging themes or issues to TQEC. A summary of themes arising from internal reviews will be considered through the Learning and Teaching Working Group annually.

2. DEPARTMENT UNDER REVIEW

2.1. A member of staff from the Department should be nominated to act as the key contact point between the Academic Standards and Quality team, the Panel and the Department team.

2.2. Departments should be aware of the Internal Review Schedule, which is updated annually and made available online and via TQEC and start preparations for internal review approximately 6 months prior to the term the review is due to take place. They will be contacted by ASQ and provided with the relevant documentation at this point.

2.3. While the documentation is comprehensive, Departments are welcome to request a meeting with ASQ at any point before the review to talk through the process.

2.4. Departments are requested to propose a date for the review meetings to take place and are required to nominate an External Subject Specialist to participate as a member of the internal review panel.

2.5. Departments are required to:
   - Review the Internal Review dataset provided on Tableau in advance of preparing their self-evaluation document
   - Draft a critically reflective Self-Evaluation Document and provide supporting documentation (where possible, supporting documentation should be existing and provided electronically)
   - Identify an area of enhancement to be explored in detail during the review meeting
   - Involve as broad as possible sample of academic and administrative staff and students in the review process, to inform the development of the SED and participation in the review meetings; this may include staff not directly based within the Department team such as technicians, librarians, disability and learning support officers
   - Book rooms and supply catering for the review meeting and the student meeting
   - Provide a factual accuracy check on the Panel’s report and a comprehensive and time-delineated response to the recommendations and commendations in time for the next meeting of Teaching and Quality Enhancement Committee following the review
   - Provide an update 12 months after the initial response to the recommendations on progress against the actions
   - Contribute to discussions within the School and College regarding any broader themes which emerge from the departmental review

3. SELF-EVALUATION DOCUMENT

3.1. The Self-Evaluation Document (SED) and supporting documentation must be submitted by the department to the panel secretary at least 6 weeks before the date of the internal review.

3.2. The key document is the Self-Evaluation Document (SED) which should be based on the template provided in Appendix 1. This core document should demonstrate and evaluate how the department utilises the College’s mechanisms for quality assurance and enhancement to ensure the academic standards and quality of its provision, identify challenges, opportunities, weaknesses and good practice and put in place appropriate actions to address these.

3.3. The SED should be clearly focused on critical self-evaluation and analysis and not on providing a descriptive narrative of how the department operates; this should be evident from the supporting documentation. The SED should reflect on the data (qualitative and quantitative)
that supports the internal review process, including the bespoke Internal Review report on Tableau.

3.4. The SED should draw on and incorporate the feedback from a range of stakeholders where possible, including students, alumni, School/College staff and professional/industry bodies. The SED should outline the process by which it has been drafted with specific reference to how student feedback has been used in the drafting process.

3.5. The SED should be provided electronically in pdf and word format. The supporting documentation should be made available electronically. It is recommended that this is collated in one place for ease of reference (for example, creating a bespoke Moodle or Sharepoint site). Where the documentation already is available online, links can be set up from this main site to the relevant locations.

4. DATA SET

4.1. A bespoke internal review data report will be available on Tableau. This report is designed to provide clear trend data on key aspects of the student journey at undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research level, from initial applications to final destinations. A snapshot of the data will be taken approximately six months before the review and normally this is what Department’s and Panel members will be expected to refer to during the review process. However, it is recognised that the data may be updated or new data may become available during the preparations for the review and Departments are encouraged to respond to this should it affect the narrative for their review.

4.2. The report contains the following data:

1. Departmental Student Numbers by Programme of Study, Fee Status (Home/EU/International) and Mode of Study (FT/PT)

2a. UG Applications, Offer, Acceptance, Intake Numbers by Programme of Study
2b. PGT Applications, Offer, Acceptance, Intake Numbers by Programme of Study

3a. UG Progression, Retention and Completion
3b. UG Achievement by Programme of Study (e.g. 1st, 2:1 etc)

4. PGT Completion and Achievement by Programme of Study (e.g. Pass, Merit, Distinction)

5. PGR Intake and Achievement

6a. UG Intake, Progression and Achievement by Ethnicity, Sex, Age, Disability, Fee Status
6b. PGT Intake, Progression and Achievement by Ethnicity, Sex, Age, Disability, Fee Status

7. Destinations Data - UG/PG Destinations by Programme of Study from Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education (DLHE) survey

8. Student Survey results – a) NSS, b) BSS, c) PTES, d) PRES

4.3. Where possible, data for the School and College also will be provided to assist the Department in analysing its performance within its broader context. The College may set benchmarks for particular data which will be used to identify areas of risk which need to be addressed through the review process.

4.4. The Department should critically evaluate key messages emerging from the data and outline the processes by which it responds to data through other processes on an ongoing basis.

4.5. As noted in 4.1, a copy of the data report will be made available to the Panel so it does not need to be replicated in full in the SED; the Department may find it useful to draw out particular parts of the data in their evaluation and to put a copy of the data on the site holding the supporting material.
4.6. Help can be provided in understanding the data. Departments may wish to seek clarification and support from the Planning team or from relevant staff within their School.

5. **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

5.1. The Department should provide supporting data to back up its statements in the SED. This documentation should be made available electronically, where possible in one place, for example a bespoke Moodle or Sharepoint site, for ease of reference by the Panel.

- Links to the latest version of the undergraduate and postgraduate student handbooks;
- Links to the programme specifications covering the review period and a sample of Moodle sites;
- A sample of assessment briefs, marking and moderation sheets, feedback to students;
- A sample of student-staff exchange meeting minutes;
- A sample of module evaluations and responses;
- A diagrammatic summary of the department operational and committee structure and a sample of minutes of key School/Department/programme meetings;
- Cluster programme annual quality monitoring reports for the review period;
- A sample of documentation outlining the key processes for research students including annual review and upgrade;
- External examiners’ reports and departmental responses for the review period;
- Responses from the Department/programme team to the National Student Survey or other student feedback for the review period;
- Memoranda of Agreement for collaborations;
- Recent reports from Professional and Statutory Regulatory Bodies and/or Industry Liaison Panels (where applicable);
- A link to staff profiles, an overview of the Department’s staff profile (e.g. percentage of teaching and scholarship staff) and a sample of documentation showcasing staff development and enhancement activities.

5.2. Supporting documentation should be kept to a minimum, drawn on existing documentation where possible and must be relevant and clearly signposted to support particular areas of the Self-Evaluation Document.

5.3. The Panel Secretary will provide the following documentation to the Panel in advance of review through reference to web links or electronic copies:

**QAA Documentation:**
- UK Quality Code for Higher Education
- Subject benchmark statements
- Framework for Higher Education Qualifications

**Birkbeck Documentation:**
- College regulations and policies
- Report of and response to the last internal review of the Department

6. **REVIEW PANELS**

**REMIT OF THE PANEL**

6.1. The remit of the Review Panel is to assure the Department’s approach to ensuring the quality of the learning opportunities and student experience. This is achieved by:
• Reviewing the information on the academic practice of the department, namely the Self-Evaluation Document, the data set and the supporting information;
• Meeting with relevant staff and students;
• Agreeing an agenda to explore identified significant themes;
• Making evidence based judgements on the achievement of quality and standards;
• Making clear recommendations for action where quality must be improved to meet standards and where quality enhancement can be achieved;
• Identifying areas for commendations where good practice has been identified.

6.2. The emphasis of each review should be on critical and constructive dialogue and exchange of ideas. The focus is on working with the Department to assure their approach to standards and quality, ensure the College policies and procedures are fit for purpose and are being implemented appropriately and to identify and share enhancement practices.

MEMBERSHIP

6.3. Internal Review Panels consist of at least three internal members, drawn from different Departments, plus an external subject specialist, all of whom must be independent of the Department under review. One of the members will chair the Panel and the Secretary will be drawn from the Academic Standards and Quality (ASQ) team. The Chair normally will have been involved in a panel previously as a panel member.

6.4. Where a programme with specialised features is under review (e.g. one delivered through flexible and distributed learning (including distance and e-learning)) the external subject specialist would be expected to have knowledge and experience of these specialised features as well as of the discipline itself.

6.5. The members of the Panel may include individuals who have varying experience of internal review and quality assurance/enhancement. However, where a less experienced member is present they will be mentored by those on the Panel with more experience of these areas.

6.6. Training will be offered by ASQ to all Chairs and specific guidance notes provided to panel members to reflect their different remits.

6.7. The overall membership of each Panel should aim to represent a balance of age, gender, ethnicity, academic and professional expertise, background and review experience.

EXTERNAL SUBJECT SPECIALISTS

6.8. The appointment of an external subject specialist is a requirement for all reviews.

6.9. The Department team should contact the external they wish to nominate in the first instance, on an informal basis. Once the individual in question has given their agreement in principle to act as the external the host Department/programme team should formally nominate them using the standard nomination form.

6.10. External subject specialists should have experience of at least one of the following:
• Higher Education in the subject area and at the appropriate level;
• Professional, Statutory and/or Regulatory Bodies, where programmes involve such accreditation or recognition;
• Practice in the relevant profession;
• Experience in the area of specialism e.g. Foundation degrees, collaborative provision, flexible and distributed learning (including e-learning).

6.11. The Panel Chair should approve the nomination for the external subject specialist, in consultation with the Panel Secretary. Once this has taken place, formal contact may be made with the external by the Panel Secretary.
6.12. The external subject specialist must be completely independent of the Department/programme(s) under review i.e. they must not be either current or recent (i.e. within the previous three years) external examiners at the College or staff of the College and should not have previously contributed to the design or delivery of the programme(s) under review or cognate programmes within the College and should not be from any Schools/Departments at another institution which run these programmes jointly with the College. They must also not have acted as external subject specialist for the College within the previous five years. The Head of Department confirms this through the process of signing the nomination form.

6.13. External subject specialists acting at Birkbeck will receive a fee of £300 plus travel expenses for attendance on the day of the review itself with an additional £50 being paid for attendance at the meeting with students. The £300 fee should include attendance by the external at the planning meeting, if possible, but is not a requirement of their involvement.

6.14. External subject specialists will hold full membership of the Panel equivalent to that of each internal Panel member.

6.15. Once the Panel has been formally constituted all contact with the external subject specialist must be carried out through the Panel Secretary in order to prevent any suggestion of lobbying by the Department.

6.16. If a programme is under (re-)consideration for accreditation by a professional, statutory or regulatory body that body’s Education or Accreditation Committee may wish to nominate an external subject specialist to the Panel. The Panel then will be regarded as being jointly constituted.

6.17. If a programme run by the University of London International Programmes is part of the review a nominee of the International Programmes team should be on the Review panel and the review may be attended by University of London International Programmes observers.

6.18. Observers may be invited, with the prior agreement of the Department and Panel Chair, to attend review meetings for staff development purposes or for professional body reasons. Observers may be invited to participate in the event.

7. REVIEW MEETINGS

7.1. The internal review process consists of 3 key meetings:

- Planning Meeting
- Student Meeting
- Review Event

PLANNING MEETING

7.2. The process of review should be initiated by a planning meeting attended by the Panel at which the items to be raised for discussion should be identified from the documentation presented. This should be held in the time between the documentation being sent to the Panel and the review meeting itself. The external subject specialist should be asked to attend this meeting, but whilst helpful, this is not a requirement of their role. However, at a minimum they should be expected to submit their initial comments on the review documentation to the Panel Secretary in time to be fed into this meeting.

7.3. The following should be established at the planning meeting:

- Timetable
- Agenda for the review event
- Agenda for the meeting with students (this may cover broadly the same areas as the agenda for the review event)
- any further documentation required
- any queries to be resolved prior to the review
7.4. The focus of the review should be on discussions around quality assurance and enhancement. As such, the Panel should identify any technical quality assurance queries or concerns arising from the documentation at the planning meeting to be raised with the Department team for a response. The responses received should then be considered by the Panel in advance of the review itself. These matters should usually be dealt with by correspondence but, in some cases and time permitting, at a meeting between the Panel Chair, Panel Secretary and the member of staff from the Department/programme team coordinating the review. Any outstanding technical matters may be discussed at the review itself, if required.

7.5. A full agenda of matters for discussion should be compiled at the planning meeting and through correspondence with any members of the Panel who are unable to attend. In drafting the agenda, matters to be raised should not be attributed to individuals but rather grouped by issue under the agenda headings. The final agenda and timetable should be passed to the Department/programme team prior to the review itself in order to assist their preparations.

7.6. A successful review should be characterised by constructive dialogue based on themes identified by the Department and the Panel. The discussion should focus on the following:

- Exploring the context in which the Department operates and how it perceives this context;
- Understanding how the Department manages its mechanisms for quality assurance and engagement and uses them to identify risks and opportunities, inform change and assess the effectiveness of these processes;
- Understanding the Department’s engagement with and contribution to School and College strategy;
- Identifying areas of risk which need to be addressed and recommendations for how this might be achieved;
- Identifying areas where enhancements have and can be made in the future and recommendations for how these might be achieved.

7.7. In seeking to achieve the above, the Panel may ask the Department to:

- Explain elements of the Self-Evaluation Document and supporting documentation;
- Critically review the data and how the Department uses data to inform its practice and monitor the quality of its standards and student experience;
- Evaluate how different forms of feedback from key stakeholders including students, alumni and employers informs the Departments’ approach to assuring and enhancing standards and quality;
- Confirm the processes through which the currency of the curriculum and the approaches to learning, teaching and assessment are fit for purpose;
- Provide further evidence in support of what the Department has stated.

STUDENT MEETING

7.8. Where practical, the meeting between the students and the Panel should be held on the evening before the review in order for the external subject specialist to be able to attend and for any issues raised by the students to be clarified with the Department team.

7.9. The meeting should be with a representative group of students from across all programmes and all levels of provision.

7.10. Guidance notes for students on what to expect at the meeting will be supplied in advance.

REVIEW EVENT

7.11. The review normally will be held over one day and should be based upon the ‘Indicative Internal Review Timetable’ (see Appendix 2 of these guidance notes).
7.12. The review should include a presentation and discussion around an area of enhancement; this will normally take place in the afternoon. The review timetable may be streamlined depending on the scale of provision under review. The length of the review event and timetable should be agreed at the planning meeting by the Panel.

7.13. The Department team should determine which members of staff should attend the review meetings. This may include all members of staff who contribute to the programme(s) under review but, at a minimum should include the Department contact, Head of Department, Programme Directors for all programmes covered by the review, those responsible for student support, the research degrees co-ordinator and relevant key administrative staff.

7.14. Each internal member of the Panel should take the lead in asking the Department team to respond to a particular question or set of questions as set out in the agenda; however, all panel members can contribute to any part of the discussion as appropriate.

CONCLUSION OF THE REVIEW

7.15. A private meeting of the Panel should follow the main meetings with the Department. This meeting will be used to record preliminary recommendations for action and commendable features.

7.16. The draft outcomes of the review should be reported back orally to the Department team in a brief meeting at the end of the review. Any feedback given at this stage will only be preliminary with the full recommendations and commendations made by the panel to be developed more fully in the review report.

7.17. The Department team should be asked to provide a written response and action plan within the timescale to the recommendations for action set by the Panel.

7.18. The full review report and department response should be presented to next appropriate meeting of TQEC where the Committee should ratify any follow up action recommended by the Panel. At the same time, the School Teaching and Quality Enhancement Committee should give full consideration to the report and response at the School level.

7.19. A progress update against actions agreed in the response to the review should be provided to TQEC 12 months following its initial consideration of the response.

7.20. After each year’s schedule of reviews has been concluded, the views of the Panel members and the Department will be sought by the Academic Standards and Quality team on their experience of the review, to inform future enhancements to the internal review process.

8. REVIEW REPORT

8.1. The report should be approved by the Chair first and then the Panel members prior to circulation to the Department for comments on factual inaccuracies only. The report of a review meeting is an interpretative account of the key points of discussion, not a set of minutes.

8.2. Staff and students from the Department under review should not be identified by name. The standard format for the report may be guided by the following which is not intended to be an exhaustive list:

- **Introductory section**: this section should introduce the internal review process, the Panel members including the external subject specialist, that staff participating from the Department and the range of provision reviewed.

- **Meeting with undergraduate, postgraduate and research students**: this section should provide a summary of the meeting with students.

- **Meeting with department**: this section should provide a summary of the discussion of the review event along the lines of the agreed agenda. This section should also include details of the example of enhancement presented by the Department to the panel.

- **Commendations and Recommendations**: this section should list the commendations and recommendations for action to remedy any identified shortcomings, and for further
enhancement of quality and standards under the aspects of review contained within the agenda.

- **Response:** departments are required to enter specific actions with an identified timeframe in response to each recommendation.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 – SED TEMPLATE

TEMPLATE FOR THE SELF-EVALUATION DOCUMENT (SED)

The Self-Evaluation Document (SED) should provide a strategic and critical review of the Department’s approach to maintaining academic standards and ensuring the quality of learning opportunities and the student experience. The SED should interrogate the Department’s practices within a wider context (School, College, Sector). The Department should use the supporting documentation to provide details on how the Department operates so the SED is focussed on critical self-evaluation rather than description. Where the Department has documentation that already critically evaluates its approach to the below themes, this can be signposted in the SED. As Internal Review covers all levels of provision (undergraduate (UG), postgraduate taught (PGT) and postgraduate research (PGR)) it is expected that these are reflected throughout the SED.

1. Contextual Introduction to the Department:
   i) Position the Department within its wider context (School, College, Sector) and provide a critical overview of its success in meeting its aims and objectives during the review period and outline its strategic plans going forwards
   ii) Briefly summarise the taught and research programmes covered in this review
   iii) Briefly outline the process by which the Department consulted with a range of stakeholders in preparing for the review, for example, permanent and teaching and scholarship staff, administrative staff, students, Library Services

2. Provision:
   i) Critically evaluate how the provision (UG, PGT and PGR) delivers the Department’s educational aims, drawing on the relationship to the College’s Mission Statement, College and School strategic objectives, subject developments and any professional, statutory or regulatory body requirements
   ii) Outline how the Department reviews and enhances its provision, both within programmes and across the subject offering more generally
   iii) Where relevant, outline the Department’s approach to collaborative provision including assuring the quality of partner institutions, managing the student experience and maintaining academic standards
   iv) Where relevant, outline the Department’s approach to delivering flexible and distributed provision (such as distance or e-learning)

3. Recruitment and Retention:
   i) Critically evaluate the Department’s approach to the recruitment of students; this should cover recruitment and selection processes and the induction of students to the Department. Draw on the data provided in the IR Tableau report on (1) Departmental student numbers and (2a, 2b) UG, PGT and PGR applications, offers, acceptance and intake to identify any trends, opportunities or concerns
   ii) Outline the Department’s approach to widening participation and how the success of strategies for widening participation is evaluated and informs future approaches
   iii) Critically evaluate the Department’s approach to student retention, including but not limited to attendance and engagement monitoring, pastoral and academic support, engagement with data to identify and address concerns around progression. Draw on the data provided in the IR Tableau report on UG progression to identify any trends, opportunities or concerns
   iv) Critically evaluate the equalities data on recruitment and retention and/or demonstrate how the Department already takes into account equalities data and uses it to inform its practice
   v) Critically evaluate the mechanisms by which the Department utilises key processes such as Sub-Boards, annual progress reviews and upgrades to facilitate student progression and retention

4. Academic Support
   i) Outline the mechanisms by which UG, PGT and PGR students are provided with academic support and review their effectiveness. This may draw on student feedback to questions on academic support in the data provided in the IR Tableau report on (8) Student Survey Results
   ii) Evaluate the extent to which the Department works effectively with a range of other support services to ensure high quality academic and pastoral support for students
5. Teaching Quality:
i) Critically evaluate the effectiveness of the learning and teaching strategy employed by the Department at UG, PGT and PGR and how this is monitored and enhanced. This should include but not be limited to consideration of engagement with technology-enhanced learning; research-led teaching; inclusive practice; staff development strategies
ii) Evaluate the effectiveness of processes for collating and responding to student feedback on learning and teaching practices
iii) Explain how the learning and teaching strategy supports students in achieving the intended learning outcomes and maintaining academic standards
iv) Evaluate the effectiveness of the use of learning resources and learning environment in delivering high quality learning and teaching and student experience. This can include department, school and College resources such as the Library, IT facilities, academic and administrative support, BGRS study skills provision, Disability and Dyslexia support. This should also include consideration of the extent of the use of Moodle and Panopto
v) Critically evaluate how the Department supports the learning experience of PGR students

6. Assessment and Feedback:
i) Critically evaluate the effectiveness of the assessment strategy employed by the Department and how this is monitored and enhanced. This may include but not be limited to consideration of assessment types; assessment volume and timing; inclusive practice; staff development strategies
ii) Explain how the assessment strategy supports students in achieving the intended learning outcomes and maintaining academic standards, including consideration of module pass and failure rates where possible
iii) Evaluate the effectiveness of assessment feedback to students, drawing on the data provided in the IR Tableau report on (8) Student Survey Results
iv) Explore the approach to marking and moderation across the Department and engagement with External Examiners

7. Student Achievement:
i) Critically evaluate student achievement within the Department, drawing on the data in the IR Tableau report on (3b, 4 & 5) UG, PGT and PGR achievement
ii) Critically evaluate the extent to which students’ employability and further study aims are enhanced, drawing on the data in the IR Tableau report on (7) First Destinations Data
iii) Critically evaluate the equalities data on achievement (IR Tableau report 6a, 6b) and/or demonstrate how the Department already uses equalities data to inform its practice

8. Student Experience
i) Critically evaluate the methods through which the Department promotes a high quality student experience at all levels and how student feedback and engagement helps to enhance the Department’s approach
ii) Reflect on the feedback provided from students via student surveys (Birkbeck Student Survey, National Student Survey, Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey, Postgraduate Research Experience Survey), drawing on the data provided in the IR Tableau report on (8) Student Survey Results
iii) Explore the Department’s approach to collating student feedback including but not limited to surveys and outline the mechanisms in place to identify and respond to key issues and trends
iv) Reflect on the efficacy of mechanisms to engage PGR students in the research community

9. Assurance and Enhancement of Standards and Quality:
i) Critically evaluate the mechanisms for quality assurance and enhancement within the Department (if covered already, you may wish to refer back to specific sections or provide an overview of how these are used in conjunction to assure and enhance quality
ii) Explain how staff remain up-to-date with School, College and Sector developments in quality assurance and enhancement
iii) Provide a brief outline of the example of enhancement that the Department will present to the Panel during the review itself with reference to how this has enhanced academic standards, the quality of the learning opportunities or the quality of the student experience as appropriate
APPENDIX 2 – REVIEW TIMETABLE

INDICATIVE INTERNAL REVIEW TIMETABLE

Note: The following timetable is an indicative one to be used for reviews involving a wide range of programmes. This may be streamlined where a small number of programmes is being considered. The length of the review event and timetable should be agreed at the planning meeting by the Panel.

INTERNAL REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT OF X
22nd & 23rd April 20XX

Thursday 22nd April 20XX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Area for Review</th>
<th>Lead Panel Questioner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.00 – 19.30</td>
<td>Meeting with Undergraduate, Postgraduate Taught and Postgraduate Research students</td>
<td>All panel members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Friday 23rd April 20XX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Area for Review</th>
<th>Lead Panel Questioner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.00 – 10.30</td>
<td>Private Panel meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10.30 – 12.15 | Main discussion between the panel and Department covering some or all of the following, based on the key sections within the SED:  
• Context  
• Provision Recruitment and Retention  
• Academic Support  
• Teaching Quality  
• Assessment and Feedback  
• Student Achievement  
• Student Experience  
• Assurance and Enhancement  
   | All panel members with lead questioners for possible exploration of individual aspects of the provision. |                                |
| 12.15 – 13.00 | Lunch and private discussion                                             | All panel members             |
| 13.00 – 14.00 | Department presentation and discussion of an example of enhancement        |                                |
| 14.00 – 14.30 | Panel meeting to consider review feedback                                  |                                |
| 14.30 – 15.00 | Oral feedback to the Department                                         |                                |