

<p>INTERNAL SUBJECT REVIEW</p> <p>Design and approval of new programme/ subject awards and modules</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • curriculum development. • learning and teaching. • Assessment. • resources – human, buildings, libraries, equipment etc. • student support and guidance. • student performance and achievement. • employability. • research. • student recruitment. • staff recruitment and development. • policies and procedures for maintenance and enhancement of quality of provision and academic standards. • identifying good/best practice. <p>The findings of the report should be substantiated through reference to internal and external reports and processes, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • external examiner’s reports. • professional body reports. • annual/periodic internal reviews. • course/programme committee reports/minutes. • student feedback – questionnaires, liaison meeting minutes etc. • annual data/statistics for applications, enrolments, withdrawals, failures, achievement etc. <p>Development procedures</p> <p>Consultation & benchmarking processes employed with stakeholders: potential learners; employers; staff; relevant national bodies (subject benchmarking, codes of practice etc.); similar established providers (national & international); professional bodies (if necessary).</p> <p>Documents required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • proposal document outlining: rationale; demand; competition. • course/programme document outlining: philosophy; aims; learning outcomes; entry requirements; learning, teaching and assessment methodologies; course structure & module/unit descriptors. • resource statement: staff cv’s; course resource requirements (studios, equipment, library etc.). • student handbook outlining: course doc. material + resources/processes for student support and guidance. <p>Institutional scrutiny & validation</p> <p>An impartial objective judgement by a panel of external and internal stakeholders. Including: external academic expert(s); external representative of the profession(s) and institutional quality assurance and academic representatives. It involves discussions about experiences of national bodies and external stakeholders (employers,</p>
--	---

	professional bodies etc.)
<p>Annual/ongoing review of programme/subject awards</p>	<p>Annual review objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a critical self-evaluation of the past year of the programme by Programme Boards. • be responsive to critical comments from key stakeholders. • to maintain currency of the programme. • to ensure the programme achieves the institutions quality criteria. <p>Documents required</p> <p>An evaluative monitoring report of the programme with an action plan identifying the past year's key issues (their status – achieved/ongoing etc.) and future actions necessary (identified through the process) involving opinion surveys of stakeholders: current learners (liaison groups, questionnaires etc.); teachers;;external examiners (reports); external (professional bodies, employers etc.);also referencing statistical data on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • applications/enrolment • progression/withdrawal • achievement/failure • destination (employment, further study etc.) <p>Programme reporting structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • staff/learner liaison groups. • programme/course boards. • faculty/department boards. • institute academic council (or equivalent). • external examiners. • exam boards.
<p>Programme/subject award review and re-approval (normally every 5 years)</p>	<p>Review objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • critical self-evaluation of programme by Programme Boards. • (systemic root-and-branch evaluation). • revision of programme documents. • (in response to issues that have arisen during the annual review. • process, ensuring programme currency and standards). • approval to continue programme for further five years. <p>Documents required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • critical review report of the programme with emphasis on its future direction through reflection and evaluation of the past five years outcomes and experiences • resource statement • annual programme reports – normally past three years

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • external examiners reports – normally past three years. <p>Institutional review An impartial objective judgement by a panel of external and internal stakeholders. Including: external academic expert(s); external representative of the profession(s) and institutional quality assurance and academic representatives. It involves discussions about experiences of: current learners; graduates; employers; relevant national bodies and institution.</p>
<p>inter}artes INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW General principles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focus on effectiveness of internal quality assurance, enhancement procedures and processes. • takes as its starting point, the institutions mission statement, aims and objectives. • places emphasis on the student’s learning experience. • looks closely at how the institution knows the quality monitoring and management practices are effective and ensure the appropriate levels and standards are achieved and maintained. • the central ambition is placed more on the activity and practice of quality improvement, their effectiveness and relevance and help identify areas requiring development. • evaluation must be based on transparent explicit published criteria applied consistently. <p>Documents required</p> <p>Institutional Evaluation Document (SED) - a critical self-evaluation report of the institution’s policies and management of quality assurance and enhancement, with attention to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • educational aims of the institution. • quality and accuracy of institutional published material – the institution delivers what it claims. • institutional policy, framework and processes for assuring academic standards and quality of its programmes and learner support – its strengths and weaknesses. • institutions intentions for the enhancement of quality and standards • management/committee structure. • institutional use of national frameworks and standards. • external reference points/professional links. • institutions learning and teaching strategy. • student admission, progression and completion. • course/programme approval, monitoring and review. • assessment criteria, procedures and outcomes. • learning resources and student support. • equal opportunities. <p>The report should contain both qualitative and quantitative data, and explain how issues/problems identified at any level are responded to</p>

	<p>and resolved. It should be considered as part of a process to place quality management and enhancement as a core value in the institution's decision making and help evaluate the effectiveness of their policies and procedures.</p> <p>The findings of the report should be substantiated through reference and access to internal and external reports and processes, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • institutionally published material. • internal committee reports. • professional body/external reports. • annual/periodic internal reviews/re-approvals. • annual data/statistics for applications, enrolments, withdrawals, failures, achievements. • student feedback – questionnaires, liaison meeting minutes. • external examiners reports. • graduate feedback.
<p>inter}artes QUALITY REVIEWERS</p>	<p>Qualities & skills required in reviewers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wide current experience of academic management and quality assurance processes at institutional level. • personal and professional recognition/credibility within the higher arts education sector. • ability to assimilate a large amount of disparate information; to analyse, evaluate and make objective conclusions about complex arrangements; and to undertake research and investigation into documentary and oral evidence in order to make informed judgements clear oral and written communication skills. • to have a good understanding of latest national and European developments in higher arts education. • if representing a specific academic discipline, to have current knowledge and experience of curriculum development, learning, teaching and assessment within that discipline, at all levels of higher arts education.