UNIVERSITY COLLEGE DUBLIN

PERIODIC QUALITY REVIEW OF TAUGHT COLLABORATIVE PROGRAMME PARTNERSHIPS

INSTITUTIONAL VISIT GUIDELINES

[These Guidelines relate primarily to the delivery of taught collaborative programme partnerships – differentiated monitoring and review procedures for major/minor collaborative arrangements are currently being considered]

UCD Quality Office
(Revised April 2019)

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE DUBLIN

PERIODIC QUALITY REVIEW OF COLLABORATIVE PROGRAMME PARTNERSHIPS

INSTITUTIONAL VISIT GUIDELINES

1. Aim of the Site Visit

1.1. Periodic quality review of collaborative programme partnerships is one of the main ways by which UCD assures itself of the quality of: the student learning experience; the academic provision; and the organisation of the partnership. The Quality Review Panel should also consider whether the partnership continues to meet the strategic aims of UCD and whether the partnership continues to be of benefit to all parties.

1.2. The panel will review the relationship between UCD and the partner, in the context of the programme(s) delivery, having regard, for example, to the student experience and to operational and quality assurance matters, making specific reference to the QQI Statutory Quality Assurance Guidelines; UCD policies and procedures; and other relevant guidelines, as appropriate.

2. Membership of the Panel

2.1. The site visit will be carried out by a panel established by the University, comprised of, for example:

- Senior UCD faculty (one of whom will act as the Panel Chair);
- One or two external academic/industry expert members;
- A member of the UCD Quality Office (who may also act as rapporteur).

The number of reviewers may vary, to reflect the size and diversity of the partnership under review.

A short-list of proposed **external reviewers** will be submitted by the programme partnership team by an agreed deadline (typically 3 nominees per representative required – see guidance notes for the selection of reviewers at **Appendix 1**). The list of proposed reviewers will be considered by the UCDQO, in consultation with the College Principal, if required. External nominees may be removed from the list or additional externs may be added to the list of nominees, by the UCD QO or the College Principal. If the unit under review does not provide nominees to be considered for the Review Panel, by the agreed deadline, the UCD QO (in consultation with the College Principal as required), will nominate the Review Panel.

As necessary, in order to adapt to changing circumstances (e.g. a prospective reviewer being unavailable or a reviewer dropping out at short notice), the procedures for the establishment of Review Panels will remain flexible.

The final selection of the Review Panel will be reported to the Academic Council Quality Enhancement Committee. The final selection will be independent of the unit under review.

Note:
- Both genders (wherever possible) should be represented on the nomination lists.
- The programme partnership team must declare any relationship it might have with a proposed external reviewer. This must be done during the initial consultation period and outlined on the external nominee form (see **Appendix 2**)

3. Arrangements Prior to the Visit

3.1. The UCD Quality Office will be responsible for making the necessary arrangements prior to the visit. This will include:

- Requesting the submission of all necessary documentation (see section 4 below) from the UCD Programme Partnership Team (or equivalent), approximately two months before the visit, and circulating these to the panel members at least four weeks before the visit;

- In conjunction with the Programme Partnership Team coordinator (and the Panel Chair), prepare a draft agenda and itinerary for the visit (see 5.3 below);

- Making all travel arrangements to include flights, taxis, accommodation; and advising on travel visas (where necessary);

- Arranging a meeting of the panel to:
  - Discuss the documentation received from the partner and agree issues to be further explored;
  - Confirm the roles of each panel member;
  - Confirm the agenda/itinerary;
- Confirm all arrangements with the Programme Partnership Team.

4. The Self-Assessment Report and Supporting Documentation

4.1. The Self-Assessment Report (SAR) should be prepared by the Programme Partnership Team. The SAR should provide an analytical reflection on key aspects of the partnership and programme delivery; including the management of academic standards; programme management; the student experience; resources; effectiveness of the quality assurance arrangements. The self-evaluative commentary should be supported by relevant quantitative data and supporting evidence, which should be clearly referenced and indexed.

4.2. In order to inform the agenda and areas of questioning for the site visit, the following **indicative** documentation should be provided by the Programme Partnership Team at least two months before the visit. This should be provided in electronic format wherever possible, in addition to a number of hard-copy documents, such as the SAR. The specific documents, and number that

will be required in hard-copy, will be confirmed by the UCD Quality Office. The definitive list of documentation will be dependent on e.g. the type of partnership; scope of provision; location/country of partner.

Typical documents required for periodic quality review will include:

- A **Self-Assessment Report** as outlined in **Appendix 3 below**;

- Documentation outlining the strategic plan and mission of the partner;

- Any relevant country specific developments/context;

- Organisational chart;

- Flow-charts of key quality assurance processes;

- Documentation outlining the governance arrangements and organisational structure of the partner;

- Responsibilities checklist (**see Appendix 4**);

- Confirmation of the legal status of the partner;

- An indication of the financial viability of the partnership;

- Reports from relevant funding; accreditation/regulatory bodies; and other external quality agencies;

- Staff information to include (i) a list of teaching staff involved in the partnership and their level of qualification and/or professional experience, (ii) who employs them; and (iii) staff development strategy;

- Documentation confirming policies and procedures to include (as appropriate), academic regulations; student support; diversity and equality; IT and teaching and learning strategies;

- Policies and procedures to assure the quality and standards of academic provision, including student feedback and evaluation; and output reports from these mechanisms;

- Programme documentation relevant to the programme(s) being considered, to include: Programme Specifications, Module Descriptors, examples of Assessment Criteria, Annual Monitoring and External Examiner Reports (and responses);

- Relevant committee minutes/papers indicating consideration/action of quality related processes in relation to the programmes and/or the partnership, including staff-student committees;

- Relevant student handbooks;

- Management information such as student recruitment, retention, progression and achievement data;

- Information and data relating to alumni engagement;

- Memorandum of Agreement with UCD.

The UCD Quality Office will provide guidance to the Programme Partnership Team throughout the development of the SAR.

5. **The Site Visit**

5.1.   The Institutional Site Visit will normally take place over a period of two or three days. The following meetings should be included: (Appendix 5 outlines the indicative scope of the Panel meetings).

- Welcome and introductions;

- Tour of facilities to include library, IT facilities, laboratory or other specialist facilities (as appropriate), teaching spaces, social and recreational facilities and student support facilities;

- Meeting with a representative group of current students and graduates;

- Meetings with senior management regarding the aims of the visit, the strategy and mission of the proposed partner; rationale for the partnership; and any relevant in-country HE developments;

- Meetings with key faculty regarding recruitment and admissions, quality assurance, the curriculum, learning, teaching and assessment strategies; feedback to students; provision of student supports; and learning resources;

- Meetings with key support staff regarding the student experience and student support;

- Meeting with relevant alumni;

- Meeting with employers and/or other relevant stakeholders.

5.2.   It is also important to ensure that adequate refreshment breaks and private Quality Review Panel meetings are built into the timetable.

5.3.   The timetable for the visit will be developed by the UCD Quality Office, in conjunction with the Panel Chair and the Programme Partnership Team coordinator, at least two weeks before the visit and should be informed by the documentation provided in advance of the visit. An indicative timetable is set out in **Appendix 6**.

6. **Following the Visit**

6.1.   A Review Panel Report (**see Appendix 7**) will be prepared by the Quality Review Panel members, to be considered by the University Management Team, and the UCD Academic Council Quality Enhancement Committee (ACQEC), no later than 8 weeks after the site visit. The report should be drafted as soon as possible following the visit. Once the report has been approved by panel members this should be forwarded to the UCD Quality Office, who will send it to the Programme Partnership Team for comment regarding factual accuracy.

6.2.   When the final report has been endorsed by the panel (following any factual corrections), the UCD Quality Office will submit the Report to the next available meeting of UMT.

6.3.   Any reasonable expenses incurred by members of the Quality Review Panel as part of the visit should be submitted to the UCD Quality Office.

7.   Publication of Review Panel Reports

The Quality Review Panel Report will be considered by the University Management Team (UMT). The Review Panel Chair will meet with the UMT when the Review Panel Report is considered. The Review Panel Report will then be considered by the UCD Governing Authority and published on the UCD Quality Office website (www.ucd.ie/quality), in accordance with the *Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012*. Upon acceptance, the Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) will also be published alongside the Review Panel Report (see paragraph 8 below).

8.   Follow-Up to Quality Review – the Quality Improvement Plan

Follow-up is an integral part of the quality review process. The decisions on improvement, which are made in the follow-up to self-assessment and review, provides a framework within which each Programme Partnership Team can continue to work toward the goal of developing and fostering a quality culture, to enhance the student experience; the programmes; and the partnership itself. The Programme Partnership Team is required, under the *Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012* and the *QQI Core Statutory QA Guidelines (201*6), to implement each of the recommendations of the Report. If, however, after due consideration, the implementation of a recommendation would be unreasonable or impractical to do so, a clear rationale must be provided to support this, which will be considered by the Quality Review Panel Chair and the UCD Quality Office.

Following receipt of the Quality Review Panel Report and a briefing provided by the UCD Quality Office, the Programme Partnership Team will arrange to have a Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) drafted within twelve weeks, based on the Quality Review Panel Report findings. Guidelines for the completion of Quality Improvement Plans are available from the UCD Quality Office and/or at www.ucd.ie/quality.

The UCD Quality Office will support the Programme Partnership Team in developing the QIP. Upon acceptance of the QIP by the Panel Chair in conjunction with the UCD Quality Office, the QIP will normally be considered by the UMT, usually with the relevant UCD staff from the Programme Partnership Team and the College Principal in attendance.

University College Dublin

Criteria to be considered when selecting external Review Panel members

- Gender representation

- Reviewer expertise within the subject area(s)

- Proficiency in speaking and report-writing in the English language

- Management experience in comparable units and/or at institutional level

- Experience of institutional quality assurance systems and collaborative partnership arrangements and/or overseas campuses

- Affiliation with world-class units and institution(s)

Exclusions

- Recent role as Subject External Examiner within UCD

- Conflict of interest regarding any relationship with the unit or associated staff

- Current partner in research collaborations with the unit or associated staff

Additionally

- Any relationship the unit has with potential nominees must be declared by Head of unit prior to selection of Review Panel

University College Dublin

<u>Nomination of External Reviewer for the Periodic Quality review of Collaborative Programme Partnership</u>

Name of Unit to be reviewed:

Title, Name and Position
of Proposed External Reviewer:

Contact Details: Address

                          Email

                          Telephone

Brief details of relevant professional experience (please provide sufficient details to enable an informed decision to be made)

Please outline any formal links/relationship the Unit or individual staff members in the unit have had with the proposed reviewer

---

To the best of my knowledge I confirm that the nominee has had no formal links with the unit during the last three years.

Signed: (Head/Director of Unit)

Date

Please attach any relevant supporting documents (website information/research profile/professional profile) and submit to: Sinéad Clarke, UCD Quality Office, Email: Sinead.Clarke@ucd.ie

Periodic Quality Review of Collaborative Programme Partnerships

SELF ASSESSMENT REPORT: INDICATIVE OUTLINE

As the nature of the collaborative partnership and scope of provision may vary between arrangements, UCD will take a flexible approach to the structure of the Self-Assessment Report (SAR). This annex sets out an indicative SAR model. The final format of the SAR must be agreed with the UCD Quality Office prior to any work commencing on the SAR.

The SAR should be a critical self-appraisal by the Programme Partnership Team (UCD and partner staff) of the delivery of the academic provision, including the partnership arrangement itself, and engagement with UCD's (and the partner's) quality and regulatory frameworks. The SAR should summarise:

- How the quality and standards of UCD programmes are assured;
- How the quality and appropriateness of the learning environment provided for UCD students is assured;
- The quality of the support provided for UCD students (and if appropriate the partner's students);
- The quality of the support and development opportunities provided for the partner's and/or UCD's staff contributing to the programme;
- The appropriateness and effectiveness of the partnerships' management of the academic standards and quality enhancement;
- Compliance with the legal agreement governing the partnership and with relevant UCD regulations and procedures.

The SAR should discuss both strengths and weaknesses of the provision, as perceived by the Programme Partnership Team, and any plans for improvement and/or enhancement.

In preparing the SAR, reference should be made to relevant Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI) guidance documentation, which can be located at: http://www.qqi.ie; and relevant UCD guidance material.

Based on ongoing analysis of SARs from UCD Periodic Quality Reviews, the characteristics of a good SAR would include:

- Addressing the primary audience – the Quality Review Panel
- Being reflective, analytical and evidence-based
- Summarising a process of continuous reflection with a forward-looking dimension
- Being open, honest (transparent), and upfront about areas for further development
- Balancing description and analysis, and assurance and enhancement
- Not too long – a readable, consistent narrative, but reflecting institutional diversity
- Using case studies illustrating strategic processes

INDICATIVE SAR STRUCTURE

The selection of evidence is at the discretion of the Programme Partnership team, but it should be limited to what is relevant to the requirements of the SAR and the review process, and should be clearly referenced and indexed. The Review Panel may also request additional information before and/or during the site visit.

1. **Introduction /Operational Context/ Organisation & Management**
   - Details of the partnership
   - Strategic plans & financial viability of the partnership
   - Organisation & management of the partnership and the programme(s)
   - Challenges/opportunities
   - HE environment (in-country)
   - Responsibilities checklist (see Annex 2)

2. **The Design of the Academic Programmes**

The SAR should summarise, with reference to supporting evidence,
   a. Alignment with the programmes delivered at UCD and the NFQ
   b. An evaluation of the current structure of the curricula and any proposals for changes to the structure
   c. How recent developments in the subject are reflected in the programme design
   d. Reflection on best practice in pedagogy and innovative modes of delivery, including e-learning and technology enhanced learning
   e. Reflection on the contribution of research-led teaching to the programme
   f. How the range and variety of assessment methods effectively:

   - Promote student learning
   - Align with published Learning Outcomes and/or the Module Descriptors
   - Enable students to demonstrate achievement
   - Enable examiners to discriminate between different categories of performance

   g. The participation of students in the development of the curricula
   h. Student representation arrangements
   i. The identification of the learning and study skills needed by students and how these are both delivered in the curricula and assessed

j. The identification of employability skills needed by students and how these are both delivered in the curricula and assessed

k. The management and evaluation of work placement opportunities (if applicable)

3. The Learning Environment

The SAR should review the adequacy of the students' learning environment and learning resources. Recent and planned facility developments and any major acquisitions of learning resources should be outlined.

4. Student Support

The SAR should articulate and evaluate the student support systems in place for the whole student journey, covering aspects that include the following:

- Recruitment and induction/orientation of students
- Identification of, and any action on, any particular learning supports
- Feedback to students on their assessment and progress
- Overall academic guidance and supervision
- Tutorial support
- Language support (where relevant)

The evaluations should be based on the supporting student data, as appropriate.

5. Staff Development

The SAR should explain the systems and strategies in place for staff induction, mentoring and the identification of staff development needs. It should provide an evaluation of the effectiveness of such systems in delivering a good student experience and for enhancing teaching performance.

6. Quality and Enhancement Management

The SAR should provide a clear indication of:

i. The participation of students in the quality assurance processes

ii. How the partnership enhances the quality of learning opportunities by systematically building upon information or feedback that may come from:

- UCD and/or the partner
- Arrangements for External Examining
- External bodies, such as Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies
- Module evaluation
- Students and graduates
- Employers
- The Annual Programme Monitoring process and Periodic Review

6.   Compliance

The SAR should provide a clear indication of how the partnership aligns its operations with UCD practices and procedures, such as:

   i. Alignment with the NFQ
   ii. Examination procedures
   iii. Appeals procedures
   iv. Complaints procedures
   v. Procedures for programme and module changes
   vi.   Procedures for approval of new modules

7.   Supporting Evidence

The SAR should indicate where the supporting evidence may be found, and should be clearly referenced. This supporting evidence may include:

   i.   Monitoring data on student recruitment, admissions (including English Language score on entry), retention, progression and achievement
   ii.   Monitoring data on graduate destinations
   iii.   External Examiners' Reports and responses to them
   iv.   Summary of student evaluations of academic provision
   v.   Changes to staffing and CVs of newly appointed academic staff
   vi.   Key outcomes of any internal monitoring processes and any changes to those processes
   vii.   Copies of regulatory documents provided to students, e.g. assessment; leave of absence
   viii. Public information on UCD awards and programmes
   ix.   Student Handbook
   x.   Programme Monitoring Reports

INDICATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES CHECKLIST

A copy of this checklist (or similar) should be completed and included with the Self-assessment Report. Please identify management responsibilities (or responsibilities for implementation within partnership agreements) using the checklist below. Where the partner is fully responsible for a task, please mark the **partner** column; where UCD has full responsibility for a task, mark the **UCD** column; where responsibility is shared or the partner implements under **UCD** direction, mark the **shared** column. Where responsibility is devolved to the partner or shared, please provide **documentary reference(s)** that show how this is managed or implemented. These may be provided in the SAR or in documents presented subsequently or made available during the site visit.

	Item	Partner	UCD	Shared	Documentary reference(s)
1.	Strategic development of higher education provision				
2.	Student recruitment and selection				
3.	Monitoring student admission, retention and completion				
4.	Curriculum development and review				
5.	Programme specifications and intended learning outcomes				
6.	Setting assessments				
7.	First marking of student assignments				
8.	Moderation or second marking of assignments				
9.	Giving feedback to students on their assignments				
10.	Student registration & records				
11.	Reviewing and responding to e.g. annual monitoring reviews and module evaluations				
12.	Responding to External Examiner Reports				
13.	Provision for staff development				
14.	Monitoring the quality of higher education teaching and learning				
15.	Student admission guidance and induction/orientation				
16.	Academic tutorial/review and monitoring/academic guidance				
17.	Library and learning resources available to students, including language support (where relevant)				
18.	Guidance for progression				
19.	Liaison with and involvement of employers				

20.	Student appeal system				
21.	Student discipline				
22.	Collecting and acting upon student feedback/opinion				
23.	Programme and module information available to students				
24.	Information about learning opportunities, for example, on web or in prospectus				
25.	Procedures for ensuring that information about learning opportunities is fit for purpose, accessible and accurate				
26.	Responsibility for degree award parchment production and conferral				

INDICATIVE SCOPE OF PANEL MEETINGS

The following issues should normally be explored as part of the Institutional Visit and should subsequently be evidenced in the Panel Site Visit Report:

1. **Background**
    - When the visit took place;
    - The purpose of the visit;
    - Details of the periodic review – i.e. the programmes/subject areas involved and the nature of the partnership
    - Rationale for the development or continued involvement in the partnership; history/profile/reputation of the partner.
    - Is the Memorandum of Agreement fit for purpose? Does it need to be renewed?

2. **Panel**
    - List of panel members involved in the visit.

3. **Process**
    - Review methodology; append the timetable for the visit and a list of documentation provided by the partnership team for the Panel.

4. **Panel findings[1]**

    a. Tour of facilities

    o What facilities are available?
    o Were all facilities available to tour as part of the visit?
    o Are the facilities adequate / appropriate for the requirements of the partnership?
    o Are the library facilities adequate /appropriate? Are there sufficient recommended texts and related reading materials?
    o Are the IT facilities sufficient?
    o Do laboratory facilities meet health and safety requirements?
    o Do facilities meet diversity and equality requirements?
    o Are the teaching spaces adequate? Are these spaces suitably equipped?
    o Have the facilities changed since any previous visits?
    o Have these changes been communicated to the University?
    o Any other information available.

    b. Meeting with students

    o What are the students' overall impressions of the partner/UCD?

---

[1] The questions included here are indicative and should not be treated as an exhaustive list

o Do students feel adequately supported during their studies – academically and pastorally?
o Do students understand the programme structure?
o Do students have a clear understanding of assessment requirements? Criteria for assessment? Grading?
o Do students receive timely and useful feedback on assessments?
o Do students have access to adequate resources?
o Were students adequately inducted into the partner's/UCD's provision?
o Are students able to access relevant information – i.e. pre-arrival information, student handbooks etc.?
o How does student representation operate?
o Do students have any concerns they wish to raise?
o Do students wish to flag any areas of good practice?
o Any other information available.

c. Meeting with senior management

o What is the strategy and mission of the partner and how does this fit with UCD's strategic aims?
o What is the market and recruitment strategy for the partnership? Has this changed since establishing the partnership?
o Is the financial arrangement in place sufficient? Does this require further consideration?
o Staffing issues – are there sufficient appropriately qualified academic and support staff to support the partnership?
o Does the partner have policies relating to staff development, health and safety, equality and diversity etc.? Are they adhered to?
o Are there any cultural differences which need to be considered in maintaining the partnership?
o Are there any issues relating to equality and diversity to be considered in maintaining the partnership?
o How can University College Dublin and the partner ensure an equitable student experience for all students regardless of location?
o Any other information available.

d. Meeting with key faculty

o Does the partner have formal quality assurance procedures and processes in place and who is responsible for managing and monitoring these? Is there evidence of programme/partnership enhancements?
o Does the partnership meet the expectations of the QQI Statutory QA Guidelines?
o Are there procedures relating to student complaints and appeals, student progress, academic feedback to students etc.? Are they adhered to?
o Does the partner comply with UCD quality procedures and how is this evidenced?
o How are changes to programmes/processes discussed and approved with UCD?
o How are the views of students sought?
o Is there a formal personal tutor system?

- o Is the curriculum appropriate in terms of level and coverage of academic material? How is the curriculum informed by industry practitioners or other external stakeholders?
- o What are the entry requirements for entry to the partner programme? What are the arrangements for the selection of students? Who has responsibility?
- o How is the quality of teaching assessed and enhanced? Does peer review of teaching take place?
- o Who is responsible for assessment? Who appoints external examiners?
- o How are external examiner reports considered and responded to?
- o Are staff at the partner organisation qualified to deliver in the English language (where applicable?)
- o What challenges does delivering the programme present? What are the benefits?
- o Any other information available.

e. <u>Meeting with key support staff</u>

- o What are the pastoral and welfare support mechanisms available to students?
- o Is there a careers advice service?
- o Are there adequate support arrangements for students? What is the induction process for students?
- o Any other information available.

f. <u>Any other meetings</u>

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

- o Provide a recommendation to UCD UMT as to whether the partnership should continue.
- o List any areas of positive practice to highlight regarding the partnership.
- o Make recommendations to enhance provision and/or the partnership arrangements.
- o List any issues which require further consideration when renewing the partnership.

University College Dublin

INDICATIVE VISIT TIMETABLE

Periodic Quality Review of Collaborative Partnerships

An indicative programme for a Quality Review site visit is set out below. This is provided here primarily to illustrate the balance between meetings with staff, students and other stakeholders, and the time that Quality Review Panels will spend reviewing evidence in private. In practice, each site visit will have a bespoke programme informed by several factors including: the type of partnership; the scope of provision; the level of involvement of UCD staff; and the topic/themes the Quality Review Panel wishes to explore. The programme will be discussed as part of the preparatory stage for the site visit.

Timetable: UCD Dublin

Monday 27 February – Dublin

Time	Activity
9.30 – 9.40	Review Panel (RG) arrive at UCD
9.40 – 12.00	Review Panel **Planning Meeting** (Tea/Coffee)
12.00 – 12.15	Break
12.15 – 13.30	Review Panel Meeting with **senior School Teaching & Support Staff**
13.30 – 14.15	Lunch (RG only) and Private Meeting of RG
14.15 – 15.00	Break
15.00 – 15.45	Review Panel meet **senior UCD University Officers**
15.45 – 16.30	Review Panel Private Meeting
16.30	Review Panel departs

Tuesday 28 February

Review Panel Fly to *Country X*

Timetable XX

Thursday 2 March – Country X

Time	Activity
9.30	Review Panel Arrives at X
9.30 – 11.00	Review Panel **Planning Meeting** and examine documentary evidence
11.00 – 12.00	Review Panel meet **senior Programme/Partnership Staff from UCD /Partner**
12.00 – 12.30	Review Panel Meeting and examine documentary evidence
12.30 – 13.30	Lunch
13.30 – 13.45	Review Panel Private Meeting
13.45 – 14.45	Meeting with **UCD/Partner Operational Staff**
14.45 – 15.00	Review Panel Private Meeting
15.00 – 15.45	Review Panel meet with **key Programme Office Staff**
15.45 – 16.00	Review Panel Private Meeting
16.00 – 17.00	Review Panel Meet **Students**
17.00 – 17.15	Review Panel Private Meeting
17.15 – 18.15	Meeting with staff **who teach on the programme**
18.45 – 19.00	Review Panel Private Meeting and Depart
19.00	Transport back to hotel
19.30	Dinner for Review Panel

Timetable XX

Friday 3 March – Country X

Time	Activity
9.00	Review Panel Arrives at **X**
9.00 – 10.00	**Guided Tour of relevant Partner teaching and learning facilities and student study/social space**
10.15 – 11.00	Meeting with **Alumni**
11.00 – 11.30	Review Panel Private Meeting
11.30 – 12.30	Meeting with **Employers**
12.30 – 13.15	Lunch – Review Panel
13.15 – 15.00	Review Panel begin to draft Report and Preliminary Feedback Points
15.15 – 15.30	Review Panel communicates <u>Preliminary</u> feedback points
15.30	Review Panel departs & transport back to hotel

<u>Friday/Saturday</u>

Review Panel return home

INDICATIVE OUTLINE OF PANEL REPORT

1.	Introduction and Context
2.	Collaborative Partnership Arrangements/Memorandum of Agreement
3.	Partner Institutions and Situational Analysis
4.	Programme Admissions
5.	Programme Governance
6.	Programme Staffing and Delivery
7.	Curriculum Design and Assessment
8.	Student Supports
9.	Quality Assurance Arrangements
10.	Marketing and Alumni Activities