Guidelines Institutional and Subject Review for Higher Arts Education Programmes
as developed by inter}artes and revised by artesnet*Europe*

Institution and subject areas for review	Quality Assurance & Enhancement Policies, Procedures & Processes
SUBJECT REVIEW General principles	• based on a set of common and shared principles underpinning quality assurance irrespective of differing national approaches; • based on peer review; • involves student participation; • involves participation of professional bodies; • emphasis on the development and use of transparent explicit criteria and processes; • process is open to external scrutiny; • national quality assurance agencies are established; • transparency of procedures through the inclusion of a range of external and international reference points; • need for '*comparability*' – European framework; • emphasis on enhancement of quality; • has formal status and outcomes are publicly available; • move to student-centred outcomes based learning; • increased emphasis on the stakeholders (student and employer) in programme planning; • greater transparency about qualifications and standards – European framework providing reference points to establish comparability.
SUBJECT REVIEW	**Review objectives** • reviewed against the course/programme aims and objectives; • evaluation of the learning outcomes appropriate to the level and considering external references (benchmarking, codes of practice etc.); • to facilitate increased '*mobility'* and the development of the international '*market place'* for students; • to ensure the accuracy of public information on the programmes/courses; • to improve the effectiveness of internal quality assurance procedures. **Documents required** Self-Evaluation Document (SED) – a critical self evaluation report of the programme/subject with reference to: • course/programme philosophy/aims; • learning outcomes; • 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. The findings of the report should be substantiated through reference to internal and external reports and processes, such as: • 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.
INTERNAL SUBJECT REVIEW **Design and approval of new programme/ subject awards and modules**	**Development procedures** 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). **Documents required** • 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 CVs; course resource requirements (studios, equipment, library etc.); • student handbook outlining: course doc. material + resources/processes for student support and guidance. **Institutional scrutiny & validation** 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, professional bodies etc.)
Annual/ongoing review of programme/subject awards	**Annual review objectives** • 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.

	Documents required 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: • applications/enrolment; • progression/withdrawal; • achievement/failure; • destination (employment, further study etc.). **Programme reporting structure** • staff/learner liaison groups; • programme/course boards; • faculty/department boards; • institute academic council (or equivalent); • external examiners; • exam boards.
Programme / subject award review and re-approval **(normally every 5 years)**	**Review objectives** • 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. **Documents required** • 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; • external examiners reports – normally past three years. **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.
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW **General principles**	• 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.

Documents required

Institutional Evaluation Document (SED) - a critical self-evaluation report of the institution's policies and management of quality assurance and enhancement, with attention to:
- 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;
- the institution's intentions for the enhancement of quality and standards;
- management/committee structure;
- institutional use of national frameworks and standards;
- external reference points/professional links;
- the institution's learning and teaching strategy;
- student admission, progression and completion statistics;
- course/programme approval, monitoring and review;
- assessment criteria, procedures and outcomes;
- learning resources and student support;
- equal opportunities.

The report should contain both qualitative and quantitative data, and explain how issues/problems identified at any level are responded to 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.

The findings of the report should be substantiated through reference and access to internal and external reports and processes, such as:
- 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.

QUALITY REVIEWERS	**Qualities & skills required in reviewers**
	- 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; having 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.