

Higher Education Review: A more risk-based approach to the quality assurance of higher education in England (April 2013)

- 1. Should a judgement of 'requires improvement to meet UK expectations' be available in the area of threshold academic standards?**

Yes

- 2. Should an initial appraisal be used to tailor the intensity of individual review visits?**

Yes

- 3. Should the process involve international reviewers?**

Yes

- 4. Does the pilot proposal offer a reasonable way to introduce international reviewers?**

Yes

- 5. Please note any brief suggestions you have about introducing international reviewers**

CILIP recommends that QAA invites nominations from PSRBs when recruiting international reviewers to ensure true breadth and depth of current discipline within the reviewing team.

- 6. Do the proposals for the review of arrangements for working with others establish an appropriate demarcation between the areas reviewed at a degree-awarding body and those reviewed at the partner, delivery or support organisation?**

No comment

- 7. Should the new method include a separate judgement about managing higher education provision with others?**

No comment

- 8. Is the proposed scale and provisional level of confidence appropriate for the initial appraisal to determine the intensity of the review visit?**

No

- 9. Is the proposed approach to determining the scale of the provision appropriate?**

Yes

10. Is the proposed approach to determining the level of confidence appropriate?

Yes

11. Should the information base used to identify the level of confidence:

- be enlarged
- be reduced
- be changed in some other way
- remain the same

Remain the same.

12. Please note any brief suggestions you have about changes relating to the information base.

No comment.

13. Should provider self-evaluation documents have a bearing on the initial appraisal?

Yes

14. Should student submissions have a bearing on the initial appraisal?

Yes

15. Is the concept of high, medium and low intensity review visits appropriate?

Yes

16. Please note any brief suggestions you have about the intensity of review visits.

CILIP agrees that an initial appraisal could be used to tailor the intensity of review visits, with the proviso that the appraisal takes account of trustworthy external information such as that provided by PSRB's accreditation reviews.

In the interests of credibility, it is important that relatively small, vocationally orientated disciplines such as Libraries, Archives and Information Services are subjected to the same level of scrutiny during the review visit as is applied to larger academic disciplines.

17. If you have any further comments about the initial appraisal please provide them here.

CILIP would welcome the opportunity to contribute to the initial appraisal by, for example, submitting accreditation review documents. However, we note that the form and content of these documents varies between professional bodies and that the impact of reviews by regulatory bodies differs from non-regulatory bodies. QAA will have to accommodate these variations to ensure, as far as possible, equality of contribution from PSRBs.

CILIP would welcome the opportunity to be more closely involved in the nomination and selection of reviewers to ensure their knowledge, skills and experience truly reflect the interests and requirements of employers.

18. Should there be just one visit to the provider?

No

19. Should we allow professional support staff to be reviewers?

Yes

20. Is the proposed categorisation of operational, minor and major changes appropriate?

Yes

21. Should the role of students in Higher Education Review be strengthened compared to the role of students in IRENI and RCHE?

Yes

22. Please note any brief suggestions you have about strengthening the role of students in the review process.

Inclusion of the student voice would help to strengthen confidence in the transparency and range of the review. However, we believe that the experience of academic support staff should have greater weighting.