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1. **INTRODUCTION**

Internal Teaching Review (ITR) is the University of Aberdeen’s version of periodic review, a requirement of all Scottish HEIs as part of the Quality Assurance Agency (Scotland)’s Quality Enhancement Framework (QEF). The QEF was developed by the QAA in conjunction with the Scottish Funding Council (SFC), and adherence to its requirements is a condition of SFC grant.

The ITR process provides a formal opportunity for a School to reflect on and critically evaluate its provision and to benefit from a constructive dialogue with senior academics from both within and outwith the University. It is intended to be a positive and constructive activity, supporting the School in the enhancement of their provision and learning experience of their students.

In accordance with Scottish Funding Council (SFC) guidance, the purpose of an Internal Teaching Review is to:

(i) provide assurance regarding the quality and standard of our teaching provision  
(ii) promote dialogue in areas where quality could be improved  
(iii) identify good practice for dissemination  
(iv) encourage and support critical reflection on current practice

A six-year rolling review schedule is approved, in consultation with the Vice-Principal (Education). Reviews are normally undertaken at School level. The schedule takes account, where possible, of external accreditation timetables.

2. **GENERAL INFORMATION**

Internal Teaching Review covers all credit bearing provision within the School. This includes:

- All Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught provision.
- Any joint degree programmes, including joint degree programmes with other schools or institutions where the University of Aberdeen is the awarding body.
- Service teaching provided for another School within the University i.e. where the School is responsible for the administration, organisation and or content of the courses.
- Collaborative provision, including provision delivery by delivery partners, and student exchange.
- Research programmes

Reviews are normally held in the period October to March when students are available to meet with the Review Panel. The Academic Services team will consult and liaise with School over possible dates.

3. **ITR PROCESS**

The ITR process is as follows:

(i) **Annual Monitoring**

Schools submit annual monitoring documentation (SCEF outcomes, annual course and programme reviews, external examiner reports and School responses thereto, Professional and Statutory Bodies (PSRB) documentation and school planning KPIs (and associated action plans) to the Quality and Planning SharePoint in accordance with publicised deadlines).
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(ii) ITR Submission

Schools, following consultation with both staff and students, must submit (i) an evidence-based Critical Analysis and (ii) a Curriculum Map(s) detailing how programmes address Aberdeen Graduate attributes and (if appropriate) Subject Benchmark Statements.

Submission should be electronic, uploaded to the Quality and Planning SharePoint.

Submission deadline: 8 weeks prior to ITR Panel visit, precise date advised by Academic Services.

The Vice-Principal for Education, Academic Registrar, Senior Educational Development Adviser, DDIS Relationship Manager, Head of Careers Service, Head of Student Support and the Equality and Diversity Adviser are sent a copy of the Critical Analysis to have the opportunity to review the CA and provide commentary; this will feed into the Pre-Panel meeting.

(iii) Pre-Panel Meeting

Approximately 4 weeks after ITR documents have been submitted by the School the internal and student panel members will meet, with external subject specialists contributing by Skype or email. They will discuss and agree the areas and topics to be covered during the Panel visit and, if required, areas for clarification with the School or, occasionally, make an explicit request for additional information prior to the visit.

(iv) Pre-Review Visit to School

Approximately two weeks prior to the main Panel visit there will be a pre-review visit (1-2h) with the Convenor, Clerk, Head of School (HoS), School Director of Teaching (DoT ), and others if requested by the School and/or Convenor, to discuss emerging themes for exploring at the Panel visit. The Convenor and Clerk may also undertake a tour of the School’s accommodation and facilities if these have been highlighted for any reason in the Critical analysis.

(v) Panel Visit

Panel Visits will normally take place over two days. The aim will be to follow up on key themes identified by Panel from submission and discussions with the School are the pre-panel visit. The Panel will hold 5 meetings:

1. QA session with Head of School, DoT, Director of Research (DoR), a selection of programme leaders and course coordinators, School Admin Officers (1.5h). The people invited to this session will vary depending on the QA issues identified by the panel.
2. Enhancement-focused discussion with students – UG (1h) and PGT/PGR (1h); may be split into discipline areas if necessary and led by the External Panel members.
3. Enhancement-focused discussion with staff (range of staff depending on themes being discussed); in multi-discipline Schools this may be discipline-specific and led by the External Panel members (2h). The range of staff should be agreed between the Head of School and the ITR Clerk and Convenor at the pre-review visit.
4. Pedagogic Partnership Session
   - Part (a) to include staff and students, excluding HoS, DoR school DoT (2h). The aim of this meeting will be to have an open-ended discussion of challenges and potential solutions.
   - Part (b) to include HoS, DoT and DOR
   - The aim of the PPS is to produce a jointly-agreed Action Plan for the School to take forward.
5. Final wash-up session with HoS, School DoT and others as requested by Head of School/Convenor.
NB1: The Panel may explore some topics in more than one meeting and will not be restricted from exploring others as they arise on the day.

NB2: Schools are asked to ensure that the students who attend the meetings include representatives of as many different sections of the student body as possible, e.g. each level of study, mode of study (part-time, full-time, distance learning) etc

NB3: suitable accommodation needs to be provided within the School for the duration of the visit; it is the responsibility of the School to organise this, and for arranging catering during the visit.

(vi) Report

The outcome will be a report consisting of two parts; Part A will be a QAC report identifying the QA findings, highlighting good practice, commending initiatives worthy of sharing across the institution or which might be considered institution or sector leading, and highlighting areas for development. Part B will consist of a jointly-devised action plan. The one-year follow up report will consist of an update on progress on the action plan.

The report and action will be considered by the QAC and posted to the ITR web pages.

4. ITR TIMELINE

i. 6-8 months prior to ITR Panel visit, Convenor and Clerk meet with HoS, School DOT, and School Admin Officer (SAO) to explain process and information required.

ii. 8 weeks prior to ITR Panel visit, deadline for School documentation submission.

iii. 4 weeks prior to the visit, a pre-meeting of the panel will be convened to discuss the submission and highlight areas for discussion at the Panel visit.

iv. 2 weeks prior to ITR Panel visit, Convenor and Clerk meet HoS and School DOT to identify three main themes for discussion at Panel visit.

v. 1 week prior to the ITR Panel Visit, School will receive a draft Schedule with individuals with whom the Panel would like to meet.

vi. Within 4 weeks of the ITR Panel Visit the draft report and action plan will be sent to the Head of School for the correction of factual inaccuracies (report) and for identifying individuals with responsibility for taking forward agreed targets (action plan). Schools will have two weeks to provide this feedback. Any suggested changes will be subject to the approval of the Convener of the Panel.

vii. Within 8 weeks of the ITR Panel Visit the final report and action plan will be sent to the Head of School.

viii. The report action plan is submitted to the next meeting of the Quality Assurance Committee, for consideration. QAC will report to the University Committee for Teaching and Learning on any issues of policy that impact beyond the School.

ix. Schools are expected to provide a progress update to the action plan approximately 12 months from the date QAC has considered the Report. Exceptionally, QAC may request a response within a shorter timescale, if deemed appropriate. QAC will review the progress reports to ensure that the recommendations have been adequately addressed and reported, including evidence of dissemination of recommendations to students.

5. ITR PANEL

The ITR panel will comprise at a minimum:

- Panel Chair: The Panel convener will be an independent member of the QAC, i.e. not the QAC member whose responsibility it is to review the School’s QA documentation annually. This gives
a fresh perspective on the School’s teaching and learning provision.

- At least two external subject specialists from other HE institutions, normally in the UK
- A student representative from outwith the School (normally a School Convener)
- Two experienced members of academic staff from outwith the School who have learning and teaching roles
- An administrator, normally from Registry, who will also act as clerk to the Panel

**External subject specialists:** the number of external subject specialists appointed to the Panel will take account of the range and volume of provision to be reviewed and ensure that the Panel as a whole is able to bring a range of experience, perspectives and understanding to the process. It is normally expected that there will be one external subject specialist for each group of cognate programmes within a School. They may come from a UK or oversees institution (costs allowing), from industry or from professional practice, and must have an awareness of the Scottish or UK HEI system. They cannot be drawn from colleagues who have been a member of staff, a student or an external examiner of the University of Aberdeen in the three years prior to the review. The Head of the School will be asked to suggest external subject specialists and forward their CV / online profiles for the consideration of the Convener of QAC before sent for approval by the Vice-Principal Education who approves the full panel composition. When nominations are approved Academic Services will contact the individuals concerned. External members will receive a fee plus reimbursement of expenses. Schools are responsible for the payment of costs and accommodation arrangements of external specialists.

**Internal panel members:** other internal panel members will normally be drawn from the academic members of the undergraduate and postgraduate committees, one from each committee. These academics will have a key role in overseeing teaching and learning provision in their own Schools, will also be acutely aware of the institution’s learning and teaching priorities and agenda.

**Student panel members:** student representation will be drawn from School Conveners external to the School being reviewed. The inclusion of a student member provides the Panel with a greater focus on the student experience and an additional perspective on other issues from the student point of view.

This model of panel membership allows the greatest dissemination of good practice between Schools, and ensures Panel members bring knowledge of institutional learning and teaching issues and priorities.

### 6. DOCUMENTATION

Schools, following consultation with both staff and students, must submit an [evidence-based Critical Analysis](#) and (ii) a Curriculum Map(s).

#### 6.1 Critical Analysis (CA)

The CA allows the Schools’ particular contexts to be set out clearly, and have a clear focus on (i) enhancement and (ii) reflection on effectiveness. The CA must be [evidence-based](#) throughout.

Documentation provided to the Quality and Planning SharePoint as part of annual monitoring or the school planning process does not need to be re-submitted, but should be explicitly referred to, where appropriate, throughout the CA. Examples of the documentation useful to help Schools support their evidence-based CA reflections are available in Annex A.

The CA is prepared (normally) by the School Director of Teaching, in conjunction with other School staff and students. Normally, students are consulted via Staff- Student Liaison Committee (SSLC) meetings and/or focus groups, to elicit input to the reflection on provision and establish whether or not it reflects their experience of the School and their programmes.
The format of the CA should follow the guidance provided in Annex A. Should Schools wish to discuss a draft critical analysis they should contact their ITR Clerk in the first instance.

6.2 **Curriculum Map(s)** should detail how programmes address Aberdeen Graduate Attributes and, where appropriate, Subject Benchmark Statements and how these have changed in line with revised statements. How and which programmes should submit curriculum maps will be discussed at the initial meeting with the School 6-8 months before the ITR Panel visit takes place.

Annex B and C provide Curriculum Map exemplars for the Biochemistry degree programme to the relevant biosciences subject benchmark statements and Aberdeen Graduate Attributes.

6.3 **Supporting Documentation** to evidence your critical analysis reflections should be referenced/hyperlinked where possible. Schools are free to use their areas on the [Quality and Planning SharePoint site](https://365abdn.sharepoint.com/projects/qacPlanning/SitePages/Home.aspx) to facilitate this if they wish. It is expected that the following documentation would be referenced to support the CA as a minimum. Please note, the ITR Panel reserves the right to request additional documentation expected of Schools, or alluded to in School submissions, in advance of, on the day of the review, or post-review.

- Details of School/Discipline organisation, management and administration (including collaborative arrangements). Please include an organogram and list of key post holders including Disability Coordinator, Communications Champion etc.
- Examples of School (discipline)-specific course and programme information provided to students e.g. course and programme handbooks, mapping of any School marking scales to CGS, Assessment and Feedback Guidance, standard MyAberdeen templates used within the School etc.
- In addition to School Teaching and Learning Committees and Staff-student Liaison Committees already on SharePoint, please include membership and remits of any School/Discipline committees concerned with teaching, learning and assessment activities, including Programme Advisory Boards (or equivalents).
- Other documentation (e.g. minutes, agendas, reports) relating to operation or review of courses and programmes (e.g. minutes of meetings about the School’s programme portfolio, agendas of School Away Days of Teaching and Learning Fora etc. This should already be available on the School area of the Quality and Planning SharePoint site.

Detailed Guidance on completing the Critical Analysis and Curriculum Maps are available in Annexes A, B and C.

In reviewing the School’s submission, ITR Panel members will be asked to consider the extent to which the CA is reflective, evaluative, and constructively self-critical and discusses School’s strengths and weaknesses. It will also consider how staff and students have contributed to its development. Additionally, ITR Panel members will be asked to focus on particular aspects:

- Internal Panel members focus on the robustness of the School’s procedures and mechanisms for assuring quality and its plans for enhancement, particularly plans related to institutional Learning and Teaching Strategy including engagement with University Task Forces, current priorities and enhancement initiatives including the national Enhancement Themes.
- External subject specialists are asked to focus on reviewing programmes in the light of relevant national subject benchmark statements and other external reference points, including the requirements of any relevant Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (where relevant) and the appropriateness of the Schools’ mechanisms for assuring the standards of awards.
• Student panel members focus on student related matters such as mechanisms for communicating with and engaging students, the usefulness key information, opportunities for students to engage in curriculum, teaching, learning and assessment development and innovation; and the effectiveness of mechanisms for obtaining and responding to student feedback.

7. ENGAGING STUDENTS IN ITR

Student engagement and participation is a much valued and vital aspect of all ITRs.

Schools are asked to inform students about the review at an early opportunity e.g. at the first SSLC meeting in the academic session in which the review will be held. Further, Schools are expected to engage with their students and to incorporate students’ views and feedback whilst producing the documentation submitted for the review. This is usually achieved by liaising with the wider student body on an early draft and then again later to seek endorsement prior to submission. Most Schools tend to do this via its network of School Convener and Student representatives, or by posting a draft on MyAberdeen, or by convening a focus group(s). Schools should also refer to student feedback obtained via routine quality mechanisms e.g. SCEFs, SSLCs, and annual monitoring reports, student surveys, etc.

The ITR Panel will ask to meet a variety of students (undergraduate, postgraduate taught, postgraduate research, students representatives, online and on campus, and from all across all years of study) to share their views on learning, teaching and assessment and on their engagement with School developments in learning, teaching and assessment, and their wider experience as students of the School. Schools will be asked to arrange for the students to meet the Panel and experience dictates that students are willing to participate, and can do so most usefully, if they have had an early briefing from the School about the review and have been engaged in the School’s preparation for it.

During the Panel Visit, students will be full partners in the Pedagogic Partnership Session which is convened to produce the jointly-agreed Action Plan for the School to take forward.

Following the review, Schools are asked to inform students about the review outcome and share with them the report and action plan. This can be provided for consideration at SSLCs or posted to MyAberdeen.

The School will be asked to report on the steps it has taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review and on the actions taken in the on year follow-up report / updated action plan to QAC.
Guidance for Completion of the Critical Analysis

The Critical Analysis (CA) should be evidence-based, and structured around the headings which follow. Its preparation should involve staff and students, and Schools should refer to their School Action Plans and planning metrics. Annual Course (ACR) and Programme Reviews (APR) and External Examiner Reports since the Schools’ previous ITRs, and PSRB reviews and reports where applicable should also be drawn upon.

Internal Teaching Review covers all credit-bearing provision: i.e. taught undergraduate provision, taught postgraduate provision, and the training and supervision arrangements for research students, online, on campus and at branch campuses. Please ensure the CA makes reference to matters relevant to all areas of activity as appropriate.

The CA should identify:

- How it was prepared and approved
- How students were involved and the impact of that student engagement
- Brief background information about the size and scale of the School
- The School’s overarching strategic priorities

The CA should provide information about the contextualisation of the School, to include: areas where the School considers it demonstrates good practice, areas prioritised for development and/or enhancement, and areas that continue to present a challenge. This information should be summarised in the opening section of the Critical Analysis, cross referenced to later sections to provide greater detail as appropriate. The School should refer to the data it uses in its School planning process in identifying its strengths and challenges.

Because ITR is contextualised, it is understood that the themes explored in each review will reflect the strategy, priorities, strengths and challenges of the School concerned. Schools are expected to address each of the 4 sections and all subheadings of the CA, but it is recognised that the volume and focus of the content provided by each School will vary.

In the context of each of the headings, the CA should indicate:

- What is distinctive and what is typical about the School
- What the key areas of strength and challenge are
- How the School has evaluated its policy and practice
- How the school intends to build on good practice or address areas for development
- Include consideration of both UG and PG (taught and research) provision.
- Include consideration of Collaborative, Online and Transnational Education (TNE) provision

**NB: this should be particular to the School, and not just evidence of School adherence to expected institutional practice.**

Be open and honest. Do not be afraid to discuss aspects of concern. The spirit of ITR is intended to be constructive, not judgmental, and the exercise is intended to contribute to enhancement of teaching and learning across the University as a whole.

Supporting Documentation

Wherever possible please provide (as hyperlinks or appendices) documentation in support of your critical analysis reflections. It is expected that the following documentation would be submitted to support the CA as a minimum. Please note, the ITR Panel reserves the right to request additional documentation expected of Schools, or alluded to in School submissions, in advance of, or on the day of the review, or post-review.

- Details of School/Discipline organisation, management and administration (including collaborative
arrangements). Please include an organogram and list of key post holders including Disability Coordinator, Communications Champion etc.

- Examples of course and programme information provided to student e.g. course and programme handbooks, mapping of any School marking scales to CGS, Assessment and Feedback Guidance, standard MyAberdeen templates used within the School etc.
- In addition to School Teaching and Learning Committees and Staff-student Liaison Committees already on SharePoint, please include membership and remits of any School/Discipline committees concerned with teaching, learning and assessment activities, including Programme Advisory Boards (or equivalents).
- Other documentation (e.g. minutes, agendas, reports) relating to operation or review of courses and programmes (e.g. minutes of meetings about the School’s programme portfolio, agendas of School Away Days of Teaching and Learning Fora etc.

**CRITICAL ANALYSIS**

1. **SCHOOL CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION**
   - Development of the Critical Analysis
   - Key features of the School’s content and mission
   - Composition and key trends in the School’s student population, including typical routes into and through the School
   - Summary of the School’s follow up to previous ITR

2. **ENHANCING LEARNING & TEACHING**
   - Strategic approach to enhancement.
   - Approaches to identifying, sharing and extending good practice
   - Engaging and supporting staff
   - Effectiveness of the approach to implementing strategies, identifying and promoting good practice and enhancing learning and teaching

3. **ENHANCING THE STUDENT LEARNING EXPERIENCE – UG, PGT AND PGR**
   - Engaging and supporting students in their learning, including the learning environment.
   - Student representation and engagement.
   - Effectiveness of the approach to enhancing the student learning experience

4. **MANAGING QUALITY & STANDARDS**
   - Features of the School’s approach to setting, maintaining, reviewing and assessing academic standards, including the management of assessment
   - Securing academic standards of collaborative provision
   - Effectiveness of arrangements for managing academic standards

Guidance as to what Schools might wish to consider in responding to each heading is provided in pages 12-14.
CRITICAL ANALYSIS: GUIDANCE ON HOW TO APPROACH EACH HEADING

1. SCHOOL CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION

- Development of the Critical Analysis. Consider:
  - who (including students) was involved in the process and how was consultation and feedback managed?
- Key features of the School’s content and mission. Consider:
  - the range of provision under review; Staffing (summary of staff cohort, FTEs and SSR); significant changes since the last review e.g. restructuring, physical resources)
- Composition and key trends in the School’s student population, including typical routes into and through the School. Consider:
  - student numbers over the review period, UG, PG, PGT, Online, those on collaborative programmes, articulation routes and targets being worked towards
- Strategic approach to enhancing and evaluating learning and teaching. Consider:
  - the School’s key aims, how the School Plan maps with institutional priorities and activities. This should be a high-level summary. Detail can be provided in the appropriate sections below.
- Follow up to previous ITR – areas for development and follow up

2. ENHANCING LEARNING & TEACHING

- Strategic approach to enhancement. Consider:
  - Activity in relation to curriculum design and development; lecture/tutorial delivery; assessment & feedback
  - Approach to intended learning outcomes, use of MyAberdeen and digitally –enhanced methods and activities, pedagogic initiatives; work-based learning, the impact of PSRB requirements (where applicable) on policy and practice
  - Assessment & Feedback: range of assessment methods, how students receive feedback on assessment, balance of formative and summative assessment, innovation in assessment, A&F Task Force activities
- Approaches to identifying, sharing and extending good practice. Consider:
  - Feedback on, evaluation, and impact of activities and the mechanisms are used to share good practice across the School
  - The School’s contribution to institutional projects and opportunities. E.g. Annual Symposia, LTEP activities and L&T scholarship networks, and the impact thereof
  - The School’s involvement to external, sector- wide enhancement activity. E.g. QAA annual conferences, QAA National Enhancement Themes and Subject Networks, and the impact thereof
- Engaging and supporting staff. Consider:
  - School-based probationer and early career development support, ongoing support and development during academic careers.
  - Support and training for tutors and PGRs who teach
  - Extent of engagement with CAD annual programme of activity; support for staff to undertake HEA fellowships and the PG certificate in Higher education in Learning and Teaching
• **Effectiveness of the approach to implementing strategies, identifying and promoting good practice and enhancing learning and teaching.** Consider:
  - the effectiveness of the School’s approached to enhancing learning and teaching
  - Aspects of provision that are considered to be particularly successful and or worthy of wider dissemination as examples of good/best practice, where the evidence supports this
  - Areas recognised for improvement, which should be prioritised, with indications given of how they will be tackled.
    - Consider: data on uptake of training opportunities (School-based, CAD-based and external), feedback from staff, feedback from students (SSLC, SCEF, NSS), trends in student outcomes, staff promotions

3. **ENHANCING THE STUDENT LEARNING EXPERIENCE – UG, PGT AND PGR**

• **Engaging and supporting students in their learning, including the learning environment.** Consider:
  - How equality and diversity is supported amongst the student body. Consider Athena Swann, Gender Action Plan, Mental health and Wellbeing
  - Transition and induction activities; support for International students, widening participation students, direct entrants, online learners, TNE students; students on collaborative programmes
  - how the development of graduate attributes is promoted. Consider: Intended Learning Outcomes, Work-based learning, placement and study abroad opportunities. Refer to AGA Curriculum Map and Positive Outcomes Task Force activities
  - Key roles: Personal Tutors, Disability Coordinators, Digital Representatives, Retention Officers, Retention Task Force initiatives etc.

• **Student representation and engagement.** Consider:
  - Success of gathering the student voice; methods used to communicate with students and engage them in decision-making and L&T development processes; how the feedback loop is closed
  - The effectiveness of SCEFs and SSLCs, informal feedback mechanisms and School-level engagement/promotion of NSS and Student Engagement Survey

• **Effectiveness of the approach to enhancing the student learning experience.** Consider:
  - The effectiveness of the School/Subject’s approaches to enhancing the student learning experience
  - Aspects of provision that are particularly successful and or worthy of wider dissemination as examples of good/best practice, where the evidence supports this
  - Areas recognised for improvement, which should be prioritised, with indications given of how they will be tackled
    - Consider: Trends in the student population (retention, progression, awards, outcomes, DLHE / LEO survey data, study abroad); SCEF, SSLC feedback and NSS and UG and PG Student Engagement Survey (and other activity) outcomes

4. **MANAGING QUALITY & STANDARDS**

• **Features of the School’s approach to setting, maintaining, reviewing and assessing academic standards, including the management of assessment.** Consider:
  - School-based approaches to preparation and review of Course and Programme Approval, Annual Monitoring (ACR and APR) and External Examiner reports (and other feedback) and QAC- responses thereto, including wider dissemination throughout the School
- Use of External Examiners’ and Student Feedback, including wider dissemination throughout the School
- Use of data to review and assess academic standards and to inform decision-making and evaluation.
- School approach to dissemination and use of external reference points, including Subject Benchmark Statements, Scottish Credit and Qualification Framework (SCFQ), Accreditation requirements, QAA Quality Code and other external references

### Securing academic standards of collaborative provision

Consider:
- key features of any collaborative activity and range of provision indicating how the School ensures oversight of quality arrangements and academic standards therein
- Study Abroad arrangements (incoming and outgoing), TNE activity, work with Delivery Partners, articulation activities

### Effectiveness of arrangements for managing academic standards

Consider:
- the effectiveness of the School/discipline’s arrangements for securing academic standards (NB: this should be particular to the School, and not just evidence of School adherence to expected institutional practice).
- how effective are processes to analyse SCEFs, APRs, ACRs, external examiner reports? How are examiner meetings handled, how effectively is moderation used in the School, how does the School gather and close the feedback loop etc
- Aspects of provision considered to be particularly successful and/or worthy of wider dissemination as examples of good/best practice, where the evidence supports this
- Areas recognised for improvement, which should be prioritised, with indications given of how they will be tackled.
  - Consider feedback from students and external examiners, PSRB accreditations, School-based Student Appeal and Complaints data
  - Consider trends in student outcomes, and those of benchmark institutions (where available).
Curriculum map to subject benchmark statements

Subject Benchmark Statements are part of the QAA Quality Code – Part A: Setting and maintaining academic standards (see http://www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality/the-quality-code/subject-benchmark-statements). According to the QAA they “set out expectations about standards of degrees in a range of subject areas. They describe what gives a discipline its coherence and identity, and define what can be expected of a graduate in terms of the abilities and skills needed to develop understanding or competence in the subject.” The Subject Benchmark Statements for most undergraduate degree programmes can be found at http://www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality/the-quality-code/subject-benchmark-statements/honours-degree-subjects. These are regularly updated and it is important to map degree programmes to their benchmark statements on a regular basis to ensure the programmes remain appropriate. The documents provided by QAA are extensive and can cover a very large set of skills. For example, the one for biosciences covers intellectual skills, analytical skills, communication skills, interpersonal skills and professional development skills as well as core knowledge and understanding expected in that discipline. The Benchmark standards are also couched in terms of generic standards and subject-specific standards and each of those is split into threshold standards and typical standards. Given this complexity you are advised to map your programme to the typical level of the subject-specific standards.

The link below provides a mapping of the Biochemistry degree programme to the relevant biosciences subject benchmark statements. Whilst we do not ask where or how in the course a particular attribute may be developed bear in mind that an ITR panel may request this information.

Curriculum mapping to Aberdeen Graduate Attributes

The Aberdeen Graduate Attributes describes a set of 19 attributes that students should have the opportunity to develop during their time studying at the University of Aberdeen. Not every course has to offer the opportunity to develop every attribute but the expectation is that each programme will afford students the opportunity to develop all 19 Aberdeen Graduate Attributes. This information is required as part of the course and programme approval process but it is useful to revisit this every few years as programmes change over time. The Internal Teaching Review (ITR) process is a timely opportunity for programme leaders to map the programme as it currently stands against the 19 Aberdeen Graduate Attributes to ensure that all are covered within the degree programme.

The link below provides a mapping of the Biochemistry degree programme to our Aberdeen Graduate Attributes. Whilst we do not ask where or how in the course a particular attribute may be developed bear in mind that an ITR panel may request this information.