



# **Outcomes from institutional audit**

## **Staff support and development arrangements**



© Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2005

All QAA's publications are available on our website [www.qaa.ac.uk](http://www.qaa.ac.uk)

*Printed copies are available from:*

Linney Direct

Adamsway

Mansfield

NG18 4FN

Tel 01623 450788

Fax 01623 450629

Email [qaa@linneydirect.com](mailto:qaa@linneydirect.com)

### Summary

Consideration of the first 70 institutional audit reports suggests that, overall, institutions have established suitable arrangements to support and develop their teaching and support staff. It is noteworthy that the published reports identify almost three times as many features of good practice in this area as recommendations.

The published reports show that most institutions view their academic and support staff as their most important resource. A majority of institutions emphasise the importance of staff support and development to the achievement of their objectives, most notably in the areas of support for teaching and more generally the student learning experience. Some institutions have been successful in adopting a strategic approach to their staff support and development which links the latter to their strategies for learning and teaching, for research and for learning support more generally. Consideration of the audit reports suggest there is scope for more of such integration.

Information in the published reports shows that most institutions have established induction programmes for staff new to the institution, mentoring schemes to support staff in the early stages of their careers and training programmes for the initial professional development of academic staff. The majority of such programmes had been certificated by the former Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education, now the Higher Education Academy, and many have been accredited by the latter.

Appraisal systems established by institutions have been used to review developmental needs and identify suitable opportunities for meeting them, and most institutions peer review or observation schemes have been established to provide collegial support for teaching. Again, in most cases, where the organisation of such schemes has been delegated to faculties or departments, institutions have taken steps to monitor how this has been done and its effectiveness. In some cases, where this has not been the case, the introduction of such central monitoring has been recommended.

The published reports show that almost all institutions have set up continuing professional development programmes for established staff, and that in many institutions centrally provided support is augmented by arrangements to support development close to the point of delivery, among course teams and in departments, schools and faculties.

In some institutions where institutional responsibilities for offering staff support and development has been delegated to subject teams, departments or faculties, steps have been taken to coordinate and monitor the effectiveness of such arrangements. Where central coordination and monitoring has been absent from such delegated arrangements, its introduction has been recommended. In many instances institutions have chosen to extend their own support and development arrangements by enabling staff to attend regional or national events and programmes.

Almost two thirds of the reports identify features of good practice in staff support and development: this suggests that this area should be seen as an area of strength in the work of most institutions.

### Preface

An objective of institutional audit is 'to contribute, in conjunction with other mechanisms, to the promotion and enhancement of high-quality in teaching and learning'. One of the ways in which this can be accomplished is through identifying features of good practice across the reports and areas where reports have commonly offered recommendations for improvement.

In due course, QAA intends to produce an extended reflection on institutional audit in the *Learning from audit* series, but since the final institutional audit reports in the present audit cycle will not be published until Spring 2006, *Learning from institutional audit* is unlikely to be published before late 2006. To give institutions and other stakeholders more timely information, QAA has therefore decided to produce a series of short working papers, describing features of good practice and summarising recommendations from the audit reports, to be published under the generic title *Outcomes from institutional audit* (hereafter, *Outcomes...*).

A feature of good practice in institutional audit is considered to be a process, a practice, or a way of handling matters which, in the context of the particular institution, is improving, or leading to the improvement of, the management of quality and/or academic standards, and learning and teaching. *Outcomes...* papers are intended to provide readers with pointers to where features of good practice relating to particular topics can be located in the published audit reports. Each *Outcomes...* paper therefore identifies the features of good practice in individual reports associated with the particular topic and their location in the main report. Although all features of good practice are listed, in the interests of brevity, not all are discussed in this paper. In the initial listing in paragraph 6, the first reference is to the numbered or bulleted lists of features of good practice at the end of each institutional audit report, the second to the relevant paragraphs in Section 2 of the Main Report. Throughout the body of this paper references to features of good practice in the institutional audit reports give the institution's name and the paragraph number from Section 2 of the Main Report.

It should be emphasised that the features of good practice mentioned in this paper should be considered in their proper institutional context, and that each is perhaps best viewed as a stimulus to reflection and further development rather than as a model for emulation. A note on the topics identified for the first series of *Outcomes...* papers, to be published throughout 2005, can be found at Appendix 3 (page 17).

This first series of *Outcomes...* papers is based on the 70 institutional audit reports published by the end of November 2004. The second series will draw on institutional audit reports published following the 2004-05 audits, and it is likely that there will be some overlap in topics between the first and second series. Papers in each series are perhaps best seen as 'work in progress'. Although QAA retains copyright in the contents of the *Outcomes...* papers they can be freely downloaded from the QAA website and cited, with acknowledgement.

### Introduction and general overview

1 This paper is based on a review of the outcomes of the first 70 institutional audits published by 5 November 2004 (see Appendix 1, page 14). A note on the methodology used to produce this and other papers in the *Outcomes...* series can be found in Appendix 4 (page 18).

2 The institutional audit process introduced in England in 2002 recognises the importance of staff support and development in institutions' quality management arrangements by making provision for the report of each audit to describe and analyse the institution's staff support and development arrangements, and to comment on their effectiveness.

3 In the self-evaluation documents institutions provide to support their institutional audit, it is frequently the case that they state that their most important resource is their academic and support staff. Not surprisingly, therefore, many emphasise the vital importance they attach to supporting and developing their staff to enable the institution to achieve its objectives - including those relating to the quality of teaching and of the student learning experience - and to enable staff to advance their personal development.

4 A review of the published reports shows that most institutions have established suitable and effective arrangements to support and develop their staff. Virtually all have established:

- induction programmes for staff new to the institution
- mentoring schemes to support staff in the early stages of their careers
- training programmes for the initial professional development of academic staff
- appraisal schemes
- peer review or observation schemes for teaching
- continuing professional development programmes
- arrangements to support development at department, school and faculty level and
- arrangements to support attendance at regional or national events for the purpose of staff development.

The reports also provide considerable evidence of good practice within the sector. In all, two-thirds of the published reports list features of good practice and in many of these features of good practice are identified across several areas of the relevant institution's work.

5 To set against this, about one third of published reports contained recommendations in this area, with about one seventh of the reports advising institutions to consider or reconsider some aspect of their staff support and development arrangements and roughly twice that number of reports suggesting the desirability of some consideration by institutions. Again, in several cases there were multiple recommendations for institutions' to consider in this area. Overall, a review of the published reports suggests that, generally, the staff support and development arrangements which institutions have adopted are appropriate to their purposes but that there are some areas for improvement.

### Features of good practice

6 Consideration of the published institutional audit reports shows the following features of good practice relating to staff support and development.

#### **Strategic approach to staff support and development**

- College of St Mark and St John 189 (i), 83-87
- Loughborough University 317 (iv), 104-110
- Royal Agricultural College 176 (i), 91
- Royal College of Nursing Institute 156 (iv), 85
- The Royal Veterinary College 215 (i), 104-7

#### **Effectiveness of institutional structures for staff support and development**

- Anglia Polytechnic University 216 (ii), 39, 105, 109-10
- Bournemouth University 239 (v), 103
- University of Brighton 250 (iii), 82
- College of St Mark and St John 189 (i), 83-87
- University of East Anglia 275 (i), 97
- University of Kent 237 (i), 99
- University of Leeds 213 (i), 87
- Loughborough University 317 (iv), 104-110
- The Manchester Metropolitan University 202 (v), 82-3
- University of Portsmouth 258 (ii) 92-106
- St Martin's College 217 (i), 101-6
- University of Salford 208 (i) 71, 76-7
- University of Southampton 189 (v), 75-76
- University of Surrey, Roehampton 171 (iii), 68-71

#### **Effectiveness of support and development for new academic staff**

- University of Birmingham 225 (ii), 77
- University of Brighton 255 (iii), 82
- Loughborough University 317 (iv), 104-10

#### **Effectiveness of induction for new academic staff**

- Aston University 253 (iii), 90, 95
- University of Bradford 250 (iii), 78
- Cumbria Institute of the Arts 179 (i), 92
- University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology 165 (i), 61-2, 64
- Middlesex University 192 (ii) 73

**Effectiveness of mentoring for new academic staff**

- University of Bradford 250 (i), 78
- University of East Anglia 275 (i), 92
- Middlesex University 192 (ii), 73

**Effectiveness of initial professional development programmes for new staff**

- University of Reading 187 (iii), 61-2
- University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology 165 (i), 61-2, 64
- University of Warwick 200 (i), 89

**Contributions of established staff and/or students to professional development programmes**

- University of Cambridge 202 (i), 70
- University of Liverpool 240 (i), 91

**Effectiveness of initial professional development for part-time staff, graduate teaching assistants, and technical staff**

- University College Chichester 58, bullet 7, 142
- University of East Anglia 275 (i), 100
- University of Keele 208 (v), 91
- The London Institute 242 (iii) 109-10, 11
- Loughborough University 317 (iv) 110
- Norwich School of Art and Design 154 (vii) 74
- Open University 207 (iii) 95-6
- Royal College of Art 156 (iii) 78
- Royal College of Nursing Institute 158 (iv), 85
- Royal Northern College of Music 120 (i), 64
- The Surrey Institute of Art and Design, University College 147 (iii) 89

**Effectiveness of schemes for peer observation of teaching**

- Anglia Polytechnic University 261 (ii), 109-10
- Bath Spa University College 179 (v), 72
- Norwich School of Art and Design 151 (iv), 69,83

**Effectiveness of performance review/appraisal as mechanism for staff development**

- London Business School 204 (v), 109-10

**Effectiveness of support and development for promoted staff**

- University of Warwick 200 (ii), 93

### Developing staff in partner institutions

- Bath Spa University College 179 (v), 72
- University of Bradford 250 (iv) 86, 91
- University of Lincoln 286 (ii), 110

### Dissemination of good practice

- Brunel University 216 (i) 31-5, 187, 197
- Royal Academy of Music 143 (i), 52

### Effective staff development to support staff to use VLE

- Loughborough University, 317 (i), 106

### Staff development handbook

- School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London 299 (i), 98
- 7 A consideration of the features of good practice and recommendations in the audit reports which relate to staff support and development suggests that the following broad themes merit further discussion:
- strategic approaches to staff support and development
  - effective institutional structures for staff support and development
  - the value of adopting an active approach to staff development
  - the extensiveness of the range of staff development opportunities offered
  - the effectiveness of support and development
    - for new full-time academic staff, including institutional induction, mentoring and initial professional development
    - for part-time teachers and graduate teaching assistants
  - the effectiveness of peer review as a mechanism for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching
  - the effectiveness of performance review/appraisal as a mechanism for eliciting and meeting the developmental needs of academic staff
  - the development of staff in partner institutions
  - the effectiveness of staff development in disseminating good practice.

### Strategic approaches to staff support and development

8 Historically, many institutions have taken the position that staff development is the responsibility of individuals and/or their departments. More recently, some institutions have identified potential benefits from aligning staff development provision more closely with institutional objectives and priorities, so as to develop staff to contribute more effectively to the latter.

9 For example, one report found substantial evidence of a shift away from '...staff development based predominantly on personal development to...staff development...which is explicitly linked to the University's strategic objectives', which



was identified as good practice [Loughborough University, 104]. In this and other cases, institutions were reported to have taken advantage of the opportunity afforded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England Rewarding and Developing Staff initiative to review the role of human resources generally, and staff development in particular, in the light of their missions and institutional strategies, including their strategies for teaching and learning. Generally, when undertaken, such reviews had resulted in new human resources and/or staff development strategies more closely aligned to institutional priorities [College of St Mark and St John, 83-5; Loughborough University, 104; Royal Agricultural College, 91; Royal College of Nursing Institute, 84; Royal Veterinary College 105].

10 In several cases, where institutions had undertaken the internal reviews referred to above, and had formerly permitted their faculties or departments to develop their own staff development strategies, an outcome had been moves to link such approaches more closely to their institutional counterparts. In each of these cases the institution had established mechanisms for evaluating, monitoring, and reporting annually upon the implementation of the institutional staff development strategy across faculties, schools or departments, as appropriate [Loughborough University, 104; College of St Mark and St John, 85; Royal Agricultural College, 91; Royal College of Nursing Institute, 84; Royal Veterinary College, 105].

11 Where institutions were considered not to have adopted a strategic approach, the reports described a variety of other ways in which staff support and development was being undertaken. In one report, the model of staff development was described as entirely 'voluntarist and individual' and in another, the approach to be taken to staff support and development was left to departments, without any institutional steer or oversight. There are also instances in the reports where the institution in question had established staff development strategies, but their links to other institutional strategies were unclear or, again, where institutional processes for staff development had been set up but it was unclear 'how these were informed by the University's strategic priorities'. In each of these cases, recommendations were offered, usually to the effect that the institution should adopt a more strategic and 'joined up' approach to developing staff which was aligned with institutional aims and objectives.

### **The effectiveness of institutional structures for staff support and development**

12 Institutional audit seeks to establish whether an institution's staff development arrangements are appropriate and meeting its needs, and whether the institution has suitable arrangements for planning, implementing and monitoring staff development activities. Institutional audit reports comment favourably where they find a clear focus at institutional and/or faculty level for the staff development function. Examples of such a clear focus might take the form of a staff development training committee or sub-committee [Bournemouth University, 99; Loughborough University, 104; University of Portsmouth, 97; University of Salford, 78; University of Surrey, Roehampton, 69]; formal arrangements for faculty, school or departmental participation in staff development activities, including plans and devolved budgets [Anglia Polytechnic University, 108; Bournemouth University, 100; Loughborough University, 104; College of St Mark and St John, 88; University of Surrey, Roehampton, 69] and systematic recording and monitoring of staff development activities with appropriate reporting

lines [Bournemouth University, 100; Loughborough University, 104; University of Portsmouth, 97; College of St Mark and St John, 88; University of Salford, 78; University of Surrey, Roehampton, 69]. In some cases where institutions had also undertaken staff 'satisfaction' surveys which had included questions on developmental opportunities, the latter were reported to have revealed warm appreciation for the support available [Anglia Polytechnic University, 108; Bournemouth University, 103].

### **Adoption of an active approach to identifying staff development needs and opportunities by staff and/or learning or educational development units**

13 The reports identify a number of cases where those responsible for staff development units or, for support of learning and teaching staff in educational development units, had actively set out to establish staff development needs and how they might be met. Where adopted, such an approach was distinguished by features such as the active engagement of units with faculties and departments to meet subject or discipline-specific needs [University of Kent, 99; University of Leeds, 88; The Manchester Metropolitan University, 83; University of Salford, 77; University of Southampton, 76]; the production of informative staff development handbooks [School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 98]; and producing paper and/or web-based resources for staff on good practice in teaching, learning and assessment [Anglia Polytechnic University, 109; College of St Mark and St John, 84; St Martin's College, 101]. The adoption of such an approach was identified in each case as a feature of good practice.

### **Extensiveness of the range of staff development opportunities**

14 A number of institutional audit reports identify the extensiveness of the range of staff development opportunities available to staff as a feature of good practice in the particular institutions [Anglia Polytechnic University, 109; University of Brighton, 87; Bournemouth University, 102; University of East Anglia 97; University of Leeds, 88; Loughborough University, 108; The Manchester Metropolitan University, 83; University of Portsmouth, 92; University of Salford, 76; University of Warwick, 93]. Specific instances of staff development provision cited as good practice in the published reports include support and development for promoted staff [University of Warwick, 93]; support for curriculum development [University of Portsmouth, 92], for the introduction of a virtual learning environment [Loughborough University, 106], and for workload management [Ibid, 10]. Equally, in one case where staff development provision and opportunities were seen as limited, the relevant institution was advised to consider improving and systematising development, in this particular case for new research supervisors.

### **The effectiveness of support and development for newly appointed academic staff**

15 Institutions' support and development arrangements for newly appointed full-time academic staff normally include an induction to the institution itself, mentoring arrangements and a programme for initial professional development in academic practice including teaching and learning. The published reports show that almost all institutions have introduced such arrangements; some reports have identified a number of features of good practice and, in a few cases, areas for improvement.

16 In the case of institutional induction, features of good practice identified in the reports have included the provision of comprehensive checklists, so that staff, managers and developers could check that the process was complete [Cumbria Institute of the Arts, 92]; the active involvement of line managers in the induction process [idem] and, where induction was devolved to school level, the active involvement of central staff development units to assist schools and help to ensure consistency across the institution in the induction process [University of Birmingham, 79].

17 In the case of mentoring, features of good practice identified in the published reports have included the provision of formal training for mentors in the performance of their roles [University of Birmingham, 79; University of Bradford, 78], and the use of mentors to observe teaching during the early stages of an appointment and to give feedback [University of Birmingham, 79]. In this connection, however, a note of caution sounded in one report was that institutions might be wise to check from time to time that mentoring schemes are working effectively.

18 Almost all institutions offer newly-appointed academic staff (and, usually, learning support staff) access to initial professional development programmes. In such cases the features of good practice identified in the reports included the active involvement of established academic staff in their delivery [University of Cambridge, 70]. Another report identified that the institution in question was operating a process with the following: integration of development activities with individual teaching and assessment; flexibility in timing and delivery across the probationary period; and the use of such programmes to spread good practice across the University. These features were identified as good practice [University of Reading, 62].

19 As well as finding many instances of good practice in support and development arrangements for newly appointed staff, the published reports also identify some areas for improvement. In one case, for example, where initial programmes were voluntary, the reports found significant variations in participation rates between new staff from different schools, and recommended that a standard requirement should be considered. Likewise, where programmes were compulsory, most institutions had arrangements for monitoring attendance. Where such arrangements were absent, there were recommendations that monitoring should be introduced, so that institutions could be confident that all relevant staff had taken the programme. A further issue which was identified was whether institutions were taking initial professional development requirements made of newly appointed teaching staff into account when planning their workloads. Several reports suggested that the relevant institutions might consider introducing protected time for this purpose when planning the workloads of newly-appointed staff.

20 Many audit reports having reviewed the areas of induction, mentoring and initial support individually have also considered the extent to which, when taken together, they offered the newly appointed member of staff an integrated and coherent package. In two cases, reports considered that where institutions had devised and implemented such an 'integrated approach to the oversight, support and development of probationary staff' this represented a feature of good practice [University of Birmingham, 77]. In another institution, which had adopted the same approach, there was evidence that it was much appreciated by staff [University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology, 61].

### The effectiveness of support and development for part-time teachers and graduate teaching assistants

21 One of the threads running through the *Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education* (the *Code of practice*), particularly Section 1 on postgraduate research degree programmes (precept 13 in 1999 version) and Section 6 on assessment of students (precept 13), is the advisability of making provision for the support and development of all those engaged in teaching and supporting learning, including part-time staff and graduate teaching assistants, and of ensuring that such staff are adequately prepared for their roles.

22 The institutional audit reports show that all institutions had made at least some form of provision for the support and development of part-time staff and graduate teaching assistants. In one case, however, it was noted that the delivery of such provision had been left entirely in the hands of the relevant departments, with the result that implementation was patchy. In that case, the report recommended that the institution might wish to consider how greater consistency in the provision of such support across the institution might be achieved.

23 In several other cases, institutions had ensured that provision and support for part-time and graduate teaching assistant staff was available locally and/or centrally, but had left it to individuals and/or their departments or schools to decide whether they should participate. Here, as in the instances cited above, the result was that take-up was very variable. In each case where such permissive arrangements were identified, reports recommended that the relevant institutions should consider whether they should require the participation of part-time and graduate teaching assistant staff, and monitor take-up and attendance.

24 The circumstances described in paragraphs 22-23 above, were only to be found in a small minority of cases, however, and almost all other institutions required newly appointed graduate teaching assistants and part-time staff to participate in training and staff development activities linked to their duties, and monitored their participation and attendance carefully. In a number of institutions, arrangements for training, supporting and developing part-time teaching staff and graduate teaching assistants were such as to constitute features of good practice. For example, in one case, graduate teaching assistants were given remission from teaching to attend training programmes [Keele University, 89]; in several other cases, part-time staff were paid for their attendance at training events [University College Chichester, 142; The London Institute, 114; Open University, 96; Royal Northern College of Music, 64]. In one of these instances the report identified the scheduling of training events for part-time staff to take place at weekends as helpful [The London Institute, 114]. Other reports commented on the value of providing comprehensive and informative handbooks for part-time staff and graduate teaching assistants [Open University, 96; Royal College of Nursing Institute, 85] ; of providing a web-based resource site for part-time tutors [Open University, 96]; and of providing part-time staff and graduate teaching assistants with the same or similar opportunities as full-time academic staff for induction, mentoring, peer review, certificated training, and external development [The London Institute, 110; Open University, 96; Royal College of Art, 78; Royal Northern College of Music, 64].

### The effectiveness of peer observation

25 Peer observation of teaching and learning support has been introduced by many institutions to support the development of staff and assist improve their performance. Ideally, where it is introduced and works effectively it provides individuals with the opportunity to receive feedback on a peer basis on their performance in the classroom. Again where it is done well, peer observation can offer reinforcement for those things that are being done well and suggestions for improvement, and it can lead to the identification of good practice by individuals which can then be disseminated to others.

26 Of the 70 published audit reports, only one does not describe the introduction of a peer observation scheme in the relevant institution and in that case the report recommended the establishment of such a scheme. Across the remaining institutions, however, some peer observation schemes were seen as being more effective than others. For example, several institutions have encouraged peer observation but have left the decision whether it should be adopted and practised to schools and departments. In such cases, some of the latter had introduced schemes while others had not, leading to inconsistencies in practice across the institution. Audit reports then recommended that the institution should consider establishing institution-wide schemes to ensure that all constituent units had opportunities to benefit from peer observation.

27 Along the same lines, where institutions had formulated a requirement that staff undertake peer observation, but had left the decision about the form this should take to departments and schools this had resulted in a variety of modes of operation across the institution and a lack of consistency in the conduct of the process and its outcomes. In this instance, the report advised regularising the modes of operation for peer observation. In another case, the report found the adoption of an institution-wide scheme which required peer observation only at three yearly intervals. In this case the report considered that more frequent peer observation opportunities would improve the effectiveness of the scheme and be desirable.

28 Among those institutions with established and effective schemes for peer observation of teaching, audit reports identified a number of instances of good practice. These included; the provision of an informative handbook for staff explaining the rationale for peer observation, and the institution's policies and procedures [Anglia Polytechnic University, 111]; effective mechanisms for disseminating good practice identified in the course of peer observation through 'Quality Circles' [Bath Spa University College, 72]; effective arrangements linking the outcomes of peer observation to quality assurance procedures, including course evaluation [Norwich School of Art and Design, 69] and annual monitoring and review [Bath Spa University College, idem]; and effective systems for linking peer observation through different channels to both quality assurance and quality enhancement arrangements [Bath Spa University College, idem].

### Effective links between appraisal/performance review and staff development

29 Appraisal or performance review of teaching staff is normally located within the institutional audit reports as part of the section which addresses 'assurance of the quality of teachers, recruitment, appraisal and reward', rather than in 'staff support and development'. But just as it may seem artificial to separate staff support and development arrangements for newly appointed staff from staff support and development more generally, there is a case for considering the appraisal/performance review of staff as a developmental process through which their needs are identified. This identification is used to provide opportunities for individuals as well as to inform the content of staff development programmes. For that reason it is clearly relevant to the focus of the present paper to include within its scope material in the published institutional audit reports about linkages between appraisal/performance review and staff development.

30 There are indications in the majority of institutional audit reports of some form of linkage between the outcomes of appraisal/performance review and staff development. This might take place, for example, through the transmission of information about developmental needs to the unit charged with responsibility for staff development, in the expectation that the latter would act upon them [University of Lincoln, 101]. In one report where this was not the case, the institution was recommended to consider whether such a link should be established. To set alongside this, however, another report identified that the institution had made a strong commitment to appraisal/performance review as a developmental process which it was using in a systematic manner to identify staff needs in relation to teaching and promoting learning, to offer professional support, and to provide appropriate developmental opportunities. The institution's approach was identified as a feature of good practice [London Business School, 110].

### Development arrangements for staff in partner institutions

31 Section 2 of the *Code of practice* which deals with collaborative provision (and, in its 2004 version, with flexible and distributed learning including e-learning) advises that institutions should assure themselves that staff in partner institutions are adequately supported in the performance of their roles by making appropriate arrangements for their development and training [see precepts 19 and 22 of the 1999 version and precept A17 of the 2004 version].

32 Two thirds of the published reports described institutions' arrangements for quality management and academic standards in connection with their partnership provision. In most reports, it was clear that the awarding institutions were taking their responsibilities in this area seriously. In a few cases, however, it was reported that there was a lack of evidence that the awarding institution was adopting a systematic approach to developing staff in its partner institutions or that they were not encouraging staff in their partners involved in delivering provision leading to their awards to participate in the awarding institution's staff development activities. Where this was the case, the relevant reports suggested that the awarding institutions consider how they might go about improving their strategy and provision for the development of staff in partner institutions. Such arrangements were clearly embedded in other institutions, however. In these cases, the arrangements that had

been made for extensive joint staff development programmes with partners [University of Bradford, 86], for the provision of opportunities for staff in partner institutions to participate in events covering institutional policies and procedures, as well as the more usual subject/course events [University of Lincoln, 110] and for providing peer support for teaching [Bath Spa University College, 72], were identified as features of good practice.

### Effectiveness of staff development in disseminating good practice

33 From the published audit reports, it is clear that in many institutions there is an expectation that where good practice is identified, whether from internal or external sources, staff development provides an important means for its dissemination among staff, and across the institution more generally. While in all the reports reviewed institutions had adopted arrangements for the dissemination of good practice, in one case these arrangements were found to be uncoordinated and disparate. In this instance the institution was recommended to take a more systematic and 'joined up' approach. In other cases, however, the reports highlight particular aspects of good practice in dissemination, including effective informal networks of staff [Brunel University, 34; University of Kent, 105] and others had established annual internal conferences to showcase good practice in teaching and learning and assessment [University of Portsmouth, 96; Royal Academy of Music, 52].

### Conclusions

34 Overall, consideration of the published institutional audit reports suggests that, staff support and development was generally satisfactory or better, in that the instances of good practice identified in the reports far outweigh those where measures were recommended to institutions. The published reports indicate areas where there are opportunities for further enhancement, particularly in the development of institutional strategies for staff support and development, and their linkage to other institutional strategies, together with arrangements to deliver staff support and development to all staff and to monitor its effectiveness. Taken together, however, the reports indicate that the sector can be confident that institutions' staff support and development arrangements represent a notable strength.

## **Appendix 1 - The institutional audit reports**

### **2002-03**

University College Chichester, February 2003  
The Royal Veterinary College, February 2003  
Cumbria Institute of the Arts, March 2003  
Institute of Education, University of London, March 2003  
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, March 2003  
Middlesex University, March 2003  
Royal Academy of Music, March 2003  
Royal College of Art, March 2003  
University of Cambridge, April 2003  
School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, April 2003  
Bath Spa University College, May 2003  
University of Lincoln, May 2003  
London Business School, May 2003  
Newman College of Higher Education, May 2003  
Norwich School of Art and Design, May 2003  
Rose Bruford College, May 2003  
Royal College of Music, May 2003  
Royal Northern College of Music, May 2003  
The School of Pharmacy, University of London, May 2003  
College of St Mark and St John, May 2003  
The Surrey Institute of Art & Design, University College, May 2003  
Trinity and All Saints College, May 2003  
Trinity College of Music, May 2003  
Royal College of Nursing Institute, July 2003

### **2003-04**

University of Bath, October 2003  
University of Bradford, November 2003  
University of Buckingham, November 2003  
University of Essex, November 2003  
University of Exeter, November 2003  
University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology, November 2003  
University of Sheffield, November 2003  
Ravensbourne College of Design and Communication, December 2003  
Royal Agricultural College, December 2003  
University of Southampton, December 2003  
St Martin's College, Lancaster, December 2003



University of Surrey, Roehampton, December 2003  
University of York, December 2003  
University of East Anglia, January 2004  
University of Durham, February 2004  
University of Liverpool, February 2004  
Writtle College, February 2004  
Bournemouth University, March 2004  
The Institute of Cancer Research, March 2004  
University of Kent, March 2004  
University of Leeds, March 2004  
Loughborough University, March 2004  
Open University, March 2004  
University of Oxford, March 2004  
University of Salford, March 2004  
University of Warwick, March 2004  
University of Wolverhampton, March 2004  
Aston University, April 2004  
University of Birmingham, April 2004  
University of Bristol, April 2004  
University of Central Lancashire, April 2004  
Coventry University, April 2004  
The London Institute, April 2004  
University of Portsmouth, April 2004  
Anglia Polytechnic University, May 2004  
University of Brighton, May 2004  
Brunel University, May 2004  
University of Keele, May 2004  
The Nottingham Trent University, May 2004  
University of Reading, May 2004  
University of Sussex, May 2004  
Wimbledon School of Art, May 2004  
University of Greenwich, June 2004  
King's College London, June 2004  
University of Lancaster, June 2004  
The Manchester Metropolitan University, June 2004

## **Appendix 2 - Reports on specialist institutions**

The Royal Veterinary College, February 2003  
Cumbria Institute of the Arts, March 2003  
Institute of Education, University of London, March 2003  
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, March 2003  
Royal Academy of Music, March 2003  
Royal College of Art, March 2003  
School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, April 2003  
London Business School, May 2003  
Newman College of Higher Education, May 2003  
Norwich School of Art and Design, May 2003  
Rose Bruford College, May 2003  
Royal College of Music, May 2003  
Royal Northern College of Music, May 2003  
The School of Pharmacy, University of London, May 2003  
The Surrey Institute of Art & Design, University College, May 2003  
Trinity and All Saints College, May 2003  
Trinity College of Music, May 2003  
Royal College of Nursing Institute, July 2003  
Ravensbourne College of Design and Communication, December 2003  
Royal Agricultural College, December 2003  
Writtle College, February 2004  
The Institute of Cancer Research, March 2004  
The London Institute, April 2004  
Wimbledon School of Art, May 2004

### Appendix 3 - Projected titles of *Outcomes...* papers

In most cases, *Outcomes...* papers will be no longer than 15 sides of A4. QAA retains copyright in the *Outcomes...* papers, but as noted earlier, they may be freely used, with acknowledgement.

Projected titles of *Outcomes...* papers in the first series are listed below.

<b>Title</b>	<b>Publishing date (provisional)</b>
Overview	April 2005
Programme specifications	April 2005
External examiners and their reports	April 2005
Staff support and development arrangements	October 2005
Learning resources (including virtual learning environments)	October 2005
Validation and approval and periodic review	October 2005
Student representation and feedback	October 2005
Academic advice, guidance and supervision	November 2005
Progression and completion statistics	December 2005
Annual monitoring	December 2005
Assessment	December 2005
Subject benchmarks	December 2005
The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland	January 2006
Institutions' frameworks for managing quality and standards	January 2006

## Appendix 4 - Methodology

The methodology followed in analysing the institutional audit reports uses the headings set out in Annex H of the *Handbook for institutional audit: England* to subdivide the Summary, Main Report and Findings sections of the institutional audit reports into broad areas. An example from the Main Report is 'The institution's framework for managing quality and standards, including collaborative provision'.

For each published report, the text was taken from the documents published on the QAA website and converted to plain text format. The resulting files were checked for accuracy and coded into sections following the template used to construct the institutional audit reports. In addition, the text of each report was tagged with information providing the date the report was published and some basic characteristics of the institution (base data). The reports were then introduced into a qualitative research software package, QSR N6®. The software provides a wide range of tools to support indexing and searching and allows features of interest to be coded for further investigation.

An audit team's judgements, its identification of features of good practice, and its recommendations appear at two points in an institutional audit report: the Summary and at the end of the Findings; it is only in the latter, however, that cross references to the paragraphs in the Main Report are to be found, and it is here that the grounds for identifying a feature of good practice, offering a recommendation and making a judgement are set out. These cross references have been used to locate features of good practice and recommendations to the particular sections of the report to which they refer.

Individual papers in the *Outcomes...* series are compiled by QAA staff and experienced institutional auditors. To assist in compiling the papers, reports produced by QSR N6® have been made available to provide a broad picture of the overall distribution of features of good practice and recommendations in particular areas, as seen by the audit teams.

**Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education**

Southgate House  
Southgate Street  
Gloucester  
GL1 1UB

Tel 01452 557000  
Fax 01452 557070  
Email [comms@qaa.ac.uk](mailto:comms@qaa.ac.uk)  
[www.qaa.ac.uk](http://www.qaa.ac.uk)

QAA 075 10/05