

GLASGOW KELVIN COLLEGE

Academic Board – 06 February 2026

Update on Tertiary Quality Enhancement Review (TQER)

Report by Head of Enhancement & Assurance

1. Introduction

TQER is the key vehicle for external quality assurance in relation to Scotland's Tertiary Quality Enhancement Framework (TQEF), sitting alongside the Annual Quality Engagement (AQE), Self-Evaluation & Action Plan (SEAP) and participation in Scotland's Tertiary Enhancement Programme (STEP) and Institution-Led Quality review (ILQR) as the key delivery mechanisms of the new framework. Participation and compliance with the review is an SFC funding requirement.

TQER reviews occur on a 7-year cycle, and may investigate all aspects of college operations as they relate the quality of the learner experience. It is carried out by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) on behalf of the SFC. The College will undergo its TQER in AY 2026/27, with the following key dates:

Scoping Meeting: March 2026

Initial Review Visit: 26th October 2026

Main Review Visit: 7th December 2026

This paper provides an update on preparations to date.

2. Key Preparation Activity

TQER Steering Group

A Steering Group was created to provide oversight of TQER preparations and facilitate a joined-up approach to its management. The group includes the Principal, Vice Principal for Curriculum, Directors of Faculty, Director of Digital & Information Services, Head of Enhancement & Assurance, Student President, Student Support Services Manager, and a Senior Curriculum Manager who is also a QAA reviewer.

Risk Mapping & Action Planning

The review process and evaluation criteria for TQER were thoroughly examined and a 'risk map' created. This uses a RAG system to estimate the College's current readiness for review against each TQER criteria. This exercise was based on analysis by the TQER Steering Group, and consultation with the Managers' Forum, Senior Curriculum Managers' Quality Forum, and at the Training Growth & Improvement Forum. The resultant risk ratings are available in **Appendix A – TQER Risk Map**. The unmitigated risk levels will be updated via an action plan (detailed below).

Action Plan

Using the risk map as a basis, an action plan has been created to identify and track measures required to ensure TQER-readiness by the time of the review. As actions are carried out, risk ratings will be adjusted to a new mitigated RAG status. Actions have been allocated to managers and staff across most areas of the College. The Head of Enhancement & Assurance has communicated the required actions to their owners, and will continue to liaise regularly to provide support and receive updates. Whereas the College is confident in the quality of its delivery and the service provided to learners, there are some areas where a greater level of documentary evidence, oversight, or

recorded process may be necessary to satisfy the review criteria. Such areas generally have an amber or red unmitigated risk rating and will require more intensive preparation. Examples of common planned actions include collation or integration of information sources, creation of process documents to illustrate existing activity, minuting of meetings etc.

Advance Information Set (AIS)

The AIS is a presentation of information, data and documents submitted in advance of TQER, that forms the pre-reading for QAA and shapes the focus of the review. QAA provide an indexing system for the collation of this information. A working draft version of the AIS has been compiled and used to identify the relevant College information for each section, and where evidence may need to be generated, adapted or collated. This document is used in parallel with the Action Plan to quantify and monitor the preparation of material for the review.

3. Institution-Led Quality Review (ILQR)

Institutions are expected to operate systems of annual monitoring and periodic review to evaluate their provision, which they may design autonomously. A centre's ILQR process will be reviewed as part of TQER. All operational areas of the college should be reviewed over a seven-year period, including faculty and support areas. The College plans to review a minimum of two areas during each AY. The first of these reviews was carried out in December 2025, in the areas of Healthcare, Childcare and Social Care.

The college's ILQR process was designed by the Head of Enhancement & Assurance, Vice Principal for Curriculum, and the Learning, Teaching & Learner Experience Working Group. The process is designed to robustly reflect the approach of TQER, while remaining clear and minimising unnecessary additional workload for staff. The current process is as follows, though some details will be amended to suit the different focus of a review in a support area:

Review Preparation

Assemble panel (approx. 8 members, including external representatives)	6 weeks before event
Distribute pre-reading data to panel (SEAP reports/ PIs and analysis; student satisfaction response summary)	5 weeks before event
Review panel pre-meet (suggestions for topics and discussion prompts)	4 weeks before event
Finalise meeting times, agenda and discussion prompts	3 weeks before event
Briefing for review area staff (meeting)	2 weeks before event
Briefing for review students (email)	2 weeks before event

Review Event

Meeting 1	Review area managers
Meeting 2	Review area staff
Meeting 3	Students
Meeting 4	Students
Panel Discussions	Panellists only
Feedback Session	Panellists and review area managers

Post Review

Create and distribute review report and action plan: Convenor and Organiser	1 week after event
Complete and return action plan: Review area manager(s)	3 weeks after event
Progress report on action plan (meeting)	6 months after event

The above process was used to review the Healthcare, Childcare and Social Care department on December 4th 2025. The panel in this case was composed of Peter Brown (Director - convenor), John Clarke (Head of Enhancement & Assurance - organiser), Steven Donnelly (SCM), Mhari Watt (CM), Judith McCool (Lecturer), Jon Craig (Student President) and two external panellists, both lecturers in relevant subject areas from Glasgow Clyde College. The panel asked a range of questions, tracking the quality of experience across the student journey: admissions/ recruitment; learning, teaching & assessment; student voice, and progression/ articulation.

Findings of the review were fed back to managers in the review area verbally at the end of the session, and a report was written by the panel convenor and organiser, including a general overview/ evaluation of the areas, examples of good practice and areas for development. The full report is available in **Appendix B – ILQR Report**. However, a brief summary follows:

This is a well-run area with passionate and committed staff, where college systems are used effectively and student/ staff relationships are strong. The staff in this area are proactively engaged with the admissions system, practice in LTA is excellent, and there is an effective understanding of additional support needs and alternative assessment arrangements. Assessment scheduling is well organised and transparent. The section works effectively with service delivery partners, and the student voice is strongly represented. Where courses may be under-performing in terms of successful outcomes, the team are engaging with the appropriate college improvement processes. The course folios in these areas have robust progression pathways, which are clearly signposted and communicated to learners.

Areas for development were minor, and related largely to student experience on work placement, and difficulties for learners in using the college's digital platforms.

The ILQR process ran smoothly and was a meaningful exercise which illustrated a range of good practice that could be shared with college staff more widely. However, there were various learnings from the ILQR, typically around communicating expectations, the digital complexities involved in making the pre-reading data available to panellists. A change was also made to the format of the final report. Initially, this contained a set of actions and recommendations for the review area. However, upon reflection on the process, it was felt the report should simply highlight potential areas for development, and that staff in the review area should plan any actions themselves, which is more in line with the format of the TQER review taking place next year.

The next ILQR is due to take place in March 2026, with Student Funding identified as the review area. Some aspects of the process (e.g. pre-reading data and panel composition) will be amended to suit review of a support area.

4. Impact on Students

The outputs of the ILQR should ultimately allow both the review area and the wider college to implement further good practice that improves achievement and the student experience.

5. Resource Implications

The main resource implication is the staff time involved in planning and implementing the ILQR. In some cases it may be necessary to backfill staff to take part in the review.

6. Equality

There are no equality implications arising directly from this paper.

7. Risk and Assurance

This report provides assurance that the college is complying with SFC requirements and improving the quality of its operations.

8. Data Protection

All GDPR requirements were met in the handling and sharing of data required to plan and undertake the review.

9. Recommendations

Members are recommended to:

- Note the college's ILQR process and activity.
- Make any suggestions to refine and improve the process.

10. Further Information

- Appendix A: TQER Risk Map
- Appendix B: ILQR report
- Appendix C: TQER Guide for Institutions
- [SFC Guidance on ILQR](#)

Glasgow Kelvin College
JC
21/01/2026