

1.3 Quality Assurance, Quality Enhancement

Jill Beard, Bournemouth University

Introduction

The process of audit and review can be a catalyst for librarians to create some of the most productive partnerships with academics and others who provide services to students. However it is often seen as a source of anxiety, but if viewed as an opportunity not a threat, the experience can be turned to advantage by subject librarians and library quality managers and so facilitate continual service enhancement for students and faculty.

Interacting with the process of audit and review is challenging with so many variations on a theme. This chapter reflects on the processes used during the past ten years and the reader will need to apply lessons learnt to the current system. The lessons are positive ones; proactive involvement in the process of review delivers benefits to the library and improved services to students. Underpinning the quality review process, however, has to be a robust mechanism to gather feedback from users and the commitment to respond to challenging feedback at all levels of the library service.

Quality assurance and learning resources

In 1995 Jean Sykes, when Chair of the Society of College, National and University Libraries (SCONUL) Working Group on Quality Assurance, described in a conference paper delivered at Bournemouth University the two types of quality assessment then being undertaken in the UK (Sykes, 1996). Audit led by the Higher Education Quality Council (HEQC) was UK wide and looked at a university's procedures. In contrast, assessment was managed differently by the four national funding councils and looked at the teaching quality of academic departments. The process known as Teaching Quality Assessment (TQA) was set up in 1993 to complement the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE). The process has evolved, with each revision claimed by those who manage quality assurance to be an improvement or simplification of the system. The rigour and burden of the early quality assurance processes was criticised by academics who were sceptical about its credibility whilst looking for simple and transparent processes (Laughton, 2003). The inclusion of a focus on learning resources has raised the profile of library services and their relationship with users. Each variation in the process has presented a challenge to those working in libraries to maintain the emphasis. Never the

RE-THINKING SUBJECT SUPPORT IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

less senior librarians lobbied hard to ensure learning resources remained in the audit process. Thus demonstrating to reviewers the significance of an effective relationship between teaching staff and their libraries, a relationship which is central to quality enhancement of the services we deliver.

In 1995 the SCONUL Working Group on Quality Assurance and Libraries provided its first guidance note for teaching quality assessors. It should be noted that from the first edition it included libraries and IT and was endorsed by Universities and Colleges Information Systems Association (UCISA). The document proved invaluable as a checklist to form an agenda for discussion with the TQA subject teams and enhanced the dialogue between faculty and library services. In 1996 Jean Sykes, on behalf of SCONUL, compiled the first guidance note for assessors to be used in their training and to inform their questioning when on review visits (SCONUL 1996). Having learning resources highlighted in assessor training also enhanced the discourse about learning resources that took place within institutions during visit preparations.

A major rationalisation of the quality infrastructure took place in 1997 with the formation of the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA). The agency took on responsibility for both audit and review. Universities were engaged in both audit of the institution and the extensive review of subjects. SCONUL lobbied and achieved continued use of the *Aide-mémoire for reviewers evaluating learning resources*. A note of caution raised by Sykes in 1996 remains worthy of serious consideration not only at the institutional level but also in the subject context throughout any engagements scheduled until 2005/2006,

“...it has become clear that the degree of prominence which will be given to the library service during audit will depend almost entirely on the written documentation submitted by the University itself.” (Sykes 1996).

Quality assurance in England and Northern Ireland since 1993

Before moving on to discuss current practice, it is helpful to document the major phases and developments in the audit of institutions and the assessment of the quality of academic delivery. The ways in which academic quality has been judged and reported on has varied between the different parts of the UK, and the focus here is on the experience in England and Northern Ireland,

Teaching Quality Assessment and Subject Review 1993 - 2001

1993 -1995 Teaching Quality Assessment (led by the Higher Education Funding Councils (HEFC)) looked at the student learning experience and student achievement in each subject area awarding the grade of

QUALITY ASSURANCE, QUALITY ENHANCEMENT

excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. There was no SCONUL guidance for the review of learning resources.

1995 - 2001 Universal Subject Review (QAA led from 1997) covered six aspects of provision each graded 1-4 with the higher the number the better the grade. Learning Resources was one of the strands and reviewers received the SCONUL aide-mémoire. (SCONUL 1996) Institutions had to provide extensive 'base room' documentation for the review teams on all aspects of the review

Academic Quality Audit from 1991

1991 - 1997 First round of audits of institutions led by HEQC and its predecessor the Academic Audit Unit

1997 - 2002 Second round of audits known as **Continuation Audits** undertaken by the QAA with an institutional wide focus on the learning infrastructure, communication and quality.

2003 - 2005 Since being announced in 2001 **Institutional Audit** was developed into the prime approach with the focus on quality assurance processes. A Self Evaluation Document (SED) was prepared before audit and student views documented in a Student Written Submission (SWS), complemented by selected Discipline Audit Trails (DAT) to test those processes. This process is supported by **Academic Review** of subjects as part of a transitional period, mostly for directly funded HE in FE programmes, but with some residual subject coverage in HEIs. This is described as a 'lighter touch' due for completion in 2006. From 2006 audits will be on a six year cycle. Supporting Institutional Audit is the **Collaborative Provision Audit** (CPA) scheduled for 2006 for those institutions with significant collaborative provision. The focus is on the effectiveness of the awarding institutions quality assurance structures and mechanisms for collaborative programmes.

QAA as agent for other organisations

2003 - 2006 Major Review of Healthcare the QAA is carrying out a major review of National Health Services (NHS) funded programmes.

How library services contribute to quality audit

The QAA in their publication, *A brief guide to quality assurance in UK higher education* described the context for institutional audits to be undertaken in all HEIs between 2003 and 2005 to ensure institutions are:

RE-THINKING SUBJECT SUPPORT IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

- “providing higher education awards and qualifications of acceptable quality and appropriate and academic standard; and (where relevant)
- exercising their legal powers to award degrees in a proper manner” (QAA, 2003a)

The QAA also articulated two definitions for ‘standards’ and ‘quality’ in higher education. Both are important to understanding the evolution of audit and review and the role that libraries can contribute to the enhancement of quality. In Scotland the word enhancement already features in their title for review process *Enhancement led institutional review*. (QAA, 2003b)

“Academic standards are a way of describing the level of achievement that a student has to reach to gain an academic award....It should be at a similar level across the UK”

“Academic quality is away of describing how well the learning opportunities available to students help them achieve their award. It is about making sure that appropriate and effective, support assessment and learning opportunities are provide for them” (QAA, 2003a).

Institutions are expected to have internal quality assurance processes for attaining standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of its provision. The development of the *Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education* (QAA 2004a) has ten sections each with precepts or principles that should be able to be demonstrated in audit. Many of these ten points lend themselves to being supported by subject librarians. Point 6 in the code is programme approval, monitoring and review. Subject librarians should be reassured that any involvement in course planning is contributing to a key element of institutional quality. Institutional Audit makes this involvement an absolute necessity. Point 4 in the code of practice sets out the context for external examining (QAA 2004b). Whatever the form of engagement with the QAA, therefore subject librarians must ensure they see the reports regularly and respond to any action planning, monitoring and feedback for any issues relating to learning resources.

The other eight sections also give pointers where subject librarians can make a contribution, especially if they can provide best practice examples in assuring the quality and standards in HE. They are: postgraduate research programmes; collaborative provision; students with disabilities; academic appeals and student complaints on academic matters; assessment of students; career education, information and guidance, placement learning, recruitment and admissions.

Bournemouth University: Case study [1] Evidencing good practice

An example of best practice from Bournemouth University, which has been used with success in Intuition Audit, the review of Foundation Degrees and Academic Review of a subject being taught in FE (Equine Studies, 2005), is the

QUALITY ASSURANCE, QUALITY ENHANCEMENT

appointment of a Peripatetic Support Librarian. The post holder works to support information skills training, staff development and support in Partner Colleges working with librarians and academic staff teaching to HE awards. The remit has recently been expanded to co-ordinate support for other services under the broad remit of Academic Services, ICT, Learning Support, and Staff Development. This is described in greater depth in Chapter 1.6.

Case study [1] illustrates how many of the quality assurance processes librarians engage with will directly or indirectly enable an institution to demonstrate innovation and best practice when it comes to the writing of the SED. It may require persistence to ensure these examples are included. This challenge will be revisited when discussing the importance of what may be said in the SED.

The Mission of the QAA may have been described in many different ways since 1997, but the current version is simple and concise and must underpin why subject librarians and library quality managers should continue to work with those in their institutions who have been and will continue to be working in partnership with the QAA to continuously improve higher education.

“Our mission is to safeguard the public interest in sound standards of higher education qualifications and to encourage continuous improvement in the management of the quality of higher education.

We do this by working with higher education institutions to define academic standards and quality, and we carry out and publish reviews against these standards.”(QAA 2005a).

Current practice

This chapter can only be a snapshot in time and the reader must refer to the latest guidance given by the QAA and as the transitional phase 2002-2005 draws to a close we can expect to see new guidance emerging. The reader should take reassurance that if the following advice is acted upon, libraries will continue to contribute to quality enhancement and the profile and value of their work should be seen as being central to the learning experience of the student. Libraries should ensure that their service is:

- involved in strategic planning groups that may be formed when any engagement is announced;
- included in the range of learning resource activity, giving examples of innovation and best practice in the SED and addressing issues before the auditors ask about them;
- equipped with quality assurance processes that are transparent and fit with institutional processes;
- involved with student feedback and the resulting action plans are documented and shared.

RE-THINKING SUBJECT SUPPORT IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

Keeping track of the quality assurance agenda at this time of change is challenging but there is some help to digest this information. The QAA for example publish a regular bulletin *higher quality* bulletin available on the QAA website and sent in hard copy to all institutions. There is no prescribed way to acquire knowledge of your institution's current approach to QAA activity. However, to ensure the nuances of current practices are understood it is beneficial for at least one member of the library or its parent division to be involved in the institutional quality assurance processes, for example attending briefings and serving on steering groups established for any audit or review events. . As an example from Bournemouth University, Academic Services held membership on the following

- The Institutional Audit Steering Group, including being part of the Institutional Audit SED drafting team and DAT planning groups.
- The Major Review in Healthcare Steering Group
- The Institutional Collaborative Audit Steering Group
- The Institution's ongoing Quality Assurance and Enhancement Group, which includes responsibility for chairing or acting as internal independent member at validation events and examination boards.

SCONUL continues to lobby and provide advice to members on how best to engage with audit and academic review. The section on their website devoted to quality assurance has guidance notes for both Institutional Audit and Academic Review.

Institutional Audit

As mentioned Institutional Audit is the review currently prevailing in England and Northern Ireland. Between 2003 and 2005, all HEIs will have taken part in an audit. It is expected that after this the audits will be repeated in a six year cycle. The judgments from Institutional Audit are expressed as 'broad confidence', 'limited confidence' or 'no confidence'. The greater the confidence that derives from the audit, the lighter the touch of any subsequent Academic Review of subjects is supposed to be. The interim arrangements for the Academic Review of subjects will focus on those delivered in further education institutions (FEIs) and the remaining subjects from the original cycle of subject review. Some of the methodology for the institutional audit and academic review models came from a limited series of developmental engagements 2002-2005. These were based on a SED and SWS. The developmental nature perhaps led to the lowest engagement with library services and a fear that all the good work and opportunity gained from the rigours of Subject Review might be lost. However, lobbying from SCONUL, and the timely publication of the findings of the first rounds of Institutional Review (QAA, 2005b) ensured learning resources provision was still acknowledged as a key component to be considered. The contribution being not only to the process driven agenda of Institutional Audit, but also to the three chosen Discipline Audit Trails (DATs) that examine the institution's internal quality assurance

QUALITY ASSURANCE, QUALITY ENHANCEMENT

processes at the subject level. Learning resources are also included in the agenda for the supposedly lighter touch Academic Review for subjects.

SCONUL's advice note, *Guidelines for QAA Institutional Audit in England* not only outlines the timetable for Institutional Audit, which helped many libraries engage in the process within their institution, but also provides extensive advice on making a contribution to the SED

Institutional Self Evaluation Document

The SED is the benchmark document submitted by the institution at the start of the review process, against which the institution will be judged. Institutions follow guidelines and advice from the QAA on the key issues to be addressed and SCONUL has provided the following advice about what to include in a library submission to the institutional SED:

- Your service's contribution to the institution's quality assurance and your own department's own quality processes
- Evaluation of your service and actions resulting
- Liaison with academic departments, teaching programmes and academic staff, including contributions to academic staff development
- Awareness of programme needs
- Your service's contribution to teaching programmes and student learning
- How your service helps shape the student learning environment
- How you consult student and staff views of your service including any links with the students union (SCONUL, 2004)

In another example from Bournemouth University, the SED contained references to library and ICT activities in 12 paragraphs which were positioned in the following different sections of the SED: learning and teaching; assurance of quality; learning support; some challenges relating to learning resources; student guidance support and supervision; collaborative provision.

Student Written Submission

SCONUL advice that library services ask to see the SWS is confirmed by the experience at Bournemouth University. When the SWS is seen before audit a reasoned response can be prepared and shared with the Student's Union, who will have prepared the report, and those who may be asked questions about its findings in meetings during the visit. The preparation of a timely response also illustrates a commitment to responding to feedback and enhancing service quality.

RE-THINKING SUBJECT SUPPORT IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

Discipline Self Evaluation Document for Discipline Audit Trails (DATs)

The QAA select three discipline areas shortly before the scheduled institutional audit visit and each DAT requires a brief SED. Librarians are strongly advised, despite the tight time scales and restrictions on word counts, to work in partnership with the drafting teams to ensure brief information is included on the strategy for building up appropriate collections, facilities, support etc. as well as the nature and quality of liaison, how services are integrated into the delivery of teaching and learning and how student feedback is obtained. If there is an example of how feedback has been used to direct quality enhancement then it is important to include this.

Bournemouth University; Case study [2] Preparing for and handling the visit.

Intranet access was provided to the learning resources strategy and other strategic documents for the groups who would be meeting the auditors. The subject librarians attended the rehearsals for the DAT meetings to brief those who would be able attending on any possible learning resources questions from the SEDs and SWS, including the reply we had already prepared for the Students Union. Three of the University wide meetings had a representative from Academic Services attending, all of whom answered questions on any aspect of service. The meetings were the overall Quality Assurance meeting, the Staff Development meeting and the Quality Assurance and Enhancement group meeting, the latter illustrating how well integrated the library was into the quality monitoring processes of the university. The assessor's judgments were based on the written submissions and any questions and answers in the institution wide meetings.

During the actual visit it is unlikely that there will be a tour of facilities. As the SCONUL note concludes:

“Do not expect a visit to the resources areas. The audit team will be static and they will expect evidence to be brought to them. They may not even ask you to respond to student or staff comments on your services”. (SCONUL 2004)

Academic Review of Subjects

Academic Review of subjects is part of the transitional arrangements to accompany Institutional Review in some HEIs during the period from 2002. It is also being used for directly funded higher education provision in further education colleges in England. The broad timetable for the subjects to be reviewed is provided on the QAA website, individual institutions will negotiate the precise timing and it is important that decisions on what is being reviewed and when are communicated to the interested parties.

QUALITY ASSURANCE, QUALITY ENHANCEMENT

SCONUL, through Jeremy Atkinson, the current chair of the SCONUL/UCISA Working Group on Quality Assurance, have negotiated an updated *Aide-mémoire for reviewers evaluating learning resources*, (SCONUL/UCISA, 2003).

The objective of the SCONUL aide-mémoire is to give a better understanding of the brief points highlighted in the QAA reviewer's aide-mémoire (Appendix B of the Handbook for Academic Review: England 2004). (QAA, 2004c) The handbook makes it clear that the review is based on the institutions self evaluation which should demonstrate in the context of learning resources review,

“the adequacy of human and physical learning resources and the effectiveness of their utilization. In particular, the evaluation should demonstrate a strategic approach to linking resources to intended learning outcomes at programme level”

The reviewers are asked to consider:

- staffing levels and the suitability of staff qualifications and experience, including teaching and non teaching staff;
- professional updating to keep abreast of emerging, relevant subject knowledge and technologies;
- staff development opportunities, including induction and mentoring for, and whether opportunities are taken;
- journals and electronic media;
- access times and arrangements, and induction and user support provision; computing hardware, and both general and subject-specific software availability, and currency;
- accessibility, including times of opening and opportunities for remote access, and induction and user-support provision;
- specialist accommodation, equipment and consumables;
- adequacy, accessibility, induction, user support and maintenance;
- suitability of staff and teaching accommodation in relation to the teaching and learning strategy and the provision of support for students.

All of the above give scope for showcasing and critically evaluating learning resources in the SED. It is important to be accurate with statements that can be verified including where possible, links to any supporting evidence The SED evidence may also act as a trigger in any staff meetings and or tours to highlight and discuss service provision. Exaggerated claims cause the review team to doubt the reliability of the institutions view of itself. It is recognised however that where changes are in progress at the time of the review, the evidence may not yet be available to illustrate the effectiveness of any new activities or procedures. The QAA encourages institutions to comment in the SED on how they are managing the process of change. The sections in the SED will follow the advice given in the Handbook for Academic Review: England 2004 (QAA2004c) and will cover: the overall aims and outcomes of the subject provision curricula; assessment; achievement; teaching and learning; student progression; learning resources; maintenance and

RE-THINKING SUBJECT SUPPORT IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

enhancement of standards and quality. Institutions are encouraged to also consider those facets of the code of practice which relate to quality and standards and to consider the questions suggested for reviewers in the aide-mémoire.

The SCONUL/UCISA aide-mémoire provides points of reference for the assessor and hints for the subject librarian who is likely to be identified by the assessors as a key person in the review of learning resources in Academic Review.

The sections are on:

- strategy, planning and liaison;
- evaluation and feedback;
- provision for the courses being evaluated;
- relevance of learning materials;
- availability and accessibility;
- user support

The contribution to the SED should address these issues. Assessors may also ask questions about them in meetings or on tours of resources. Recent experience suggests that, although Institutional Audit does not include tours because of the focus on process, the 'lighter touch' Academic Reviews will involve tours. Review teams seem to be receptive to the value of seeing the learning resources and this presents a wonderful opportunity to discuss how you ensure the resources are effective and how they are being utilised. It is advisable to communicate with your institutional review facilitator and explain why you believe a tour can help showcase all the learning and teaching innovations especially those flagged up in the SED. If the lead assessor does not request a tour the institutional facilitator may well then suggest one when they meet the lead assessor at the preliminary meeting.

All reviews follow the same basic approach: presentation of the SED; visit from the lead assessor to discuss the review; dialogue between the institutional facilitator and the review panel chair to arrange the programme for the visit including visits to placement, partnership, or work based learning as appropriate. Additional documentation required is identified and the detail of who will meet the assessors in which meetings is agreed. As there will just be one meeting covering all aspects of the review it is possible, but not certain, that the meeting with staff will include learning resources staff. There will also be a meeting with students and when appropriate a meeting with employers. The student meeting will include learning resources and their deployment. The reviewers will be looking to triangulate any comments made when they meet staff or go on tours.

The advice given to reviewers is that everything that is said during the visit is on the record and there should always be two of them present on any tour, it is therefore sensible to adopt the same approach and have a small group leading any tour that can represent all the constituencies of learning resources. The lead person would normally be the head of learning or teaching or an equivalent post holder in the discipline area under review. It would be expected that the

QUALITY ASSURANCE, QUALITY ENHANCEMENT

subject librarian would also be involved. If you rehearse it is possible to ensure all your key enhancement activities will be highlighted even if direct questions are not forthcoming.

Major review of healthcare programmes

The major review of healthcare has its own newsletter *News for healthcare education*, which gives hints, tips and feedback on how the reviews have been progressing and the lessons learnt. There is a separate handbook for the major review (QAA, 2003c) and a complete section on the QAA website devoted to the Partnership Quality Assurance Framework for Healthcare Education in England (QAA, 2004d)

The language used makes it clear that the process is very much about continuous quality enhancement and as much about the quality of education in healthcare practice environments as in the HEI. With so many partners in the delivery of healthcare education it becomes more challenging to ensure the contribution of learning resources is recognised in the SED and the review programme. All the ideas given about involvement in Academic Review are still relevant but the emphasis on education for clinical practice may appear to lessen the perceived importance of the HEI central provision. Subject librarians should demonstrate in their SED contribution how their information literacy and collection development activities are related to intended learning outcomes, subject benchmarks and are making a difference to accessing learning resources both in practice and the HEI.

The schedules for the review visits are congested, with the two of the four days spent visiting practice and partnership locations with each team covering four locations on each day. It was understandable therefore that the QAA and NHS agreed that if the NHS libraries were accredited using the Health Libraries and Information Confederation (HeLicon) scheme they would require no further visit (Health Libraries and Information Confederation, 2002).

The Scheme was originally designed by the Library and Information Co-operation Council (LINC) Health panel and the author of this chapter was one of the authors of that original scheme. (Beard, 1996) The current version is the second to be produced under the auspices of HeLicon and provides a useful benchmark on the all round performance of a library service. Although it can be used in HE it is most effective in an exclusively NHS setting. Accreditation includes the preparation of a portfolio of evidence. The visit includes discussion with library staff and stakeholders such as senior Trust Managers, including the Chief Executive, and users of the service. This accreditation is usually part of a three year cycle. One of the precepts of major review, which is explicitly a part of the Partnership Quality Assurance Framework, is for HEIs to ensure the ongoing quality monitoring and enhancement and it may be desirable to consider how to take HeLicon accreditation as a benchmark and build an annual enhancement review into HEI institutional/library quality assurance processes.

RE-THINKING SUBJECT SUPPORT IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

Bournemouth University: Case study [3] A major healthcare review

A senior library staff member was invited to be on the steering group and to contribute to the writing of the SED. Contributions featured in 16 of the paragraphs appearing under the headings of achieving learning outcomes by students; curricula; learning and teaching; learning resources and their effective utilization; maintenance and enhancement of standards and quality. A theme chosen for particular focus was e-learning and so the examples of innovation were drawn from this area including the diverse range of e-resources and e-support. Mention was made of an ongoing impact study and the interim results were available and displayed on the student portal, which the assessors could access and on posters around the faculty and library. The positives, high usage and enthusiasm for more e, as well as an ongoing need for training, were highlighted. A tour of learning resources was requested by the lead assessor and two and a half hours was made available to showcase the wide range of e-learning and clinical skills support. The tour was an opportunity to mention new or forthcoming additional enhancements to e availability for the healthcare students. It also gave the assessors the chance to explore how student feedback was working and how the services in the NHS hospitals linked with the services from the University. The tour was carefully rehearsed to ensure the route gave opportunities to focus on all the aspects of learning resources from the student office, lecture theatres to the PC labs, the library and clinical skills facilities. Where visits were to be made to a sub campus and the University Centre managed by a partner college, there were additional briefings arranged which included feedback about the University resource visit.

Collaborative Audit

Where HEIs have significant partnership activity the Institutional Audit will not be sufficient to assure the quality of provision. A collaborative audit will take place after Institutional Audit and will look at the effectiveness of the awarding institutions quality assurance structures and mechanisms for collaborative programmes. The guidance is given on the QAA website (QAA,2004e).

One area specifically mentioned for consideration is the experience of students as learners in collaborative provision. Subject librarians will have a significant role in explaining how students of their institution studying in a collaborative provision access learning resources, how they are supported in acquiring the skills of information literacy and how the quality of the experience is monitored and how is the student feedback obtained and acted upon.

The Code of Practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education, section 2: Collaborative provision and flexible and distributed learning (including e-learning) issued in September 2004 is also

QUALITY ASSURANCE, QUALITY ENHANCEMENT

being used as one of the tools adding guidance to this type of review. At the time of writing no case evidence exists to give advice on how best to interact with this phase of review. All the best practice from all the other methods will contribute to best practice in this area. What is clear is the obligation of the HEI to be responsible for the academic standards of all awards granted in its name. An HEI must know about all collaborative partnerships and they should be managed in accordance with formally stated policies and the awarding institution is ultimately responsible for ensuring the quality of learning opportunities offered through a collaborative arrangement is adequate to enable a student to achieve the academic standard required for its award (QAA 2004f).

Quality enhancement & institutional procedures

What is clear from the discussions about all the different methods of audit and review is that the library must have sound processes for assuring the quality and enhancement of the services they provide. Whatever methods exist must also be part of the institutions processes. Reference has already been made to involvement in programme planning and review. If the subject librarian has significant experience in being involved in supporting programme development perhaps there may be opportunities to contribute as an independent member of any institutional quality assurance groups. The experience gained could enhance subsequent involvement in external audit and review.

Evaluation of services

The subject librarian can work with other colleagues to ensure there is adequate student feedback, that it is documented and suitable action plans are developed and delivered. There is not space in this chapter to discuss all the possible methods for obtaining evaluation and if possible some measures on the impact of the activities undertaken. What is important to stress is that the feedback must be sought on a regular basis and in a variety of ways from taught sessions, to suggestion schemes, focus groups, surveys and of course the student written submission.

Conclusion

Jean Sykes' concluding remarks at the *Routes to Quality* conference held at Bournemouth University in 1995 have stood the test of time

“Clearly quality assurance will continue to take a prominent place of the HE agenda in the coming years. Equally clearly HE Librarians and computing directors will need to ensure a continued involvement for learning resource services in the quality processes and procedures. They can work on this from two directions: on the one hand by pressing internally for an appropriate role for the library and computing services in the

RE-THINKING SUBJECT SUPPORT IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

institution's quality procedures, and on the other hand by ongoing discussion with any HE quality agencies which might emerge in the future."

It is clear that the QAA will engage more and more with the HEIs as they work to develop quality assurance measures that encourage enhancement of the student experience. The protocols and methods outlined in this chapter may change but the principles of engagement and the need for regular and robust local procedures to illustrate how the standards and quality are being upheld will remain. Indeed it can be argued that if there is effective external quality audit it can be a powerful lever for institutional change and improvement to institutional quality management (Scott & Hawke 2003). If the subject librarian looks back over the last ten years and reflects upon when audit has taken place, then it is clear that the engagement with faculty has led to an opportunity to improve services to the student. Audit and review are two of the best catalysts for change the subject librarian can engage with.

References

BEARD, J., 1996. The Bournemouth Experience: Health care libraries and accreditation. In B. Knowles (ed.), *Routes to quality*, BUOPOLIS 1. Proceedings of the conference held at Bournemouth University 29-21 August 1995.

HEALTH LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION CONFEDERATION, 2002. Accreditation of libraries in the healthcare sector: A checklist to support assessment 2nd ed. [online]. Available from: http://www.nelh.nhs.uk/librarian/Accreditation_Checklist_2nd_Edition_2002.pdf, [Accessed 15 April 2005].

LAUGHTON, D., 2003. Why was the QAA approach to teaching quality assessment rejected by academics in UK HE? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28 (3), 309-321.

QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY, 2003a. A brief guide to quality assurance in UK higher education QAA 032 06/03. [online]. Available from: <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus/heGuide/guide.asp>. [Accessed 08 August 2004].

QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY, 2003b. Handbook for enhancement-led institutional review: Scotland [online]. Available from: <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews/ELIR/default.asp>. [Accessed 08 August 2004].

QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY, 2003c. Handbook for major review of healthcare programmes. QAA 034 05/2003 [online]. Available from: <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews/institutionalAudit/collaborative/supplement/CPASupplement.pdf>. [2005, Mar/04]

QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY, 2004a, Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education [online]. Available from: <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/academicinfrastructure/codeOfPractice/default.asp> [Accessed 04 May 2004]

QUALITY ASSURANCE, QUALITY ENHANCEMENT

QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY, 2004b. Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education. Section 4: External examining – August 2004 [online]. Available from: <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/academicinfrastructure/codeOfPractice/default.asp> [Accessed 04 August 2004]

QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY, 2004c. 'Handbook for academic review: England 2004' [online] Available from : <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews/academicReview/acrevhbook2004/HandbookAcademicReview.pdf> . [Accessed 25 April 2005].

QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY. 2004d. The Partnership Quality Assurance Framework for Healthcare Education in England [online]. Available from: <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/health/framework/default.asp> .[Accessed 25 March 2005].

QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY, 2004e. Supplement to the Handbook for institutional audit: England: collaborative provision audit [online]. Available from: <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews/institutionalAudit/collaborative/supplement/CPASupplement.pdf> . [Accessed 02 February 2005].

QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY, 2004f. Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education. Section 2: Collaborative provision and flexible and distributed learning (including e-learning) – September 2004 [online]. Available from: <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/academicinfrastructure/codeOfPractice/default.asp> [Accessed 04 March 2005].

QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY, 2005a. . QAA Home page [online]. Available from: <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus/> [Accessed 21 March 2005].

QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY, 2005b. Institutional audit: England – key features and findings of the first audits QAA 07604/05 [online]. Available from: http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews/institutionalAudit/outcomes/Outcomes_initial.pdf [Accessed 06 March 2006].

SOCIETY OF COLLEGE, NATIONAL & UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES. UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES INFORMATION SYSTEMS ASSOCIATION, 1996. The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education – Aide-memoire for reviewers evaluating learning resources. London. [now withdrawn]

SOCIETY OF COLLEGE, NATIONAL & UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES. UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES INFORMATION SYSTEMS ASSOCIATION. 2003. 'The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education – Aide-memoire for reviewers evaluating learning resources [online]. Available from: http://www.sconul.ac.uk/activities/quality_ass/papers/. [Accessed 09 June 2005].

RE-THINKING SUBJECT SUPPORT IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

SOCIETY OF COLLEGE, NATIONAL & UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES. UNIVERSITIES, 2004. SCONUL guidelines for QAA institutional audit in England [online]. Available from: http://www.sconul.ac.uk/activities/quality_ass/papers/. [Accessed 09 January 2005].

SCOTT, G. AND HAWKE, I., 2003. Using an external quality audit as a lever for institutional change *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28, (3), 323-331.

SYKES, J., 1996. Quality issues in higher education: the library perspective. In B. Knowles (ed.), *Routes to quality*, BUOPOLIS 1. Proceedings of the conference held at Bournemouth University 29-21 August.