

TQF Bulletin, Summer 2025

Welcome to the TQF Bulletin - your quick guide to the activity of [The Quality Forum](#). Please feel free to share this with colleagues who might find it valuable.



Photo credit: Alison Eales

Our final meeting of the session took place on Wednesday 11 June on Zoom and provided members with an opportunity to reflect on the first year of delivery of the [Tertiary Quality Enhancement Framework \(TQEF\)](#) and its component activities.

We started with a discussion about Tertiary Quality Enhancement Review (TQER). One university was reviewed in session 2024-25, and others are at various stages of TQER preparation. Colleagues reported that the Advance Information Set was more substantial

than required for previous review methods and that they were considering how best to make the volume of data digestible for reviewers. Colleagues also reflected on approaches to engage with staff and students, given shorter timescales. More positively, colleagues praised the TQER training, and the student engagement support being provided by [sparqs](#). Some colleagues reported that they were using the SEAP headings to prepare their reflections.

This was followed by a conversation about Annual Quality Engagements – the meetings conducted between institutions, the [Scottish Funding Council \(SFC\)](#), and [QAA](#). Colleagues reported that these meetings had generally been useful but that the programme of meetings had felt like a work in progress. Meetings with SFC had been a useful opportunity to receive high-level and general feedback on the SEAPs, while meetings with QAA (which generally took place after the meetings with SFC) provided more space for discussion. Colleagues noted that where key contacts at agencies changed, care would need to be taken to avoid repetition between meetings from one year to the next.

We then moved on to have a conversation about managing quality in straitened times. Quality teams are increasingly being asked to 'do more with less' and colleagues shared some of their experiences of how they were adjusting approaches in response. Some institutions are experimenting with changing the unit of review for their Institution-Led Quality Reviews (ILQR), and it was suggested that this might be a topic for a future TQF Special Interest Group (SIG). Institutions were also experimenting with changing how review meetings were recorded. One institution reported that they had shifted to recording outcomes rather than full minutes, on the grounds that the annual monitoring process would capture more granular data. Other institutions had started using AI for certain administrative tasks such as transcribing meetings, though there was some uncertainty about whether data was processed locally, and institutional licences and policy differ across the sector in this regard.

We took some time to reflect on things we had tried at TQF in session 2024-25. We have been running a SIG on Professional Services Review (PSR), with three informal meetings each attended by six to eight people. Members of the SIG reported that the experience had been positive and reassuring and that it had been useful to have a space to focus and share practice on one area of activity.

We had also trialled a hybrid meeting in 2025. Colleagues who attended in person had welcomed the chance to meet face-to-face, but most people had attended the meeting online and the general agreement was that a hybrid meeting had not been as effective as hoped. It was suggested that it would be worth bringing TQF together with the college quality network run by [College Development Network \(CDN\)](#) for an in-person working day, with sector-specific discussions alongside opportunities to discuss common matters.

Derek Horsburgh introduced SFC's update paper and provided some reassurance about the guidance being produced around production of the 2025 SEAPs. This was due to be published at the end of June and while there had been a commitment to reviewing it after the first year, there was no intention to change the guidance.

Holly Thomas from QAA introduced an item of AOB. With the publication of the new UK Quality Code for Higher Education in June 2024, and the ongoing development of the UK Quality Code Advice and Guidance against each of the 12 sector-agreed principles, QAA are taking the opportunity to revise and extending the existing suite of Characteristics Statements. A [Padlet](#) has been set up to capture feedback and TQF members are encouraged to contribute. QAA is also seeking members to join the Advice and Guidance writing groups who will progress the work of redeveloping the 2024 Quality Code. Recruitment is open until 30 June. For more information, please see this [news story](#).

After a short break, we had a discussion about academic integrity and generative AI. Colleagues each reported on recent developments in their institutions. There is still a sense that practice is developing, and that guidance skews towards when AI should *not* be used, rather than when it can be. It remains very difficult to tell definitively when a student has used it in contravention of institutional policy. In some institutions, managers are keen to see the use of AI in administration and professional services as well as for tasks such as thematic analysis. All colleagues agreed that there is an ongoing training need for both staff and students and that, in the quality field, there is still a need for the expertise and judgement of staff.

QAA will be in touch over the summer to ensure that TQF membership is up to date and to get a sense from members about what you would like to discuss in session 2025-26. We are likely to follow the same pattern of meetings (mornings in October, March and June, on different days of the week, and online).

TQF is a forum for sharing practice on matters of teaching quality, and colleagues are encouraged to suggest items for discussion. Please [get in touch with QAA Scotland](#) if you would like to share practice from your institution or learn more about practice across the sector.