20 | **11**

Handbook 6:

Periodic Review

UNIVERSITY
of DERBY

www.derby.ac.uk

Contents

PART E: The Reporting Stage

PART F: A Glossary of Terms   24

Foreword

The periodic review process detailed in this handbook replaced subject review which formed part two (AMR2) of the *Annual Monitoring and Review Procedures*. The periodic review process implemented from September 2008, both draws on and builds upon subject review and therefore is evolutionary rather than revolutionary. Continuity is important whilst accepting that the new process needs to reflect the **University's Quality Strategy** with its emphasis on **risk**, being **forward-looking** and **enhancement-focused**. The new review method strengthens its predecessor without the need for a radical step change or sideways move. It is a logical development encapsulating both the strengths of the previous process whilst seeking to further mesh together aspects of the monitoring and review of taught provision (see Handbook 5).

In parallel with the revisions to the Validation and Approval (VA) procedures completed in 2008/09, the opportunity has been taken to review all the quality enhancement documentation with the result that a series of handbooks have been published consisting of existing procedures (annual monitoring and periodic review) supplemented with new material, for example programme design and delivery, external examiners and committees. The **eight handbooks** published in September 2009 consist of:

1. An Introduction to Quality Enhancement
2. Programme Design and Delivery
3. Validation and Approval of Taught Programmes
4. Collaborative Provision (including Partnership Review)
5. Annual Monitoring
6. Periodic Review
7. External Examiners
8. Committees

The forward-looking perspective is now a more prominent feature of periodic review with reference to quality and standards being an important but additional consideration. This approach accords with the revised monitoring process. There is now greater emphasis on the strategic context and a consideration of the ways in which the subject or School is engaging with both the **internal** (subject, Faculty, institutional) or **external** (regulatory, the market) environment that may have a future impact on the provision. It is an enhancement-focused review process that seeks to identify both current and future mechanisms to enhance the quality of the student learning experience and thereby facilitating improvement. Periodic review provides an opportunity for discipline teams to think **strategically** about their provision and review the longer-term plans and objectives.

The most significant changes from Subject Review are as follows:

- The format and structure of the **self-evaluation** have been significantly enhanced so that the sections now accord with the focus of exploration undertaken by the reviewers and the main headings found in the final report.

- A selective list of **additional documentation** has to be provided to the reviewers prior to the review event to supplement the self-evaluation.

- Reviewers are now required to provide **commentary (bullet points)** on their allocated section(s) so that lines of enquiry can be prepared in advance of the review event.

- Periodic review now formalises the support provided by LEI throughout the review period.

- The role of the **Review Chair** is emphasised pre- during and post review.

- The **review event** is normally held over two-consecutive days.

Many of the other features of periodic review have continuity with the previous process, for example, the role of the Faculty Curriculum Development Manager as a cross-bencher has been retained, the panel continues to include a Student Union sabbatical office and it remains a process conducted by peers.

Revisions:

26 September 2008

- Periodic review panel membership revised so that the student may be UDSU sabbatical officer *or nominee*

- Documentation to be submitted with the briefing paper may now be hard copy or electronic format supplied on CD-ROM

20 October 2008

- Key stages of periodic review table enhanced to show timing of the draft report. Further guidance provided on the timing of the enhancement plan and the approval process

- Flow diagram included to show the key stages of the periodic review process

- Section 4 revised to clarify the timing of the draft report and the approval process for the Enhancement Plan

9 September 2009

- Format revised to conform with the 'house style' for the quality management handbooks

- Inclusion of references to equality and diversity

8 September 2010

- Handbook revised to reflect the establishment of the Centre for Quality.

16 September 2011

- Periodic review cycle now six years rather than five.

- Structure of review changed so that the focus is now on the discipline e.g. performing arts, psychology, education engineering, earth sciences, business, etc.

- Timescales adjusted to provide more lead time prior to the review event.

- Review evidence tracker templates introduced to formalise pre-review analysis of self-evaluation and documentation.

- Servicing officer is from LEI and is responsible for producing the review report. Previously the officer came from the faculty and panel members prepared the report with the chair having editorial responsibility.

- Handbook updated to reflect new University structures.

Part A: Introduction

SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION

A1 This part of the handbook:

- Provides an **overview** of what is contained within the handbook;
- Includes a brief introduction to the **periodic review process** identifying its key features, purpose and focus of activity;
- Provides an introduction to **social inclusion**;
- States the **duration of the review cycle** and the locus of responsibility for approving the review schedule.

SECTION TWO: HOW TO USE THIS HANDBOOK

A2 This handbook has been written for all those involved in the periodic review of the University of Derby's academic provision. It details the various stages in the process from preparation for periodic review, through to the review event itself and finally the reporting stage post-review. The audience for this handbook is varied. It is essential reading for all staff that will be engaged in a review in the coming months and should be particularly helpful for both staff new to the University or those who have taken up a new role and may be unfamiliar with the process. Overall it should be of value to:

- **Senior managers** within the University with responsibility for academic provision;
- **Academic staff** within subject areas or Schools that will be engaged in some aspects of the review process;
- **Faculty Curriculum Development Managers** (FCDM) with responsibility for overseeing quality enhancement processes and providing guidance to colleagues;
- University staff involved in the **management** and/or **administration** of academic provision both within the Faculty and the supporting departments.

A3 This handbook is designed to meet the needs of University staff by providing a **comprehensive** and **accessible** resource on the procedural requirements for the periodic review of academic provision at the University of Derby.

- **Part A** sets out the University's approach to periodic review locating it within the **Quality Enhancement Framework** (see Part A: Section Three) with its emphasis on being enhancement-focused, self-critical, evidence-based and forward-looking. These aspects are touched on in more detail in the other parts of the handbook.
- **Part B** provides an overview of periodic review; its aims, focus, scope and structure, and as such provides the context for the review process with its focus on the three core themes of **academic standards**, **quality of learning opportunities**, and **quality management and enhancement**.
- In **Part C** the handbook deals with the various stages in the lead up to the review event. It covers the preparation of the self-evaluation, additional

documentation to be made available, membership of the periodic review panel and the preparatory meeting prior to the review event itself.

- **Part D** covers the key aspects of the review period, for example the review meetings with staff and students and emerging good practice and recommendations for enhancement.
- **Part E** details the reporting stage and preparation of the enhancement plan.

A4   Whilst this handbook has been structured around the logical sequence of activities for periodic review, it has also been designed with the intention that the reader may access individual sections as required.

SECTION THREE: THE QUALITY ENHANCEMENT FRAMEWORK

A5   The University has responsibility for the **standard of awards** made in its name and for ensuring that the awards are set at the right standard from the outset. The very first precept in the QAA Code of Practice on *Programme design, approval, monitoring and review* underlies this responsibility by stating:

"Institutions ensure that their responsibilities for standards and quality are discharged effectively through their procedures for:

- *The design of programmes*
- *The approval of programmes*
- *The monitoring and review of programmes."*

A6   Periodic review is the process through which the University assures itself of the maintenance of **academic standards** and **quality** of its higher education provision. It is an **enhancement-focused** review process that seeks to identify both current and future mechanisms to enhance the quality of the student learning experience and thereby facilitating improvement. Periodic review is an opportunity for discipline teams to think **strategically** about their provision and review the longer term plans and objectives. To do this, the cumulative effect of change needs to be evaluated and account has to be taken of both the **internal** (subject, faculty or institutional) or **external** (regulatory or the market) environment that may have a future impact on the provision, taking into account the current UK legislative framework in relation to **equality and diversity**.

A7   The review process requires that a **self-critical**, **evidence-based** evaluation be made of an **academic discipline** or subject area as defined by Schools. The emphasis should be on building strengths, identifying and assessing actual and potential **risks** to the quality, standards and viability of provision, and highlighting any areas for **enhancement** to exploit and minimise the threats that emanate from the internal and external environments in which the provision is operating. The review is a **peer** process with the involvement of internal staff, students and others who are external to the University. The University is committed to ensuring that the process is supportive and not adversarial in character.

A8   Unlike the Quality Assurance Agency's (QAA) Academic Review methodology, where the window of activity provided a side-on view of a subject's provision and was set within the period of review, the University's periodic review process is designed to be **forward-looking** and **developmental**. Review will focus on a provision's **strategic initiatives** and how these are informed by the internal and external environments in which it operates. Reviewers will be keen to explore how current and future

developments are informed by research/scholarly activity, learning, teaching and assessment, and how these are effectively managed through resource planning, staff development, CPD, quality management and enhancement.

A9   Periodic review and the monitoring of academic provision (see Handbook 5) procedures are both '**forward-looking**' and '**context focused**' and in this respect they serve an 'enhancement' function. They are designed to anticipate risks to the viability, quality and standards of the University's taught programmes, thereby facilitating preventative action. Such action is promoted by the links that have been established between the monitoring of academic provision, business planning and budget allocation procedures. Therefore, periodic review is not conducted in isolation. It is only one part of the quality enhancement system, the context of which is defined by the **Faculties' strategic plans** and **learning**, **teaching** and **assessment strategies**. This interrelationship is shown schematically in Figure 1.

Business Planning

Validation and Approval

Business Plans
Service Delivery Plans
Operating Strategies
Corporate Plan

Market Research
Development Approval
Programme Development
Validation event
Programme build

RISK

Module Reports
Programme Enhancement Plans
Collaborative Reports
School/Faculty Enhancement Plans
Scheme Reports
Periodic Review

Initial enquiry
Development approval
Partner approval
Collaborative approval
Partnership review

Monitoring and Review

Collaborative Provision

Figure 1: The Quality Enhancement Framework

SECTION FOUR: SOCIAL INCLUSION

A10   As stated in paragraph A6, the University is required to comply with legislation relating to **social inclusion** and therefore it is important for all academic programmes to take this into account.

> ### *Definition of social inclusion*
>
> Socially inclusive practice is where everyone is treated fairly and their individuality is respected and valued. Difference is accepted and openly discussed to enhance understanding. Practice is organic and evaluated for future improvement(s).

A11   A key aspect of periodic review is for the University to be assured that the School/discipline demonstrates awareness of the diverse needs of its learners i.e. age, disability, gender, ethnicity, religion and sexuality. **Diversity** is based on the concept of **recognition of differences** – recognising that everyone is different, and respecting and encouraging those differences. Reviewers will engage with the equality and diversity themes from the outset, and therefore it is important that the self-evaluation addresses how and to what extent the strands of diversity are incorporated into the academic provision.

SECTION FIVE: THE PERIODIC REVIEW CYCLE

A12   Periodic review takes place once within a fixed **six-year** cycle and allows disciplines to take a longer, more **holistic** and **strategic** view of their provision, identifying and assessing actual and potential risks to the quality, standards and viability of provision and highlighting areas for development. It focuses upon the discipline area's competence and capacity to both develop and manage the various programmes of study and the students' learning experience. The timing of the reviews will be negotiated with Faculties or University of Derby Corporate (UDC) as appropriate, subject to approval of the University Quality Enhancement Committee (UQEC) (see paragraph B13). UQEC should be notified of any proposed revisions to the schedule.

A13   The first cycle of periodic review covered the periodic 2005-11. The current method of review was introduced in 2011-12 for the second cycle of review. A schedule of periodic reviews for the period 2011-16, together with relevant documentation, is available from the LEI website.

Part B: Key Feature of Periodic Review

SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION

B1   This part of the handbook:

- States the **aims** of periodic review;
- Explains what the review process will **focus** on;
- Identifies what falls within the **scope** of periodic review;
- Outlines the **structure** of the review process;
- Explains how the **schedule** for periodic review is prepared and formally approved by the University;
- Details the **key stages** of periodic review.

SECTION TWO: AIMS

B2   Periodic review aims:

- to support disciplines in evaluating and improving their management of their HE provision, for the benefit of students;
- to evaluate and confirm the maintenance and enhancement of **academic standards** and the **quality of learning opportunities** within the discipline taking account of:
    - engagement with the **Academic Infrastructure** (Code of Practice, the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications [FHEQ], subject benchmark statements, Foundation Degree qualification benchmark, Progress Files, Programme Specifications), and other external reference points, for example **Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body** (PSRB) requirements;
    - developments in the discipline;
    - developments in learning, teaching and assessment; and
    - the outcomes of previous external audits and reviews, review and revalidation and annual monitoring;
    - equality and diversity legislation leading to social inclusion for all students.
- to provide an opportunity for dialogue concerning the current and **future** mechanisms for enhancing the student learning experience and an assessment of these enhancement developments and initiatives;
- to validate claims of **good practice** and **innovation** worthy of dissemination across the institution, and externally; and
- to encourage improvements in the quality of education through the publication of **review reports**, and through the sharing of good practice.
- **Avoid excessive paperwork** or **time burden** on Schools or reviewers.

SECTION THREE: FOCUS

B3   Periodic review is a forward-looking and enhancement-focused review methodology primarily that covers a discipline's management of the security of the **academic standards** of its provision and of the **quality of the learning opportunities** it provides to enable students to achieve those standards. Emphasis will be placed on how the discipline has learned from and is developing its approaches to enhancing the quality of the student experience.

B4   It is important to recognise that periodic review is not a process of **validation or revalidation**; the University's programme (excluding some collaborative programmes) are revalidated when required and not on a fixed cycle.

B5   Review teams will focus their enquiries within this process according to three **core themes**: *academic standards*, *quality of learning opportunities* and *quality management and enhancement*.

- **Academic standards**

   This will cover the use made of key stakeholders, PSRBs, higher education networks and agencies, external examiners, internal and external review, assessment strategies, management information, the Academic Infrastructure and other reference points in respect of:
   - Curriculum
   - Assessment
   - Management Information Trends

- **Quality of learning opportunities**

   This will cover the use made of key stakeholders, PSRBs, higher education networks and agencies, external examiners, internal and external review, learning and teaching strategies, research activity to inform learning opportunities, other modes of study (such as work-based and flexible and distributed learning), management information, the Academic Infrastructure and other reference points in respect of:
   - Learning and Teaching
   - Student Support and Guidance
   - Learning Resources, including staff development and CPD

- **Quality Management and Enhancement**

   This will cover:
   - The subject area's approach to the **quality assurance** of its HE provision and the effectiveness of this approach for the programmes under review.
   - The use made of quantitative data and qualitative feedback from students, external examiners, employers and other stakeholders in a strategy of **enhancement** and continuous improvement.
   - The arrangements to ensure consistency in the **monitoring** of academic standards and the quality of the student experience, across all locations and delivery modes.

B6   Review chairs and panel members are asked not to overlap with **external examiners** in the judgements of the standards achieved. Reviewers should be satisfied that an effective process of external moderation has taken place; they are not asked to confirm the academic judgement of external examiners. **Student work will not normally be seen**, except where this illustrates some enhancement activity.

SECTION FOUR: SCOPE

B7 Periodic review is concerned with both undergraduate and postgraduate **taught** higher education provision within a cognate **discipline** at levels C, I H and M of the FHEQ (or levels 4 to 7 of the National Qualifications Framework), and postgraduate professional master's and doctorates awards (levels 7 and 8 of the National Qualification Frameworks).

Table 1: The FHEQ and its relationship to the NQF

FEHQ	Level	National Qualifications Framework
Doctorates	D Doctoral	8
Master's degrees, Postgraduate Certificates and Postgraduate Diplomas	M Master's	7
Bachelor's degrees with Honours	H Honours	6
Foundation Degrees, ordinary (Bachelor's) degrees, Diplomas of Higher Education, Higher National Diplomas and Certificates	I Intermediate	5
Certificates of Higher Education	C Certificate	4

B8 Periodic review does not apply to either the traditional or new route **research** master's (MPhil/MRes) or doctorate (PhD) awards as detailed in the University's Regulatory Framework for Postgraduate Research Degrees by Thesis.

B9 Programmes which are offered in **collaboration** with other colleges or organisations should be included in periodic review. There is a separate process to quality assure collaborative partnerships (see Handbook 4) and the focus within periodic review should be on the strategic and curriculum issues.

B10 Normally **Joint Honours programmes** will be reviewed as individual programmes within their subject group, rather than looked at holistically with other subject pathways outside of the discipline. Nevertheless, reviewers may wish to look at the effectiveness of a programme which has been designed to be taken by students in other subject areas.

B11 Where **modules from other subject areas** contribute to a programme, these will not normally be looked at in detail during the review as they may not be within the field of the external peers, nor within the authority of the discipline team. Nevertheless, in order to understand the whole context of the provision, and to enable the review panel to comment on the quality of service modules, templates for such modules should be available during the visit if requested. Multi- and cross-disciplinary programmes may be treated differently, however.

B12 **Recently approved programmes** which have not yet recruited will be included in the review from the point of view of illuminating subject development and currency of curriculum. Clearly there will not be management information relating to such programmes but approval reports etc may be included as evidence. **Programmes which have closed** and which no longer have enrolled students need not be included. **Programmes which are due to close** but which do still have enrolled students should be included, since good practice is relevant even in (perhaps particularly in) these circumstances.

SECTION FIVE: STRUCTURE OF THE REVIEW

B13   Discussions between LEI and each Faculty/UDC will determine the exact nature, scope and programme for the review. Normally, periodic review is of the **discipline** e.g. performing arts, psychology, education engineering, earth sciences, business, etc.

- **Disciplines for periodic review** are defined by Faculties, subject to approval of the University Quality Enhancement Committee (UQEC). It is the responsibility of each Faculty to ensure that their programmes fall within a discipline for periodic review.
- Where the discipline contains **large number of programmes**, it may be agreed between the panel and the discipline team that the review should focus in detail on a sample set of programmes; however, all programmes will remain in scope. The sample should reflect the range of provision and capture a significant proportion of students.

SECTION SIX: SCHEDULE FOR PERIODIC REVIEW

B14   In consultation with LEI, each Faculty/UDC will propose its schedule for periodic reviews to UQEC at the start of each **six-year cycle** taking account of how reviews are structured (see paragraph B13). The schedule will indicate the scope of the review and the academic year in which each review will take place. The scope of the review may be influenced by the size or complexity of the provision, potential or perceived risks in which a discipline area operates, or the need to focus on a particular subject to satisfy external requirements. Whilst it is anticipated that a review is of the discipline, there may be justification for focusing on a subset, particularly where subject areas within a School are distinct in terms of their discipline, learning resources, modes of delivery, etc.

B15   At the commencement of each academic year, the overall schedule for the University will be presented to UQEC for endorsement. Any proposed revisions to the schedule and scope of reviews within the six-year period should be submitted to UQEC for approval.

SECTION SEVEN: KEY STAGES OF PERIODIC REVIEW

B16   Formal preparation for periodic review will start approximately **26 weeks before the scheduled review** although the process of ensuring that the evidence is in place and the documentation up to date should be ongoing. A **briefing meeting** between LEI, the Head of School and representatives of the discipline will agree on the programmes to be covered in the review (a Periodic Review Programme Information template should be completed, see Annex 6-A), size of panel, dates for submission of documentation and dates of the review.

B17   A digest of information on **key performance indicators** derived from relevant programme monitoring data sets showing trends over the last two to three years will be provided by the Planning and Statistics Unit (PSU) **approximately 12 weeks before the date of the review**; key section of the self evaluation will reflect this data. On the basis of this data and the periodic review programme information template, the panel chair will agree with discipline staff and LEI whether the review should focus on a sample of programmes.

B18 A **discipline self-evaluation** will be submitted **8 weeks** before the review. Participation in the production of the self evaluation should extend to all staff in the discipline, and as far as possible, students or their representatives.

B19 The **key stages** are set out in relation to the review event up to the submission of the report and enhancement plan to UQEC.

Table 2: Periodic Review Timeline

Time +/- review event	Activity
- 26 weeks	Faculty provides completed periodic review programme information template (Annex 6-A). **Briefing meeting** between LEI, Head of School and discipline staff to determine scope of review.
- 16 weeks	External panel member(s) nominated by Faculty and approved by LEI. Internal panel members appointed from register. Students' Union (UDSU) panel member agreed. Digest of information on key performance indicators to inform self evaluation provided by Planning and Statistics Unit. Meeting of panel chair, LEI and discipline staff to agree on any sampling of programmes.
- 8 weeks	Self evaluation submitted by the Faculty. Servicing officer circulates the self evaluation and supporting documentation to the panel. Panel chair agrees distribution of workload with panel.
- 4 weeks	Servicing officer receives each reviewer's analysis of the self evaluation and supporting documentation for their allocated section(s) and forwards this to the panel chair. Panel members call for additional information from the Faculty, as required.
Period between receiving reviewers' analysis and review	Additional documentation forwarded to panel members. Meetings scheduled – employers and students invited etc.
- 2 weeks	**Preparatory meeting** convened to finalise arrangements for the review event.
- 1 week	Faculty assembles further evidence in accordance with the panel member's requirements.
Review	Normally two full days for the review event. Meetings held with discipline staff, student, employers etc. Panel meet to agree preliminary findings. At the end of the review the panel chair gives an oral report of the findings of the review to discipline staff.
+ 4 weeks	Draft report circulated to discipline staff for response.
+ 6 weeks	Response from discipline staff returned to panel.
+ 8 weeks	Final report circulated to the Head of School and discipline team. Final report sent to UQEC.
Approx 14 weeks after review	Enhancement Plan submitted to FQEC then UQEC.
Up to 1 year after review	Actions from review monitored by FQEC. UQEC final sign off of action after one year.

Part C: Preparation for Periodic Review

SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION

C1   This part of the handbook:

- Covers the key stages in **preparing** for periodic review;
- Outlines the purpose of the **briefing meeting** together with its timing and membership;
- Specifies the constitution of the **review panel**;
- Explains the scope and purpose of the **self-evaluation** and identifies the **minimum supporting evidence** to be submitted with the self-evaluation;
- Covers the scope and purpose of the **preparatory meeting**.

SECTION TWO: MANAGEMENT OF THE PROCESS

C2   Each Faculty/UDC provides administrative support to the periodic review process. LEI will provide support, coordination and oversight to include:

- **Advice**, guidance and training on all aspects of the periodic review process.
- The **setting up** of the review panel.
- The provision of a **servicing officer** who will liaise with the panel members and prepare the review report.
- **Confirming dates** for review events with Faculties/UDC.
- Liaising with the Head of School, discipline team, Faculty Curriculum Development Manager (FCDM) and Faculty Operations Manager (FOM).
- Convening a **briefing meeting** (see paragraph C3) between the panel chair Head of School, FCDM, representatives of the discipline team and FOM to determine the scope of the review.
- Convening a **preparatory meeting** (see paragraph C15) between the panel chair (who will lead this activity), Head of School, FCDM, FOM, serving officer, representatives of the discipline team and a LEI representative.
- Making arrangements for the receipt of **confirmed reports** to the University Quality Enhancement Committee (UQEC).

SECTION THREE: THE PERIODIC REVIEW PROCESS

The briefing meeting (26 weeks before review)

C3   A **briefing meeting** will be convened by LEI at least **26 weeks** before the review is scheduled to take place. A representative from LEI will lead the session that is normally attended by the Head of School, FCDM, representatives of the discipline and FOM. The meeting is designed to:

- Confirm the scope of the review using the completed periodic review programme information template (Annex 6-A).

- Provide an overview of the review process
- Identify a date for the review and establish deadlines for submission of documentation and the preparatory meeting.
- Provide further advice and guidance on developing the self-evaluation.
- Finalise the review timetable including the post review activities (see paragraph B19 for the key stages).
- Raise awareness with regards to the support that is available for teams from central departments.
- Discuss the size of the panel and the nomination process for external panel members.

Establishing the periodic review panel (12 weeks before the review)

C4   Membership of the review panel is coordinated and approved by LEI not less than **12 weeks** before the date of the review event. Nomination forms for external panel members are provided in Annex 6-B. Once the nominations have been confirmed a formal invitation will be sent from the Faculty. The range of expertise across the panel should be appropriate for the provision under review; for example if the characteristics of the programmes feature work-based learning or postgraduate level work, the panel should include members with experience in those relevant areas.

C5   The panel constitution should normally be:

- A Review Chair - senior academic (Dean, Assistant Dean, Subject Manager) or other member of staff drawn from eligible chairs from an independent Faculty.
- Two or more **external members** with current or recent experience, knowledge and understanding of higher education provision will be nominated by the Faculty and be subject to approval by LEI. External panel members should have relevant subject and pedagogic expertise at the appropriate academic level. Depending on the nature of the review, it may be appropriate to engage external panel members from outside the higher education sector, for example representing further education, employers or professional interests. It is expected that external panel members meet one or more of the following criteria:
    - No previous involvement with the proposed discipline.
    - Experience as a QAA Auditor, Academic Reviewer, Subject Specialist Reviewer or IQER Reviewer.
    - Experience as an external examiner at another institution.
    - Participation in professional body accreditation activity.
    - Distinction by way of scholarship and research within the subject.
- At least two **internal** academic members of staff from another Faculty not associated with the design, delivery or assessment of the provision to be reviewed.
- The Faculty Curriculum Development Manager acting in a cross-bench role.
- A University of Derby Student Union (UDSU) sabbatical officer, or nominee, not associated with the provision under review. The Students' Union will indicate at the start of the year which of its sabbatical officers will undertake this responsibility and LEI will provide training.
- A Servicing Officer from LEI.
- An LEI representative with a quality brief has the right to attend all periodic review events.

C6   Once the panel is set up by LEI the servicing officer will circulate the review timetable to the review panel and to the discipline team contact(s).

Digest of information (4 months before review)

C7   A **digest of information** on entry profiles, retention and achievement, and NSS satisfaction scores derived from relevant programme monitoring data sets showing trends over the last three year will be provided by the Planning and Statistics Unit (PSU) approximately **16 weeks** before the date of the review; key section of the self-evaluation will reflect upon this data. On the basis of this data and the programme information template (annex 6-A), the panel chair will agree with discipline staff and LEI whether the review should focus on a sample of programmes.

C8   Discipline teams should use the data provided centrally for any analysis. If there is data held locally by the team then this should only be used in addition to the central data (and tagged as such) and not instead of it. Other centrally produced data can be used to provide additional performance statistics and information relating to student employability (graduate destination survey). This can be obtained from the Career Development Centre.

Self-evaluation and supporting documentation (8 weeks before review)

C9   A discipline **self-evaluation will be submitted 8 weeks** before the review, using the template (Annex 6-C) which is available from the LEI web site. The discipline contact should coordinate the self-evaluation process and this same person should coordinate the preparation of the document. Note that the self-evaluation should cover all programmes in the discipline, even if it has been decided that the review will focus on a sample.

C10   The self-evaluation should be an **honest** and open **self-critical** evaluation of the standards and quality of the provision. The self-evaluation is central to the review process and should be **forward looking** providing an analysis of the discipline in an **internal** (subject, faculty or institutional) and **external** (regulatory or the market) context clearly identifying any drivers that may have a future impact on the provision. The emphasis should be on identifying good practice, and remedying any weaknesses in provision in order to exploit the opportunities and minimise the threats that emanate from the internal and external environments in which the discipline is operating.

C11   The self-evaluation should be the **only** item of documentation prepared specifically for the review as it is expected that documents referred to within the text are routinely available within the institution. Any new material should be strictly limited to what is required to signpost and/or contextualise existing material for the review team. It is not possible to provide definitive guidance on the length of the self-evaluation. The length depends on the complexity and size of the discipline to be reviewed and the comprehensiveness of existing written evidence. However, where a discipline feels confident in relying on a portfolio of existing evidence it may be able to restrict any new material to four sides of A4. The self-evaluation should be paginated throughout with each paragraph being numbered for ease of referencing. The structure of the document is detailed in Annex 6-C.

C12   The Faculty may submit the self-evaluation in **hard copy** or **electronic format** or a mixture of the two. The Faculty may provide any electronic documents on a USB memory stick or a similar electronic storage device. Alternatively, the Faculty may provide hyperlinks to electronic documents available on the University's website. If so, the links from the covering or introductory note should be direct to the documents concerned and not to the University's homepage or similar. The following supporting evidence submitted with the self-evaluation should be clearly titled, numbered and referenced from the covering or introductory note.

- **List of evidence -** A numerical list of all the evidence referenced in the main body of the self-evaluation.
- The completed **periodic review programme information template** (Annex 6-A).
- The **digest of information** on enrolment, progression, retention, achievement and destination data for the School/subject taking account of equality and diversity.
- **Programme specifications** and **programme handbooks** for the major programmes covered (this will be the sample programmes, if it decided that sampling is necessary).
- **External examiners' reports**, together with responses, for the last three years (for the sample of programmes, where sampling has been agreed).
- **Programme monitoring evidence** for the last three years (for the sample of programmes, where sampling has been agreed); approval reports for any new programmes included that have not yet been through a monitoring cycle.
- **University/School Learning and Teaching Strategies.**

C13   The panel will also have access by request to other documentation maintained by the discipline. The panel might reasonably expect this information to be available on demand, but will try to give the discipline sufficient notice of specific information requirements. Where sampling has been agreed, documentation can still be requested for programmes outside of the sample. Other documentation may include:

- **Module handbooks** together with assessment details and any module specific assessment criteria or marking guides.
- Other **relevant programme documentation** (e.g. induction pack, guidance materials), as provided to students. Include any specific materials developed for minority groups e.g. induction packs for international students
- **Subject staff lists** and short profiles (indicating main teaching and research interests, recent staff development activities and any administrative responsibilities of lecturers, and responsibilities of other staff).
- **Programme committee** minutes for one year.
- **Programme questionnaire** summaries. Relevant Unistats data for example National Student Survey (NSS) satisfaction levels.
- **Student data** in relation to academic offences and appeals.
- **Review and accreditation reports** (both internal and from accrediting bodies and QAA)
- Notes of **subject/team meetings** for the last year.
- Recent **validation reports**.
- Information about **local quality management systems** and structures and minutes of related committees, for example Faculty Quality Enhancement

Committee (FQEC), Faculty Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee (LTAC), School Quality Committee (SQC).

- **Marketing materials** such as programme brochures and a University prospectus.
- Access to **Blackboard** or other **VLE** where the subject area makes significant use of technology enhanced learning for supporting the delivery of its provision.

C14 The servicing officer circulates the self-evaluation and supporting documentation to the review panel at least **8 weeks** prior to the commencement of the review, in order that reviewers have at least **four weeks** for thorough reading.

C15 The panel chair will convene a panel meeting (involving externals by email) on receipt of the documentation to agree on allocation of tasks and on the meetings that will be required.

Completion of evidence trackers by panel members (4 weeks before review)

C16 All panel members are expected to have read the basic documentation. Panel members are asked to take a lead on certain areas of the preliminary analysis and in related meetings. While allocation of workloads among the panel members will be the responsibility of the panel chair, the following is a recommended distribution for a standard panel (see paragraph C5); this may be varied to suit panel member expertise.

Section 1: Curriculum	External panel members
Section 2: Assessment	External panel members
Section 3: Management Information	Internal panel members
Section 4: Learning and Teaching	External panel members
Section 5: Student Support and Guidance	Student's Union plus internals
Section 6: Learning Resources	External panel members
Section 7: Quality Enhancement Management	Internal panel members

C17 Within **one month** of the review panel members are required to record their preliminary analysis of the advance documentation for each of their allocated tasks and forward this to the servicing officer. Using the **evidence tracker template** (Annex 6-D) panel members are requested to identify potential good practice, questions for meetings and requests for further information. It will be the responsibility of the panel chair to collate this information and make it available to the discipline team so that any requests for additional information can be actioned. Agendas for the review meetings should follow from this collation.

Preparatory meeting (at least 2 weeks before the review)

C18 A **preparatory meeting** takes place between the panel chair (who leads this activity), Head of School, FCDM, FOM, servicing officer, representatives of the discipline team and a LEI representative, normally not later than **two weeks** prior to the commencement of the review. The preparatory meeting is to:

- Agree what key issues should be discussed during the review based on the analysis provided by the review panel.
- Check which claims in the self-evaluation the panel is going to seek to verify.

- Identify key members of staff who will attend the meetings.
- Discuss arrangements for meeting with students.
- Confirm the arrangements for contacting, where relevant, e-learning students and meeting representatives from collaborative partners.
- Shape the overall agenda for the review event.
- Provide an opportunity for the panel chair to clarify the process and for the discipline team to ask questions.

C19   It is essential that meeting(s) be held with students and so the timing of the review should take into account student availability. Where **e-learning students** are unable to attend a meeting at the University, panel members may contact them by telephone, video link or email. The review panel must carefully document the outcomes of this contact in writing. Where a review includes programmes delivered in collaboration with a partner institution, then partner staff and students should be included as appropriate using videoconference facilities where necessary.

C20   An indicative agenda for the preparatory meeting may take the form:

- Purpose of the preparatory meeting.
- Clarification of the periodic review process.
- Clarification of the scope and nature of the provision.
- Potential lines of enquiry arising from an initial analysis of the self-evaluation.
- Confirmation of the main matters for consideration during the review including the agenda for review, tour of resources, meetings with staff and students, and the availability of documents.

C21   The Servicing Officer will ensure that the agreed agenda for the review, including the names of staff attending each meeting, is circulated to the review panel and the discipline team not later than **one week** prior to the commencement of the review.

Part D: The Review Period

SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION

D1   This part of the handbook:

- Details the **key activities** that take place during the review period;
- Outlines the nature of the **meetings** that take place with both staff and students;
- Provides an example of a **programme** for a review event;
- Explains the possible **event outcomes**.

SECTION TWO: THE REVIEW EVENT

D2   The review event normally takes place over **two consecutive** days. Some flexibility is allowed in the periodic review process to extend or reduce the length of the event as appropriate to the discipline. This will be determined at the briefing meeting through discussion between LEI and the discipline team and agreed on a case-by-case basis.

D3   It is essential that reviewers are able to gather sufficient evidence to allow them to test statements made in the self-evaluation, and to draw **robust conclusions** on the quality and standards of the provision. To facilitate this, a number of **key meetings** are held during the review period. These will be with discipline and other staff, current and former students, and, where appropriate other relevant stakeholders. Documents (see paragraphs C12 and C13) are important sources of evidence that assist the reviewers to evaluate the quality of learning opportunities and academic standards achieved. Reviewers also gain evidence from observing some elements directly to evaluate their quality, for example, learning resources.

D4   A typical review event programme is provided in paragraph D6 but this can be varied as agreed by panel and discipline staff. The following meetings are normally involved:

- Meeting with staff to cover curricula, subject development and academic standards.
- Meeting with staff to cover quality of learning opportunities (management information, student admission, support and progression, learning resources).
- Meeting with staff (and students, if appropriate) to cover enhancement activities, implementation of University and Faculty/School learning and teaching strategies and to provide a showcase for good practice.
- Meeting with students (normally student representatives; from sampled programmes, where sampling has been agreed).
- Meeting with recent graduates, employers and or PSRB representatives.
- A tour of the teaching and learning facilities (where appropriate).
- Final clarification meeting with staff to identify and discuss any outstanding issues.

D5   The panel can vary this pattern according to the nature of the provision. The panel chair will agree with the discipline team which staff attend which meeting (staff from outside the discipline may by included where relevant). The panel chair will agree with the Head of School and the discipline team which meeting senior staff should attend.

SECTION THREE: REVIEW EVENT PROGRAMME

D6   The precise format for the review event will be agreed by the panel chair and the discipline team but will be based around the following model:

Day One of the Review

Time	Activity
08.30 – 08.45	Review team members to assemble – welcome and introductions
08.45 – 09.00	Presentation by the discipline team
09.00 – 10.00	Private meeting of the review panel – review process, lines of enquiry and lead responsibilities for the first day meetings
10.00 – 11.00	**Meeting with senior staff**
11.00 – 13.00	Private meeting of the review panel – review of preceding meeting and review of documentation. Buffet lunch
13.00 – 14.00	**Meeting with students**
14.00 – 14.30	Review of preceding meeting
14.30 – 15.30	Private meeting of the review panel – review of documentation
15.30 – 16.30	Tour of resources
16.30 – 17.30	Private meeting of the review panel – review of day 1, review of documentation, additional documentation identified
17.30 – 18.30	**Meeting with employers, placement providers, as appropriate**

Day Two of the Review

Time	Activity
09.00 – 10.30	Private meeting of the review panel – discussion of themes and review of agenda for day 2, lines of enquiry and lead responsibilities for the second day meetings
10.30 – 12.00	**Meeting with staff – subject team and central staff**
12.00 – 12.30	Review of preceding meeting over buffet lunch
12.30 – 14.00	Private meeting of the Review Panel – review of documentation
14.00 – 14.30	**Meeting with key subject staff for clarification purposes**
14.30 – 16.00	Private meeting of the review panel – to agree good practice and recommendations
16.00 – 16.30	Summary of feedback of themes given orally to subject staff
16.30	Review event ends

D7 The panel will conduct the review with reference to the template on which it is asked to report (Annex 6-E). This maps closely to the required structure for the self-evaluation.

SECTION FOUR: MEETING(S) WITH STUDENTS

D8 The meeting(s) with students are **strictly confidential** between the students and the reviewers; no comments are attributed to individuals. Students should be drawn from different levels, different years of study within each level (undergraduate, postgraduate), and from different modes where practicable with representation from minority groups where possible. The Faculty should provide a list of students expected to attend the meeting(s) and their designation (level, year and mode) no later than the morning of the first review day.

SECTION FOUR: OTHER MEETINGS

D9 The review event will include **private meetings** of the review panel to provide the opportunity to agree on lead responsibilities for lines of enquiry, reflect on discussions with staff and students, and to identify, share and evaluate evidence related to the programmes under review. **Other meetings** will be arranged with **staff** to discuss academic standards, the quality of learning opportunities and quality management and enhancement. There is no fixed pattern of meetings, although the agreed lines of enquiry should inform their number and membership. The reviewers may also include meetings with **employers** and **work placement/work-based learning** providers.

SECTION FIVE: GOOD PRACTICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

D10 The outcomes of the review are provided orally to the Head of School and discipline staff at the end of the second day. This will provide an indicative list of **good practice** and **recommendations**, but does not preclude other issues being included in the report. Good practice is defined as practice that the reviewers regard as making a particularly positive contribution to the provision, and which is worthy of wider dissemination. The report may include recommendations about how the discipline, may improve aspects of its higher education provision.

D11 Recommendations for improving the discipline's management of its academic provision are categorised as **desirable**, **advisable** or **essential** according to priority.

- **Essential recommendations** refer to important matters which the team believes are currently putting quality and/or standards at risk and which require urgent corrective action.
- **Advisable recommendations** refer to matters which the team believes have the potential to put quality and/or standards at risk and require preventative corrective action.
- **Desirable recommendations** refer to matters which the team believes have the potential to enhance quality, build capacity and/or further secure standards.

Part E: The Reporting Stage

SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION

E1   This part of the handbook:

- Specifies the content of the **periodic review reports**;
- Explains the process by which the **report** and **enhancement plan** are considered and approved by the appropriate **University committees**.

SECTION TWO: THE REPORT

E2   The report will be written by the servicing officer who will be a member of the Department for Learning Enhancement and Innovation. The headings of the report and guidance are provided in Annex 6-E. The draft report should be circulated to discipline staff for a response within **four weeks** of the review event. The final report should be circulated to the Head of School and the discipline team within **eight weeks** of the review event. The review report will be submitted to the University Quality Enhancement Committee (UQEC) which will determine the follow-up action with reference to the panel's recommendations. The discipline will then provide an enhancement plan to address issues raised in the report. This timetable is designed to ensure that the final report together with its enhancement plan is considered by UQEC no later than **fourteen weeks** after the review event.

E3   In the case of a review highlighting significant shortcomings in the provision, UQEC can order a further review (of all or part of the provision) within a limited time period.;

SECTION THREE: THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN

E4   On receipt of the **final report**, the Dean of Faculty, Head of School and Subject Managers are responsible for the preparation of an **enhancement plan**. Faculty Quality Enhancement Committee (FQEC) considers the report and enhancement plan at their **next scheduled meeting** after the publication of the final report.

E5   UQEC will consider the enhancement plan at their **next scheduled meeting** after consideration by FQEC. An update will be provided to FQEC and UQEC one year after the review event.

Part F: A Glossary of Terms

Academic Infrastructure	The Academic Infrastructure is a set of nationally agreed reference points relating to effective practice in the setting and management of academic standards and quality in higher education. It comprises: *Code of Practice* www.qaa.ac.uk/academicinfrastructure/codeOfPractice/default.asp *The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications* www.qaa.ac.uk/academicinfrastructure/FHEQ/default.asp *Subject Benchmark Statements* www.qaa.ac.uk/academicinfrastructure/benchmark/default.asp *Foundation Degree Qualifications Benchmark* www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews/foundationDegree/benchmark/FDQB.pdf *Programme Specifications* www.qaa.ac.uk/academicinfrastructure/programSpec/default.asp *Progress Files* also contribute to the Academic Infrastructure www.qaa.ac.uk/academicinfrastructure/progressFiles/default.asp
Academic Standards	QAA defines academic standards as the *'level of achievement a student has to reach in order to achieve a particular award or qualification'*. There are nationally agreed reference points for the academic standards of the various levels of HE qualifications set out in the FHEQ, published by the QAA. See 'Academic Infrastructure' for more information. The first core theme of periodic review focuses on academic standards. Emphasis will be placed on how the subject area has learned from and is developing its approaches to enhancing the quality of the student learning experience.
Briefing Meeting	The Briefing Meeting is the first stage of the periodic review process. Its purposes are to describe periodic review in more detail, allow colleagues to ask any questions about the process, to give further advice and guidance on developing the self-evaluation and finalise the review timetable.

Core Themes

Periodic review has three core themes:

1. Academic Standards
2. Quality of Learning Opportunities
3. Quality Management and Enhancement

Periodic review is concerned with reviewing the discipline's management of its responsibilities according to these three core themes within the context of an enhancement-focused review process.

The review report makes evaluative comments about these three core themes within the area under review identifying both good practice and recommendations for improvement.

Enhancement Plan

After a periodic review, the discipline will be asked to develop an enhancement plan describing how the Faculty plans to address the findings of the review. The plan is approved and monitored by the Faculty Quality Enhancement Committee.

Evidence

Periodic review is an evidence-based process. This means that the review team conducts their enquiries primarily by focusing on the discipline's competence and capacity to develop and manage the various programmes of study and the students' learning experience.

Evidence comes in a wide range of forms and will vary from discipline to discipline. It is likely to include annual monitoring report, validation documents, external examiners' reports, data about the individual programmes, review and inspection reports of other organisation such as Ofsted/Professional Bodies and any other information arising from meetings with staff and students.

FQEC

Faculty Quality Enhancement Committees are responsible to the University Quality Enhancement Committee for the maintenance of academic standards and the enhancement of the quality of student learning opportunities for taught programmes which lead to the awards or credit of the University.

Good Practice

Good practice is practice that the periodic review team regards as making a particularly positive contribution to the discipline's management of the student learning experience and which is worthy of wider dissemination.

Lines of Enquiry	The review team uses lines of enquiry as a way of reviewing the evidence and formulating conclusions about the discipline's management of higher education in the area under review. They can be regarded as lenses through which teams view the area in question. For example, where worked-based learning (WBL) is a major component of the curriculum, possible of lines of enquiry could include how work placements contribute to the final assessment; how the views of employers inform assessment criteria; or the effectiveness and adequacy of the WBL mentors in supporting the student learning experience.
Panel Chair	Panel chairs are selected for their experience of the management of higher education.
	A panel chair is responsible for chairing the Preparatory Meeting; discussing and agreeing the programme for the review; identifying the most effective way of engaging with students; leading the team at the review; and responding to any comments on the report from the Faculty.
Peer Review	Periodic review is peer review process. This means that the reviews are conducted by people with current or very recent experience of managing, developing, delivering and/or assessing higher education. As a result, periodic review reports reflect a working knowledge of the UK higher education system and, more specifically, the challenges of managing higher education academic standards and quality effectively in the University sector.
Preparatory Meeting	The purpose of the Preparatory Meeting is to agree what key issues should discussed during the review based on an analysis of the self-evaluation; develop the agenda for the review and identify further evidence for the discipline to make available at the review event. It also provides the opportunity for the panel chair to clarify the process and for the discipline team to ask questions.
QAA	QAA stands for the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. QAA was established in 1997 and is an independent body funded by subscriptions from UK universities and colleges of higher education, and through contracts with the main UK higher education funding bodies, including HEFCE.
Quality of Learning Opportunities	Quality of learning opportunities considers the effectiveness of everything that is done or provided (the 'learning opportunities') by the discipline to ensure that its students have the best possible opportunity to meet the stated outcomes of their programmes and the academic standards of the awards they are seeking.

Recommendations

Periodic review reports may include recommendations about how a discipline might improve its higher education provision. Actions taken to address these recommendations and any other issues raised in the report are included within the Enhancement Plan.

Report

Periodic review culminates in a report of the team's findings. The report has two main elements: good practice and recommendations for action by the discipline.

The report together with its enhancement plan is approved and monitored by the Faculty's Quality Enhancement Committee. The University Quality Enhancement Committee receives and considers periodic review reports.

Review Event

The review event normally takes place over two consecutive days. The purpose of the event is to allow the review team to scrutinise evidence, meet staff, students and other stakeholders (such as employers where appropriate) and thus test statements made in the self-evaluation, and to draw robust conclusion on the quality and standards of the provision.

SQC

School Quality Committees are responsible to the Faculty Quality Enhancement Committee for the maintenance of academic standards and the quality of student learning opportunities for taught programmes which lead to the awards or credit of the University.

Self-Evaluation

The periodic review is based on a self-evaluation prepared by the discipline. The self-evaluation is central to the review process and should be forward looking providing an analysis of the discipline in an internal (subject, faculty or institutional) and external (regulatory or the market) context clearly identifying any drivers that may have a future impact on the provision.

An effective self-evaluation is key to the discipline gaining substantial benefit from periodic review and to the smooth running of the review process and so, its preparation requires due time and attention.

Unistats

From 2008, the Unistats website will bring together authoritative, official information about higher education from universities and colleges in one place, in a way that is not available on any other website. HEFCE owns the Unistats websites and has contracted UCAS to manage the delivery and maintenance of these websites on its behalf.

UQEC

The University Quality Enhancement Committee is responsible to Academic Board for the maintenance of academic standards and the enhancement of the quality of student learning opportunities for all taught programmes which lead to the awards or credit of the University.

UQEC oversees the work of the Faculty Quality Enhancement Committees, and assists Academic Board in discharging the University's responsibilities as an awarding institution

Annex 6-A

Periodic Review Programme Information Template

Scope of review (subject areas):	
Faculty:	
School:	
Date of the Review Event:	

Programme Title[1]	Location of Delivery[2]	Overall Student Numbers			
		Full-time	Part-time	OLDL	FTE
Student numbers, totals					

Details of accreditation by a professional or statutory body	

Notes:

[1]   Please list award bearing programmes only. In some cases, this may be a composite programme incorporating a number of pathways.

[2]   Derby, other UK or overseas (please specify).

Annex 6-B

Nomination Form for **External** Review Panel Members

Scope of review:	
Faculty:	
School:	
Date of the Review Event:	

DETAILS OF PROPOSED EXTERNAL PANEL MEMBERS

Title:	
Surname:	
Forename(s):	
Position Held:	
Address for Correspondence:	
Telephone No:	
Email:	
Qualifications:	
Subject Expertise and Teaching Experience:	
Industrial Experience:	
Reasons for selection, including relevant experience pertinent to the review process:	
Any previous connection with the University of Derby	

FACULTY APPROVAL

Head of School to confirm:

- **Nomination approved**
- **Required authority obtained for nominee to be available for periodic review panels**

Signature of Head of School		**Date:**	

Please submit this form to LEI, 4th floor, South Tower, not less than **16 weeks** before the date of the review event. Once the nominations have been confirmed a formal invitation will be sent from the Faculty/UDC.

Annex 6-C

Self-Evaluation Template

The structure of the document should conform to the following headings:

a. Submission document coversheet

b. Programme Information Template (see Annex 6-A) – this provides summary information including identification of the Faculty and School(s) that have ownership of the programmes, names of the subjects to be reviewed, the date of review, a comprehensive list of the programmes under review, overall student numbers on programmes, indicating mode of study, location(s) where the subject is delivered, including partner colleges, and details of professional body accreditation (where applicable).

c. Contents page

INTRODUCTION

d. This section should provide a contextual overview of the provision outlining the discipline's **vision** and **strategy** for development. This section establishes the context for the discussion that follows. Suggested content:

–   Brief description of the development of the discipline and its location within the School/Faculty, and the national and international arena.

–   Highlight any links with professional bodies and employers.

–   Provide headline statistical data; for example total number of undergraduate and postgraduate students, number of full-time and part-time academic staff involved in teaching and supporting the provision, including names of discipline staff with key responsibilities.

–   Explain the School's strategy for the development of the discipline under review, locating both current and planned developments within the internal (School, Faculty, institutional) and external (market and regulatory) environments in which they operate. Opportunities for cross-Faculty or external collaborative partnerships should be discussed.

–   Outline the relationship of programmes and their aims to the University's broader strategic aims.

–   A brief outline of how the discipline team approached their critical appraisal; what evidence did it draw on, plus any consultation with students, internal faculties/departments and external stakeholders.

CORE THEME ONE – ACADEMIC STANDARDS

e. **CURRICULUM**

This section should present an **evidence-based analysis** of how the discipline area ensures the continuing appropriateness of the curriculum. This section should also consider how the development of the curriculum is meeting the **strategic** objectives of the Faculty and University. The evaluation should take into account the features of specialist programmes, such as Foundation Degree and those involved in collaborative, flexible and e-learning. Suggested content:

- Discuss the mechanisms for establishing the continuing appropriateness of the curriculum taking account of social inclusiveness.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of programme design and content detailing how both current and predicted developments in the markets which the discipline serves, or might serve in the future, have impacted or may impact on curriculum development.
- Explain how the external (regulatory and the market) drivers for change in the short to medium term is influencing the strategic development of the portfolio.
- Evaluate the extent to which curricular content and design are informed by recent developments in techniques of learning and teaching, current research, scholarship or consultancy and by any changes in relevant occupational or professional requirements.
- Explain how the views of external bodies such as the LTSN, professional bodies and employers are used to inform the curriculum.
- Outline the strategic priorities for the discipline in relation to academic and programme development, including cross-Faculty initiatives, collaborative partnerships giving a summary analysis of the threats and opportunities.

f. **ASSESSMENT**

This section should provide an evaluation of the **effectiveness** and **appropriateness** of the assessment strategy in providing students with the opportunity to achieve the aims and learning outcomes of the individual programmes. Explain how the assessment strategy takes account of student diversity. The evaluation should take into account the quality of experience achieved through work-based learning and professional practice as appropriate. This section should also discuss any significant action taken in response to issues raised by external examiners, internal moderation or other feedback processes. Suggested content:

- Evaluate the ways in which programme content and methods of assessment support achievement of the intended learning outcomes of the programme(s).
- Articulate how curricula and assessment together determine the academic level of the award(s) to which the programme(s) lead.
- Evaluate the ways in which employers and other professionals contribute to the development of assessment strategies, where appropriate.
- Analyse and evaluate the assessment strategies, policies, procedures and practices, including details on how these ensure rigour, consistency, fairness and developmental support for learning.
- Discuss any significant action taken in response to issues raised by external examiners, internal moderation or other feedback processes.
- Detail any innovative approaches to assessment that have been developed and what **further changes** might be required as a result of an analysis of both the internal (school, faculty or institutional) and external (regulatory or the market) environment.

g. **MANAGEMENT INFORMATION TRENDS**

This section will draw on the digest of data, drawn from programme monitoring data sets and produced by the Planning and Statistics Unit. This digest will cover enrolments, retention, student performance, graduate employment, composition of the student body. This may be supplemented with data from local sources if necessary. Qualitative illustration of student achievement is also useful. Suggested content:

- Analyse the levels of achievement for the provision over a period of not less than three years as indicated by the statistical data, identifying any significant issues or trends.
- Evaluate the mechanisms to prepare students effectively for their subsequent employment roles.
- Analyse and evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies employed to promote student retention and achievement.
- Identify any significant internal or external factors (positive or negative) that currently (or may in the future) have an impact on the provision.
- Areas of good practice that can be shared with other areas of the University.

CORE THEME TWO – QUALITY OF LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

h. **LEARNING AND TEACHING**

This section should **evaluate** the appropriateness and effectiveness of the learning and teaching arrangements in relation to the stated approach and how student learning is supported. Suggested content:

- Evaluate the effectiveness of the current teaching and learning arrangements identifying strengths and good practice worthy of wider dissemination, and the various opportunities and threats that might impact on the student learning experience.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the learning and teaching strategy in taking account of different student needs.
- Assess the impact of staff research, scholarship, practice and professional activity on the quality of learning and teaching.
- Evaluate the quality of learning experience achieved through work-based learning and/or practice placements.
- Assess the effectiveness of any innovative approaches to learning and teaching that have been developed (e.g. TQEF projects) and what further changes or innovation might be required as a result of an analysis of external (regulatory or market) developments. Flexible learning should be discussed and evaluated where applicable, for example arrangements for the delivery of modules or programmes online or via distributed learning.
- Discuss any significant action taken in response to issues raised by external examiners or other sources of feedback.
- Outline the discipline's **strategic priorities** in relation to learning and teaching giving a summary analysis of the threats and opportunities.

i. **STUDENT SUPPORT AND GUIDANCE**

This section should **evaluate** the development and effectiveness of **student support arrangements** including academic and pastoral support, provision of information such as programme and module handbooks, and the use of other media to support students. Particular attention should be paid to arrangements for international students, part-time, direct entry, e-learning and collaborative partner students. Where appropriate, evidence of engagement with the University's schemes and policies on equality and diversity may be presented and evaluated. Suggested content:

- Assess the appropriateness and effectiveness of the arrangements for recruitment, admission and induction, and the information provided to students. Where the review includes provision that is delivered in collaboration with a partner organisation(s) an evaluation of the shared arrangements for recruiting and supporting students must be included.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the academic and pastoral support provided and how consistent this is with the student profile and context of the provision within the discipline.
- Evaluate the multi-campus and e-learning arrangements (if applicable), identifying any risks (current or future) to the quality of learning opportunities.
- Comment on the effectiveness of the arrangements for staff and students to access central support services.
- Evaluate how practice placement or other work-base learning enhances employability as appropriate.
- Outline any **future changes** that might be required as a result of analysis of external (regulatory or market) developments and changing student needs, together with an assessment of risk.

j. **LEARNING RESOURCES**

This section should evaluate the adequacy of **human** and **physical** learning resources and the effectiveness of their utilisation. In particular, the evaluation should demonstrate a **strategic** approach to linking resources to curriculum planning, teaching and learning and staff development needs. Future resource requirements to maintain and enhance the quality and standards of the provision offered by the discipline and collaborative partner, if applicable, should be considered. Physical learning resources include local and central support such as Learning Centres, IT provision, specialist equipment, workshops, laboratories, general teaching accommodation. An analysis of staff development needs and the strategy and practice to support this should be discussed. The section should include an analysis of the external (regulatory and market) environment identifying any developments that could have an impact (positively or negatively) in the future on the adequacy of the resources to support the provision. Suggested content:

- Analyse the current staffing level (including collaborative partners) to support the provision (including the balance between permanent and support staff) and the impact of institutional practices and external marker conditions on future staff resources, staff recruitment and retention. Discuss how staff changes have been/are planned for and managed.
- Assess the adequacy of the relevant experience and expertise of teaching staff within the discipline and at collaborative partners to support the provision.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the arrangements to support new staff.

- Evaluate the adequacy and effectiveness of staff development opportunities including professional updating to keep abreast of emerging, relevant subject knowledge and technologies, and whether opportunities are taken.
- Discuss how academic research and scholarly activity is supported making reference to the Faculty's/areas strategy for research and knowledge transfer.
- Evaluate the adequacy (range and quantity) of physical learning resources (including collaborative partners) to support the provision identifying areas at risk and opportunities for development.
- Outline the School's/areas strategic priorities in relation to resource requirements, identifying risks to, and opportunities for, the development of the provision.

CORE THEME THREE – QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

k. This section should evaluate the effectiveness of the measures taken to maintain and enhance academic standards and the quality of the learning opportunities provided by the programmes under review. Consideration should be given to the use of **quantitative and qualitative feedback** from external examiners, students and other stakeholders in a strategy of enhancement and continuous improvement. Suggested content:

- Evaluate how well the internal and external mechanisms for assuring academic standards and quality are working. These will include School and Faculty Quality Committees, programme committees, annual monitoring, student evaluations (programme, institutional and National Student Survey) and feedback from external examiners, employers and PSRBs as appropriate.
- Assess to what extent there is a robust and understood framework in place for the effective monitoring and enhancement of quality and standards across all parts of the provision including flexible learning, collaborative partnerships and work-based learning.
- Outline the risks to, and opportunities for, quality management and enhancement that have been identified together with any actions taken or proposed.

SUMMARY OF GOOD PRACTICE, INNOVATIVE FEATURES AND ASSESSMENT OF RISK

l. This final section provides the opportunity for the discipline team to succinctly draw together the various strands within the self-evaluation to indicate any areas of innovation and/or examples of good practice that may be worthy of wider dissemination. This section also encourages the discipline team to reflect on the evaluation process and from this to arrive at an objective assessment of the key current and projected risks to the continuing health of the provision, clearly stating the actions taken or proposed to address the issues.

Annex 6-D

Reviewer Evidence Tracker Form

On the basis of your analysis of the self-evaluation and supporting evidence, note your comments for your allocated line of enquiry (LoE). For potential good practice, gaps, areas for clarification or potential development items, use a few words to indicate the point in question. For example, if the team was concerned that assessment criteria might not relate to learning outcomes or thought feedback to be well handled, you would insert a few words as in the 'gaps, clarifications' box. **Some examples are provided to assist you in completing the form.** Leave the last two columns blank in order to maintain a record of work undertaken and conclusions reached during the Periodic Review visit.

Line of enquiry	**Column 1:** Potential good practice to be followed up.	**Column 2:** Gaps, clarifications required or potential development items to be followed up.	**Column 3:** Evidence source (give clear reference)	**Column 4:** Further evidence sources needed (meeting, document, written response in advance etc)	**Column 5:** Outcome – Resolved? More evidence needed?	**Column 6:** Further documents/ information provided
LoE1 – Curriculum Design and Development						
1.1		*How is the design and organisation of the provision managed to support flexible delivery modes and study patterns such that it is 'responsive to the changing landscape'?*	*Self-evaluation (SE) para. 9*	*Meeting with staff; meeting with students; signpost relevant documentary evidence*		
1.2	*Staff development strategy*	*How does the School support staff in the development of the curriculum?*	*SE para. 15; Staff CVs*	*Meeting with staff; staff development records; School-based development programme of activities?*		
LoE2 – Assessment						
2.1	*WBL*	*How do you assess competency? Is breadth and depth tested? Are there examples of students creating theory from practice? What are the support mechanisms for practice?*	*SE, section 4, APR*	*Prog spec (Ad. Practice), eg's of assessments, prog. Handbook. Meeting staff and students.*		

LoE3 – Management Information Trends					
3.1		*How will the discipline balance the flexibility of the framework and sharing of modules between programmes, with that of cohort identity, consistent achievement and cohesive management?*	*SE para 9; Paper 3 p5; Paper 6 p8, p12; Paper 7 p4*	*Meetings with staff; signpost to relevant documentary evidence*	
3.2		*Given the flexibility of the new Post Graduate Framework, how will the school ensure that typical early indicators for further support to aid retention and achievement are embedded to retain high rates?*	*Paper 2 p13*	*Signpost to examples*	
LoE4 – Learning and Teaching					
4.1	*Learning and teaching projects*	*How are the findings used?* *How are staff made aware of this work?*	*SE, Programme monitoring report (Ref 23)*	*Examples. Staff meeting.*	
LoE5 – Student Support and Guidance					
5.1		*What measures are being taken to address variable retention rates across the postgraduate provision?*	*SE para. 39;*	*Meeting with staff; signpost relevant documentary evidence.*	
5.2		*How does the discipline team ensure consistency of practice in relation to the selection, training and support of mentors?*	*SE para. 40 and 41.*	*Meeting with staff; meeting students; meeting with mentors*	
LoE6 – Learning Resources					
6.1		*Move towards blended learning approach despite student opposition – would like to explore the level of opposition and how it can be improved to bring students on board*	*Paper 1 p29; paper 3 p9*	*Meeting with staff, meeting with students*	
6.2		*Room booking problems noted resulting in inefficient use of expensive resources. How serious is this problem?*	*Paper 3 p11*	*Meeting with staff, visit to see physical resources*	

LoE7 – Quality Management and Enhancement					
7.1		How is good practice both captured and disseminated so that this fosters enhancement?	SE para. 57; Doc 1	Meeting with staff; signpost to examples.	
7.2		Given the University's move to indefinite approval, how does the discipline assure itself of the currency of the provision and mitigate the risk of 'validated drift'?	SE para. 13; SE para. 57	Meeting with staff; signpost to relevant documentary evidence	

General Comments

Good Practice

Areas for Development

Annex 6-E

Periodic Review Report Template

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

State the following:

This report presents the findings of a review of the academic standards achieved, and the quality of the learning opportunities provided, in *<name of discipline>* programmes within the School of *<name of School>.*

The Periodic Review of *<name of School/subject(s)>* took place on *<date of review>.* As a result of its investigations, the Periodic Review Panel (the panel) considers that there can be **confidence** in the School of *<name of School>* discharge of its responsibilities for the management and delivery of the standards of the *<name of subject areas>* awards it offers. The panel concluded that the standards and quality of the programmes were being maintained in the light of relevant subject and professional benchmarks and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ). Students are achieving the intended learning outcomes. Practice in the programmes conforms to University requirements which are informed by the QAA Code of Practice. The panel also considers that there can be **confidence** in the School's discharge of its responsibilities for the management and assurance of the quality of learning opportunities it offers. The panel concluded that the programmes remain valid and reflect relevant subject and professional benchmarks and current developments within the discipline. Teaching, learning and assessment modes are enabling students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Good practice

State the following:

The panel has identified the following good practice for dissemination across the Faculty:

- *List the aspects of innovation and good practice, which were identified in the review.*

Recommendations

State the following:

The periodic review team reports that it is **essential** for the discipline to:

- [**bulleted list**]
- [**bulleted list - continue as necessary**]

[and/or…]

The periodic review team reports that it is **advisable** for the discipline to:

- [**bulleted list**]
- [**bulleted list - continue as necessary**]

[and/or…]

The Developmental engagement team also reports that it would be **desirable** for the College to:

- [**bulleted list**]
- [bulleted list - continue as necessary]

A   INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

State the following, modifying as appropriate:

1.   This report presents the finding of the Periodic Review of *<names of discipline>* located with the School of *<name of School>* and the Faculty of *<name of Faculty>*. The purpose of the review was to provide an assessment of how the School and discipline discharges its responsibilities for the management and delivery of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities available to students for programmes it delivers. More specifically, the review sought to:

    - Provide an opportunity for the consideration of the strategic context of the subject and its relationship with the strategies of the Faculty and the University.
    - Confirm the maintenance of academic standards and quality in the light of the QAA academic infrastructure and other relevant external reference points.
    - Assess current and future mechanisms for and to engage in dialogue about enhancing the student experience.
    - Identify good practice and innovation worthy of dissemination across the Faculty and the University.

2.   The review was carried out by *<names of external reviewers>,* external reviewers, *<name of internal reviewers>*, internal reviewers, and by *<name of review chair>,* review chair. The work of the panel was supported by *<name of servicing officer>*, servicing officer. External members of a Periodic Review panel are selected and ultimately approved by the University on the basis of their subject and pedagogic experience and expertise related to the programmes under consideration. A further criterion relates to level of independence they can bring to the review and so past or current external examiners are precluded from serving on the panel. External members are required to consider particularly, but not exclusively, matters relating to the curriculum, teaching, learning and assessment, and standards in relation to external benchmarks.

3.   The Periodic Review panel (the panel) conducted the review in negotiation with the *<name of School>* in accordance with the University's Periodic Review procedures as contained within the Periodic Review Handbook. The first stage of the process took the form of an initial evaluation of the submitted documentation, with the panel particularly drawing on the self-evaluation to identify lines of enquiry and subsequent meetings with staff and students. Evidence in support of the Periodic Review included documentation supplied by the Faculty (appendix I); meetings with staff (appendix II) and students (appendix III); reports from external examiners and professional bodies. The review was conducted on *<insert dates of the review>*.

4.   *<Names of discipline>* is located within the School of *<name of School>*, which is one of *<number>* Schools comprising the Faculty of *<name of Faculty>*. The School consists of *<number>* disciplines; *<names of disciplines>* that provide a wide range of programmes. *<Name of discipline>* currently accounts for *<number>*% of the School's/Faculty's students and *<number>*% of its income. *<Name of discipline>* has a current establishment of *<number>* academic staff, employs around *<number>* Associate Lecturers (sessional staff), *<number>* visiting research professors/fellows and a range of specialist and vocational consultants. In the academic year *<year of review>*, there are *<number>* full-time, *<number>* part-time and *<number>* e-learning students enrolled on undergraduate and postgraduate programmes.

5.   The following programmes were included in the review:

<List the currently and newly validated programmes together with any proposed future developments. Indicate programmes that are delivered in collaboration with another institution and/or via e-learning>

B   ACADEMIC STANDARDS

Comment on matters revealed in the Review relating to academic standards. This will include reference to good practice and areas requiring action in terms of:

Curriculum
Assessment
Achievement

NB Reference should be made to any relevant numbered recommendations and good practice indicated earlier in the report.

C   QUALITY OF LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

Comment on matters revealed in the Review relating to learning opportunities. This will include reference to good practice and areas requiring action in terms of:

Learning and Teaching
Student Support and Guidance
Learning Resources

NB Reference should be made to any relevant numbered recommendations and good practice stated earlier in the report.

D   QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

Comments on matters revealed in the Review relating to the current and future arrangements for the maintenance and enhancement of standards and quality. This will include reference to good practice and areas requiring action in terms of:

The maintenance and enhancement of standards and quality in the subject(s)

NB Reference should be made to any relevant numbered recommendations stated earlier in the report.

APPENDIX 1
Provide a list of the documentation used in the Review

APPENDIX 2
State the names and titles of all academic and support staff who were met as part of the review

APPENDIX 3
State the state the programme titles and levels from which students were met. Do not state student names. Also if e-learning students were unable to attend a meeting, the mechanism for communication with these students should be noted

APPENDIX 4 (Optional)
State the names and titles of any other stakeholders were met e.g. staff from collaborative institutions, employers etc.