

PERIODIC REVIEW HANDBOOK

Periodic review process approved	December 2009
Approved by	Academic Quality and Standards Committee
Department responsible	Academic Services
Date of last revision to handbook	June 2015

CONTENTS

		Page
Section 1: Introduction and Purpose		
1.1	Introduction	3
1.2	Purpose	3
1.3	Modifications proposed through periodic review	4
Section 2: Process		
2.1	Establishing the scope of periodic reviews	5
2.2	On completion of scoping of periodic reviews	5
2.3	Composition of periodic review panel	6
2.4	Documentation for periodic review	7
2.5	Preparation timeline	7
Section 3: Event		
3.1	Meetings and attendees	8
3.2	Indicative programmes	9
3.3	Learning resources tour	10
3.4	Minerva demonstration	10
Section 4: Outcome and follow-up		
4.1	Outcome of review	11
4.2	Review report	11
4.3	Action plan and response to conditions, recommendations and good practice	11
4.4	Twelve month follow-up activity	12
Section 5: Practicalities		
5.1	External panel members	13
5.2	Practical arrangements for review	13
Annexes:		
1	Self-evaluation document (SED)	14
2	Student written submission (SWS)	18
3	Documentation for periodic review	19
4	Preparation timeline	20
5	Role of review panel members	21
6	Nomination form – external panel member, with guidance on selection	23
7	Action plan/response to periodic review	25

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

1.1 Introduction:

The University's process for periodic review is approved by the Academic Quality & Standards Committee (AQSC), which considers reports, action plans and themes resulting from periodic reviews. Periodic reviews normally operate on a six-yearly cycle, with a schedule of reviews approved periodically by AQSC and published on the Academic Services A-Z webpage¹ (see section on Periodic Reviews).

The periodic review process is reviewed on a regular basis, with revisions informed at a national level by sector developments and at a local level through evaluations undertaken by Academic Services to ensure it is fit for purpose. Through a robust mapping exercise, the University can be reassured that the process meets the expectation of the Quality Assurance Agency² (QAA) UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Chapter B8: Programme Monitoring and Review which requires that:

Higher Education providers have effective procedures in place to routinely monitor and periodically review programmes”.

The Academic Services team is responsible for the organisation and management of periodic reviews, working closely with the subject teams under review. For scheduling purposes, reviews are initially grouped using the Joint Academic Coding System (JACS)³ – section 2.1 provides more information about the process for determining the scope of individual reviews.

1.2 Purpose:

From a University perspective, periodic review provides a mechanism for the continuing approval of existing provision, together with an opportunity to review and consider incremental modifications that have been made since the last periodic review. It provides assurance to the University of the following:

- Academic standards
- Quality of learning opportunities
- Student experience
- Currency and relevance in relation to the discipline, sector and profession
- Alignment with national and European expectations
- Coherence with the University's strategic priorities
- That the process meets the expectation of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Chapter B8: Programme Monitoring and Review.

From a subject perspective, periodic review process provides an opportunity for programme teams to consider the provision against a number of factors:

- Coherence with external reference points, for example:
 - UKQC Chapter B8: Programme monitoring and review
 - UKQC Chapter B1: Programme design and approval
 - Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies⁴
 - QAA Subject Benchmark Statements⁵
 - Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ENQA)⁶

¹ [Quality and Standards, A-Z](#)

² [QAA UK Quality Code, Chapter B8: Programme Monitoring and Review](#)

³ [Joint Academic Coding System](#)

⁴ [Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies](#)

⁵ [QAA Subject Benchmark Statements](#)

- Professional Statutory Regulatory Bodies (PSRB)⁷
- Compatibility and alignment with internal reference points, for example:
 - University's strategic priorities
 - Home School's strategic plan and resource planning
- Quality of student experience and parity across locations of delivery (where relevant), for example:
 - Learning and teaching methods
 - Diversity of assessment that encourages and enables achievement of learning outcomes
 - Learning resources
 - Equality of opportunity
 - Staff development and scholarly activity
- Effective use of information, for example:
 - External examiners' reports, annual monitoring reports, module evaluations
 - Student progression and achievement data
 - Destination of Leavers in Higher Education (DLHE)
 - National Student Survey (NSS) and Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES)
 - Staff-Student Liaison meetings

1.3 Modifications proposed through periodic review

Periodic review provides programme teams with an opportunity for reflection and, if desired, a platform to propose revisions to existing provision. Revisions may have been identified through feedback from a variety of stakeholders, for example completion of module evaluations by students and through external examiners' reports, as well as developments in the relevant subject area and sector. Modifications may also result from changes to staffing and their expertise.

Programme teams are encouraged to consult at an early stage with Academic Services for advice regarding the extent of any modifications proposed to ensure that the correct process is followed. For example, modifications of a fairly minor nature can be dealt with through revised student handbooks with an explanatory overview in the self-evaluation document (SED). However, where more major modifications are proposed, then the designated internal stakeholders for programme approval will need to be consulted which should include circulation of documentation such as rationale for modification, revised module descriptors and student handbook. This consultation should be undertaken well in advance of the review, allowing time for adjustment of documentation based on stakeholder comments, and the production of a summary of stakeholder feedback together with a response from the programme team/s.

Programme team/s are encouraged to consult with the Head of Employability and Enterprise/Careers Team at an early stage in the discussions concerning programme revisions, who will be able to provide helpful guidance in particular around the 'Skills for Life and Work' intended learning outcomes and achievement of Graduate Attributes.

⁶ [Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European HE Area](#)

⁷ [QAA UK Quality Code, Chapter B1: Programme design and approval \(Indicator 5\)](#)

SECTION 2: PROCESS

2.1 Establishing scope of periodic reviews

Academic Services will make initial contact with lead members of staff involved in forthcoming reviews, usually in the spring or summer term of the academic year prior to the year of review. Section 1.1 outlines the initial grouping of reviews by JACS code for scheduling purposes.

Where the number of programmes proposed within the JACS coding group is both discipline-appropriate and manageable, a single review event will be the most likely approach. However, where the programmes proposed within the JACS coding group involves a large number and discipline-varied set of programmes, the periodic review process would be neither constructive nor manageable for either the subject team or review panel. In such cases, Academic Services will initiate discussion at an early stage with lead members of programme teams and Deans of Schools to establish the grouping of programmes into manageable reviews. Where the review is likely to exceed three days, consideration will be given to separation of awards into individual events within the same academic year.

When determining the scope of events, areas for consideration might include:

- Programmes that complement one another and where there may be student collaboration across programmes.
- Where there is progression to further study onto an award within a set of programmes.
- Collaborative provision at partners for which the subject area has responsibility and where there is a named progression route onto a BSU award.
- The optimum use of external panel members, for example where external expertise may be used across a number of programmes. It would be an inappropriate use of external panel members' time where the diversity of programmes under review was such that they could not reasonably be expected to contribute to discussion.
- Most efficient use of staff resources involved in preparation for and attendance at reviews.
- Academic Services will take into account the management and practical arrangements for reviews, for example where travel to a number of delivery locations may be required.

2.2 On completion of scoping of periodic reviews

Following discussions with lead members of programme team/s regarding scope and number of reviews, Academic Services will allocate review dates. Factors such as University term dates, and those of partner providers where appropriate, and the University's grid meetings will be taken into consideration when scheduling reviews. It should be noted that scheduling of grid meetings does not take place until late spring. Programme team/s will normally be advised of review dates towards the latter part of the summer term of the academic year prior to the year of review.

Where a review involves partner provision, it is the responsibility of the BSU programme team/s to lead in informing the partner of dates and documentary requirements for the review. The programme team/s should continue to liaise with the partner throughout the process, which includes responsibility for forwarding required documentation to Academic Services. Academic Services will be responsible for practical arrangements at the partner, see point 5.2.

Academic Services is responsible for drawing up the draft review programme and will consult with lead members of programme team/s. Whilst each review will largely follow the same format, there will be some variance based on the scope of each review. See section 3.2 for a sample programme. More details regarding the types of meetings that may be included in reviews can be found at section 3.1. Reviews will vary in duration, depending on the number of programmes to be

considered and whether travel to other delivery locations is involved.

2.3 Composition of periodic review panel

Academic Services will co-ordinate composition of the review panel, which will normally include the following:

Review panel member	Criteria	Nominated by
Chair	Head of Department, BSU from a different School	Academic Services
Internal panel member	From an unrelated subject area, BSU	Academic Services
Suitably qualified student ⁸	From an unrelated subject area, BSU	Academic Services
Internal panel member and programme representative	From the subject areas under review, BSU	Programme team/s
External academic panel member (see below)	With expertise in the subject area and quality assurance experience	Programme team/s
External employer/industry panel member (see below)	From a related industry	Programme team/s
Review Secretary	Academic Services, BSU	Academic Services
Head of Quality may be in attendance or available for advice		

The nomination form and guidance on the role of review panel members can be located at annex 5.

Nomination of external panel members

Nomination of external panel members is the responsibility of the programme team/s and should be undertaken as soon as possible once the date of the review has been determined. Normally there will be at least two external members of the panel (one academic and one industry/employer), however there should be prior consultation with Academic Services to determine the number of externals required, with careful consideration given to the diversity of subject areas. The nomination forms can be found on the Quality and Standards A-Z webpage, and completed forms should be forwarded to academicervices@bathspa.ac.uk no later than three months prior to the review. Academic Services can provide advice on nominations, if required.

Responsibility for consideration and approval of nominations for external panel member is delegated by AQSC to the Head of Quality. A number of factors are taken into consideration in terms of suitability of nominees such as appropriate expertise in the subject area or relevant industry and, in the case of external academic panel members, experience in quality assurance processes. It is helpful if nominations can be submitted simultaneously so that the Head of Quality can be assured that approval of nominees will result in a review panel with a balance of expertise. When making nominations, programme team/s are encouraged to ensure nominees have sufficient and varied academic or professional credibility, depending on whether they are academic or industry/employer nominees, and be mindful of any conflicts of interest.

⁸ This will normally be a current member of the Student Representatives Committee

A fee of £150 per day of attendance at the review is payable to external panel members and the student panel member, plus an additional £150 is payable in recognition of time set aside for reading documentation for the review. Travel and subsistence expenses will also be reimbursed. Academic Services will be responsible for processing payment of fees and expenses.

2.4 Documentation for periodic review:

The primary documents will be the self-evaluation document (SED) prepared by the programme team/s and the student written submission (SWS) prepared by students. With the exception of these two documents, the review panel will endeavour to make use of existing documentation as far as possible. Details of the documentation required for reviews, together with guidance on the required content of the SED and SWS can be found at annexes 1 and 2. A list of required documentation can be found at annex 3.

The documentation provides the review panel with a comprehensive introduction to the programmes included in the review. Discussion at meetings at the time of the review will complement the documentation and provide an opportunity for further exploration and understanding of the programmes under review.

Documentation should be forwarded to Academic Services on a USB stick no later than eight weeks prior to the review, using a consistent document-naming method such that it is clear what each document is. There is no requirement for hard copies of documentation. Academic Services will host the documentation on a secure area of the University's Wiki, which will be accessible to all panel members. Documentation will be made available to the review panel no later than six weeks prior to the review event.

After initial reading of the documentation, panel members are requested to provide comments using a template provided by Academic Services. Annex 5 gives guidance on the role and particular focus of panel members, although panel members are welcome to comment on areas in addition to those indicated in the guidance section. These comments should include areas for consideration and further discussion at meetings, as well an opportunity to celebrate good practice and enhancement. Panel members will be given a deadline for return of the completed template, to enable collation of all comments in readiness for the pre-meet of the local panel members (see 4 below).

2.5 Preparation timeline

Annex 4 indicates the sequence of events leading up to and after periodic review, with expected timescales and responsibilities. Academic Services will provide a bespoke schedule for each review once review dates are set.

SECTION 3: REVIEW MEETINGS

3.1 Meetings and attendees

a) Pre-meeting of local panel members

Approximately two weeks prior to the review local panel members, including the internal panel member representing the programme team/s, will meet to review comments provided by all panel members. At this meeting those present will consider key areas identified by the panel to be explored through discussion at review meetings with programme team/s and students. This meeting will provide an opportunity to establish panel members' responsibilities with regard to discussion at review meetings.

The outcome of the pre-meeting will be a draft agenda produced by Academic Services which will indicate the areas the panel wish to pursue at review meetings as well as areas of good practice that the panel would like to hear about in more detail. Once the draft agenda has been drawn up, it will be shared with the review panel and programme team/s prior to the review. The draft agenda is indicative of areas for discussion at meetings, but does not preclude additional questions as deemed appropriate by the panel. At this point, the panel may request additional documents to be made available at the review event.

b) Private panel meetings

At intervals during the review the panel will have private meetings to review discussion at programme team/student meetings, and identify areas where clarification may be required at forthcoming meetings. At the final private meeting, the panel will review discussion from all meetings held with the programme team/s and students, together with supporting documentation and formulate outcomes from the review (see also in this section: *Final private panel meeting*).

c) Programme team meetings

There will be at least one meeting with the programme team/s at which the panel will explore areas identified from the initial reading of documentation, as indicated on the draft agenda circulated to the programme team/s in advance of the review. Normally there will be a second meeting with the programme team/s, once the meeting with students has taken place, at which there may be additional areas that the panel wish to explore. In addition a second meeting with the programme team/s may be necessary as there may have been insufficient time at the first meeting.

Academic Services can provide guidance on attendance at programme team/s meetings. It is suggested that a representative mix of staff should attend, including part-time and hourly paid staff. The draft agenda provided after the pre-meeting of local panel members will help programme team/s in deciding which members of staff are best placed to attend and provide clarification in the areas identified for discussion. It is advisable to be selective in fielding staff who can make a significant contribution to the discussion rather than field a larger number of staff who may not have the opportunity to speak at the meeting/s.

A list of members of staff attending programme team meetings, together with job titles, should be forwarded to Academic Services no later than one week prior to the review.

d) Student meeting

At the outset, the Chair of the panel will assure students that their responses will be treated confidentially and anonymously, and that the review report will not attribute comments to named students to encourage them to answer openly and honestly. In most cases a face-to-face meeting is the usual and preferred forum for the panel to meet students on the programme/s and programme

team/s are encouraged to follow this method. However, there may be circumstances where this is not practical or possible, for example where students are on work-based programmes or for geographical reasons such as distance learning. Academic Services will work with the programme team to identify a method for the student voice to be heard, this might be through telephone contact, either individually or conference call, or circulation of pre-review questionnaires.

As well as areas that may be highlighted in the SWS, the panel will wish to ask students about their student experience, which might include: assessment, feedback, academic and pastoral experience, effectiveness of the student voice, usefulness of documentation, and learning resources.

Academic Services can provide guidance on attendees at the student meeting, which should not normally exceed ten students. There should be representation from each programme, to include part-time, full-time and mature students, alumni are also welcome to attend. A list of students attending the meeting should be forwarded to Academic Services no later than one week before the review; the list should include detail of name of student, programme, and level of study.

It should be noted that the internal panel member representing the programme team/s does not attend the student meeting.

e) Final private panel meeting

At the final private panel meeting, the panel will discuss and consider:

1. Approval of the programme/s being reviewed, together with approval of any revisions proposed and the period for which the approval applies.
2. Whether any mandatory conditions apply to the decision for approval, and when the conditions must be met. The Chair is responsible for ensuring conditions have been satisfactorily met.
3. Recommendations that are desirable, but do not directly affect academic standards.
4. Commending areas of good practice and enhancement.

f) Feedback meeting to programme team/s

The Chair of the panel will deliver the outcome of the review at the feedback meeting, initially informing whether the programme/s have been approved and for what period. The Chair will read out the areas of good practice and enhancement identified by the panel, together with conditions that may have been set as part of the approval and recommendations identified. Where approval is subject to conditions, the Chair will also advise of the date by which conditions must be met.

The Chair will advise that Academic Services will forward precise wording of the outcomes delivered at the feedback meeting to the lead programme team/s member, normally within two working days of the feedback meeting.

Attendance at the feedback meeting is at the discretion of the programme team/s. Academic Services can provide guidance if required.

3.2 Indicative programme

The duration of the review and type of meetings to be held will depend on the scope of the review; examples of programmes are below. Academic Services will forward the programme to the programme team/s in good time to allow for arrangement of teaching cover for those attending meetings with the panel.

Indicative programme for BSU based provision (exact timings may vary depending on scope of review)		
Day	Time	Meeting
DAY 1	0900-1045	Private meeting of review panel
	1045-1100	Break
	1100-1245	Meeting with programme team/s
	1245-1400	Private meeting of review panel, to include lunch
	1400-1500	Meeting with students
	1500-1545	Tour of learning resources
	1545-1615	Break
	1615-1730	Private meeting of review panel
DAY 2	0900-1000	Private meeting of review panel
	1000-1015	Break
	1015-1145	Meeting with programme team/s
	1145-1200	Break
	1200-1500	Private review meeting to discuss outcome of review, good practice, conditions and recommendations, to include lunch
	1500-1530	Feedback to programme team/s

Indicative programme for partner based provision, which will be incorporated into programme for BSU based provision (exact timings may vary)		
Day	Time	Meeting
DAY X	0900-1030	Arrive at Newton Park, then travel to <i>-name of partner-</i>
	1030-1100	Break
	1100-1200	Meeting with students
	1200-1330	Private meeting of review panel (to include lunch)
	1330-1430	Meeting with programme team/s
	1430-1515	Tour of learning resources
	1515-1600	Private meeting of review panel
	1600-1730	Return to Newton Park

3.3 Learning resources tour

The programme will allow time for a tour of learning resources, which might include resources such as the Library, studios, laboratories, specialist teaching facilities, and performance areas. Where the review involves provision at partner providers, the review panel will tour learning resources when visiting the partner. There should be prior discussion with Academic Services to determine the nature of the learning resources tour, in particular whether there are specialist resources to view so that additional time can be factored into the programme to allow for this. It is the responsibility of the programme team to liaise with their Subject Librarian with regard to the expected time that the panel will visit the Library.

3.4 Minerva demonstration

Some programme team/s may wish to demonstrate use of Minerva with the review panel, if this is the case please let Academic Services know so that time can be factored into the programme. Where this is the case, it is usual for the Minerva demonstration to around the same time as the learning resources tour which will be allocated additional time.

SECTION 4: OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP

4.1 Outcome of review

At the final review meeting the Chair will provide feedback on the outcome of the review to the programme team/s, informing whether the programmes have been re-approved which may include revisions proposed by programme team/s through the review process.

The outcome of the review may include the following:

- *Conditions*

Areas of concern identified by the panel that may place the University or programme/s at risk. Conditions set must be met to the satisfaction of the panel within the timescale specified.

- *Recommendations*

Issues identified by the panel that do not necessarily place the University or programme/s at risk, but which the panel has good reason to think should be met in order to, for example, mitigate a weakness or enhance an area of the programme/s. There is an expectation that recommendations will be met, unless programme team/s can offer good reason to the contrary.

- *Good Practice and Enhancement*

Areas identified by the panel as being worthy of individual mention that are considered to make a positive contribution to the provision and student learning experience, and that may be worthy of wider dissemination.

Please note that it is the responsibility of the programme team/s to advise relevant BSU staff (for example Student Services, Bath Spa CareerHub) of any modifications made to provision through periodic review, including subsequent modifications through the action plan, to ensure that institutional records are updated accordingly, for example introduction of new amended modules onto SITS.

4.2 Review report

Academic Services will provide the Secretary for the review who will write the review report. The content of the report will be based on discussion at all meetings and documentation or information provided. Following approval of the report by the Chair, it will be circulated to all members of the panel for confirmation that it is a true reflection of the review event. At this stage the draft report will be forwarded to the lead programme team/s member for confirmation of factual accuracy normally within a month of the review. It is the responsibility of the lead programme team member to share the draft report with partner providers, where the review has involved collaborative provision. Following approval by all members of the panel and confirmation of factual accuracy by the programme team/s and partner providers where appropriate, the final step is for the report to be considered at AQSC and received at the relevant School Board.

4.3 Action plan and response to conditions, recommendations and good practice

An action plan (annex 7) detailing the programme team/s response to the outcome of the review and the advice contained in the body of the report should be forwarded to Academic Services within the timescale advised at the feedback meeting and in the review report. The response and, where appropriate, revised documentation will be considered by delegated members of the panel, which will be decided at the review event, to ensure it satisfactorily meets the outcomes of the review. Where the report makes suggestions or provides advice within the body of the report that do not constitute conditions or recommendations, then the response should also address these. Where the

review involves partner provision a separate action plan should be provided by each partner provider, for submission with the action plan for BSU based provision.

The action plan/s will normally be considered by the relevant School Board before submission to Academic Services for receipt at AQSC.

4.4 Twelve month follow-up activity

A review of follow-up activity will be undertaken twelve months after the periodic review. The action plan previously completed should be utilised for this purpose, with revisions to demonstrate progress made in achievement of conditions, addressing recommendations and suggestions/advice within the body of the report. As noted in 4.3 separate action plans are required from each partner provider where partner provision is involved, for submission with the revised action plan for BSU based provision. The revised action plan/s will be received by AQSC, normally with prior approval by School Board.

SECTION 5: PRACTICAL

5.1 External panel members:

Nomination of external panel members is the responsibility of the programme team/s, see 2.3. Once nominations for external panel members have been approved by the Head of Quality who has delegated responsibility from AQSC for their approval, Academic Services will be responsible for future contact with externals, including arrangements such accommodation, parking, relevant IT permissions for access to the Wiki and payment of fees/expenses.

Expenses and fees: Forms for reimbursement of expenses and payment of fees will be issued by Academic Services.

5.2 Practical arrangements for the review:

Academic Services will be responsible for booking of rooms, catering, technical equipment and name plates. As mentioned in 3.1 (points c and d), it is the responsibility of the programme team/s to advise Academic Services of attendees at these meetings.

Where reviews include partner providers, Academic Services will liaise with partner staff to make the practical arrangements listed above.

ANNEX I SELF-EVALUATION DOCUMENT (SED)

General

The SED is central to the review process and should provide an evidence-based evaluation of the provision being reviewed. Where the review comprises only BSU based provision, then one SED is required covering all provision. Where reviews comprise BSU based and partner provision, there are two approaches to presentation of the SED. The preferred approach is to provide an integrated SED, which considers both BSU based and partner provision. The alternative is for separate SEDs; one that covers BSU based provision which should acknowledge any provision with partners, with accompanying individual SEDs from each partner provider. All SEDs, including those provided by partners, should normally be considered by the relevant BSU School Board prior to submission to Academic Services.

When writing the SED, it is important to consider that it will be read by a varied audience; for example the panel will be made up of academic staff from within and outside BSU, a current BSU student, and industry/employer specialists some of whom may have limited familiarity with BSU and higher education. It is, therefore, helpful to include a glossary of acronyms, such as FHEQ, DLHE, NSS and those of a more subject-specific nature.

Stakeholder consultation

The SED should be prepared in consultation with members of the programme team/s, current students and, where possible, former students. It is also recommended that relevant stakeholders are consulted who can offer guidance around content of the SED, in particular where it relates to a specific area of responsibility and interest. It is helpful to record in the SED where consultation has taken place and with whom. As a minimum, stakeholders should include:

- Director of Library Services
- Head of Enterprise & Employability (please see section 1.3)
- Head of Learning & Teaching
- Registrar
- Deputy Registrar (Academic)
- Vice-Provost (Research & Graduate Affairs) – where the review includes postgraduate taught provision
- Students - current and past
- External examiner/s

Content of the SED

When compiling the SED, the recommended approach would be for a structure of one-third reflection and two-thirds forward-thinking. The SED should be factual rather than descriptive, referring to sources of evidence that will complement information in the SED and avoid duplication.

1 Context:

1.1 Programmes included in the review and detail such as:

- Award title and programme leader
- Mode of delivery: full-time, part-time, distance-learning
- Location of delivery: BSU or partner
- Revisions that are being proposed through review and academic year these will be effective from
- Overview of revisions made since last review, including approval of new programmes

- 1.2 Outline of the provision and fit with BSU, School and partner (where appropriate) strategy:
- A snapshot of the provision, including that with partners, with regard to its place within the School structure and how it aligns with the objectives of the School strategy.
 - Alignment with the University's Vision and Strategy.
 - An outline of any planned developments that have been identified specifically to foster and/or strengthen alignment with strategies.
 - Opportunities for international engagement, from a student and staff perspective.
- 1.3 The provision - current and future:
- Characteristics and focus of the provision, which might helpfully include some historical information, such as when programmes were approved, details of any professional accreditation, formal engagement with employers.
 - Aims of each programme.
 - Development of the curriculum since the last periodic review, including revisions made through minor modifications or programme re-approval and details of new programmes approved.
 - An outline of revisions to programmes that are included for consideration by the review panel and what has informed them.
 - Developments identified for the future of the provision and what has informed them, with detail of how and when these will be taken forward.
- 2 Core facts:
In writing this section Programme team/s should make use of available resources which might include centrally produced data such as that produced for annual monitoring reports, together with subject-specific or local data.
- Students*
- 2.1 Reflective narrative on the student profile; such as FTE, entry profile and demographics, ethnicity, disability, age, and gender.
- 2.2 Reflective narrative on student recruitment, progression, retention and achievement and how this compares across BSU and the sector. This should include reference to National Student Survey results and Destination of Leavers in Higher Education data, and your response to the results of these surveys. Information on actions proposed to address areas that may require attention should be included.
- Staff*
- 2.3 A list of staff members, their job title (for example Subject Leader for XX) which should link to the relevant staff member's profile on the University's [Staff Profiles](#) web page. It is helpful to record a statement about staff involvement with committees and groups, such as membership of Learning & Teaching Committee, Collaborative Provision Committee and other University committees to demonstrate engagement at an institutional level. It is important to ensure that staff profiles on the web page are up to date so that the panel have access to current information.
- Resources*
- 2.4 Evaluative comments on the resources available to support the provision and the ways in which such resources are utilised for teaching and learning and in the improvement of the student experience. This might include Library provision, specialist facilities such as laboratories, studios, and digital/technical suites, equipment, performance studios etc. The panel will focus on the ways that available resources contribute to students' learning

experience, but will also be interested to learn about the strategic management of resources.

- 2.5 Use of e-learning, including the University's virtual learning environment, Minerva, highlighting areas of innovative use.
- 2.6 The opportunities available to students with regard to wider central and pastoral services, for example careers and welfare, and the methods in place to ensure students are aware of the support available to them through these channels.
- 3 Evaluation:
This section is an opportunity to show-case the provision, highlighting where there has been success and how this can be demonstrated. It should also acknowledge where plans did not go as well as expected, together with remedial action proposed or already in place.
- 4 The provision:
 - 4.1 *Aims and outcomes:*
Levels of the aims and learning outcomes are appropriate and relevant, with progression evident through levels and with due reference to FHEQ, Subject Benchmark Statements and professional/accreditation requirements (if applicable).
 - 4.2 *Curriculum and development:*
Methods in place to inform development of the curriculum to ensure currency and relevance, and assurance that the integrity of the programme aims and outcomes are maintained. This might include feedback from external examiners, current students/alumni, staff-student meetings, industry/employer engagement, module evaluations, and NSS/DLHE data. It is helpful to include how changes to the curriculum are monitored to evaluate their success.
 - 4.3 *Assessment and feedback:*
An explanation of the assessment strategy, how it encourages a flexible and inclusive approach, and the achievement of learning outcomes. You should include a summary of the variety of assessment methods used and how the programme team/s can be confident that students are satisfied with the range of assessment methods.
 - 4.4 *Methods of feedback should be clarified, both formal and informal.*
An explanation of the variety and effectiveness of feedback methods, and evidence of how this is evaluated, for example external examiner's report and module evaluations.
 - 4.5 *Quality of learning opportunities:*
Methods/variety of teaching and learning used; how its effectiveness is evaluated to inform future practice, responsiveness to the range of students' abilities; support for staff development including peer review.
 - 4.6 *Student support and documentation:*
The range of academic and pastoral support services that is available to students and the methods used to ensure student awareness. Quality of information that is provided to students, such as student and module handbooks, and methods in place to provide assurance that students value them.

- 4.7 *Research, scholarly activities and professional practice:*
Assess the opportunities for and impact of staff research, scholarship, and professional activity/development in underpinning the provision.
- 5 Collaborative Provision/Managing HE provision with others:
An overview of the partner provision, including link tutor activity and engagement with partners, opportunities for partner involvement in BSU activities, for example staff development, research seminars, School/Department away days and work placements.
- 6 Collaboration with the wider community
Opportunities for engagement with the wider community, which might include work placement (if not included in section 5 above), guest speakers from industry, and field-trips.
- 7 Learning resources:
Resources available for students, which might include specialist facilities that the review panel can view in the learning resources tour during the review. Information on management of capital expenditure of resources.
- 8 Quality assurance and enhancement:
Assurance of engagement with established BSU quality processes, together with information on School/subject-level processes. Opportunities for student engagement in feedback to programme teams, and how outcomes are fed back to students, for example module evaluations, staff-student liaison committee, 'You said, we did'.
- 9 Equality of opportunity:
Information on how you ensure equality of opportunity for all students to accommodate a varied student profile, and how the impact of measures in place is evaluated.

Examples of SEDs can be found in the Academic Services Wiki area, at this link - [SED examples](#).

ANNEX 2
STUDENT WRITTEN SUBMISSION (SWS)

The University encourages the engagement of students in its quality management processes and the provision of an SWS for the review provides an excellent opportunity. As well as hearing from students who are invited to attend meetings with the review panel, the panel welcomes the opportunity to hear from a larger representation of students. It is essential that the SWS is the work of the students, and is representative of the majority of students.

The format of the SWS can be decided by the students; however the most popular and simplest format is by way of a SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats). Through this format students can comment on what went well, what might change and developments they would wish to see. Whilst it should be emphasised that the SWS should be student-driven, the SWOT method may be unfamiliar to some students and therefore a brief explanation by staff may be necessary. It is helpful if the SWS can be broken down by programme and, if possible, level although it is acknowledged this level of detail may not be possible or practical. Student Academic Representatives are encouraged to facilitate production of the SWS and, if they wish, can seek advice from members of the programme team/s on how to present the information. It is important that students do not consider the SWS to be an onerous task such that students are unwilling to contribute.

Where the SWOT approach is chosen, students may wish to follow this format:

PROGRAMME NAME	
LEVEL X	
Strengths • •	Weaknesses • •
Opportunities • •	Threats • •
LEVEL X	
Strengths • •	Weaknesses • •
Opportunities • •	Threats • •
LEVEL X	
Strengths • •	Weaknesses • •
Opportunities • •	Threats • •

ANNEX 3
DOCUMENTATION FOR PERIODIC REVIEW

Provided by Programme Team/s
Self-evaluation document
Student handbook/s – these should be the version/s that include any revisions being proposed through periodic review and include module descriptors
Sample of module evaluations and any analysis that may have been undertaken
Student submission (if preferred this can be submitted direct to Academic Services)
Provided by School Professional Services
Subject-level and School-level annual monitoring reports for last three years
Staff-Student Liaison meeting minutes for last three years
Provided by Academic Services
External examiner reports and XRFs for last three years
Most recent report from Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body (or equivalent)
Link to 'You said, We did', or similar which demonstrates response to student voice

ANNEX 4
PREPARATION TIMELINE

Timescale	Action
May/June of academic year before review	Academic Services will contact programme team/s to determine scope of review
Late in summer term in academic year prior to year of review	Academic Services schedules review dates and notifies programme teams
After review date set, ideally 6 months before review	Meet with Academic Services to discuss arrangements for review, with guidance on documentation, external panel members, programme (including whether Minerva demonstration is required)
No later than 3 months before review	Programme team/s to submit nomination forms for external panel members Academic Services.
Timing to be decided by programme teams, but no later than 12 weeks prior to review	Programme team/s to circulate self-evaluation document to relevant internal members of staff (see guidance on SED annex 1, section on <i>Stakeholder consultation</i>)
Timing to be decided by programme team	Approval of SED at School Board before submission to Academic Services
8 weeks to review	Programme team/s submit SED, SWS and USB stick containing documentation to Academic Services
6/7 weeks to review	Academic Services hosts documentation available to review panel
3 weeks to review	Review panel forward comments to Academic Services using template provided
2 weeks to review	Academic Services co-ordinates meeting of local panel members to discuss all panel member comments and formulate draft agenda, which will be shared with programme team/s and the review panel prior to the review.
1week to review	Programme team/s forward details of attendees at review meetings (programme team/s and students) to Academic Services by programme team/s.
Review week	
Immediately after review	Programme team/s advise relevant BSU staff of any modifications approved through periodic review (for example new modules uploaded to SITS)
Normally 2 days after review	Academic Services forward outcome of review (as relayed at review feedback) to programme team/s
During month after review	Academic Services compiles report, circulates to panel for approval and programme team/s for factual accuracy
Next available School Board meeting	Programme team/s forward approved report to School Board
Next available AQSC meeting	Academic Services forward approved report to AQSC
By timescale agreed by review panel and noted in review report	Programme team/s forward action plan and response following receipt at School Board to Academic Services for consideration by panel, together with any revised documentation.
Next available AQSC meeting	Academic Services forward approved action plan and response received at AQSC.
12 months after review	Programme team/s forward updated action plan and response following receipt at School Board to Academic Services
Next available AQSC meeting	Academic Services forward approved updated action plan received at AQSC

ANNEX 5 ROLE OF REVIEW PANEL MEMBERS

All panel members will be expected to participate fully in the review as follows:

Prior to review

Read documentation provided by programme team/s and submit comments on the template provided to Academic Services by the deadline given.

During the review

Attend and participate in meetings detailed on the programme, and contribute to the formulation of outcomes of the review.

After the review

Consider and confirm the draft review report circulated by the Officer. Consider and confirm the action plan and response to outcomes of the review.

Chair

The Chair of the panel will be responsible for chairing all the review meetings including the pre-meeting of local members of the review panel prior to the review. At private panel meetings the Chair will, through discussion and agreement, allocate questions identified at the pre-meeting to members of the review panel for subsequent meetings with programme team/s. S/he will endeavour to encourage discussion at meetings that addresses the areas highlighted by the panel for consideration, moving the discussion forward as appropriate.

Internal Panel Member

Providing internal knowledge of the University's strategic priorities, regulations concerning the academic framework, and the University's regulations regarding the operation and delivery of programmes.

Internal Panel Member and Programme Representative

Providing a broad knowledge of the programme/s being reviewed, informing the panel where specific documentary evidence can be found and providing clarification to the panel to resolve issues that may otherwise have been raised at meetings with programme team/s.

Student Panel Member

Providing the student perspective, albeit from another subject area, on areas such as the student learning experience, clarity of information/documentation, and opportunities for student engagement.

External Academic Panel Member

Providing external subject-specific scrutiny of the programme/s in relation to, for example, sector guidance such as Subject Benchmark Statements, FHEQ, and alignment with professional requirements (where relevant). Consideration of areas such as teaching, learning and assessment methods, student engagement and support, analysis and response to data (such as NSS, DLHE, module evaluations, recruitment, progression and achievement).

External Employer/Industry Panel Member

Providing the perspective of an employer to consider the programme/s in relation to, for example, opportunities for employer/workplace engagement, use of guest speakers and engagement with relevant Sector Skills Councils and/or Professional Regulatory or Statutory Bodies. Consideration of

the curriculum with regard to currency and content to ensure graduates attain relevant employability skills and knowledge. Opportunities available for students to undertake work placements, and the associated support provided to students and employers.

NOMINATION FORM: EXTERNAL PANEL MEMBER OR ADVISER

Guidance on selection is provided at the end of the nomination form.

In the event of any queries, please contact Academic Services

Form to be completed by the proposer and submitted electronically to Academic Services

Part 1: Programme and Event Details	
Programme title	
School	
Collaborative Partner <i>(if applicable)</i>	
Type of event: periodic review, programme approval or programme re-approval	
Date of event <i>(if known)</i>	

Part 2: Nominee Details	
Proposer of nominee	
Title and name of nominee	
Nominee's current academic or professional post <i>(including full name of organisation/employer)</i>	
Nominee's current postal and email address	
Previous employment <i>(relevant academic or professional employment in the last 5 years)</i>	
Relevant experience and expertise <i>(see guidance notes below)</i>	

Part 3: Confirmation of eligibility	
Details and dates of any association with the University (or its partners, where collaborative provision is involved) in the last 5 years <i>(e.g. guest speaker, work placement)</i>	
Is the nominee eligible to work in the UK? <i>(sight of passport/visa and evidence of National Insurance number will be required at periodic reviews)</i>	

Part 4: Approval

This section to be completed by Academic Services

Approved by Head of Quality	
Date for receipt at Programme Approval and Review Sub-committee or Collaborative Provision Committee	

GUIDANCE ON SELECTION OF EXTERNAL PANEL MEMBER OR EXTERNAL ADVISER

Academic:

Able to provide the expertise of an external academic, with subject specialist knowledge and provide assurance to the University that the quality and standard of its provision, quality of learning opportunities and student experience are comparable with other institutions which includes provision may be delivered at partner providers.

The nominee should:

- Hold academic qualifications at least to the level of the programme under consideration.
- Be familiar with UK quality issues such as QAA UK Quality Code and relevant Subject Benchmarks Statements, and Professional Regulatory Body Status requirements, if appropriate.
- Demonstrate experience of quality assurance processes, both within and outside their institution, for example validation, periodic review, external examining, QAA reviewer, which will inform national comparisons about standards.
- Demonstrate a broad knowledge of current practice and developments in teaching, learning and assessment in higher education.

Nominees who have had an association with the University within the last five years, including external examiners, are ineligible for appointment.

Employer/Industry:

Able to provide expertise from the perspective of an employer or industry on areas such as currency and content of curriculum, and whether this promotes the attainment of relevant skills and knowledge for employability.

Nominees who have had association with the University within the last five years may be ineligible, please contact Academic Services for guidance.

ANNEX 7
ACTION PLAN/RESPONSE TO PERIODIC REVIEW

Periodic Review	
Date of review	
Action plan/response due by	
Revised Action plan/response one year after review due by	

Condition	Action/s proposed	Timescale	Responsibility / resource	Evaluation	Progress on action/s proposed
Recommendation	Action/s proposed	Timescale	Responsibility / resource	Evaluation	Progress on action/s proposed
Advice within body of report, other than conditions or recommendations			Action taken/response		