

Document Reference:	Periodic Review
Reference Code:	QAPr.
Version:	2.0
Date:	February 2016
Date of Implementation:	April 2016
Originator:	Progression Quality and Standards Committee
Approval by:	Progression Quality and Standards Committee
Date for Review:	June 2018

Description:

This code of practice will be of interest to staff, students and external participants involved in the Institute's periodic review activities. It provides clarity regarding the principles and procedures that the Institute adopts in order to ensure all of its provision is subject to regular intervals of periodic evaluation and review and rigorous internal and external scrutiny. In using this code of practice other documents may need to be considered.

Document Reference:

QAARTl.	Review of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education
QAEa.	External Examiners
QAWBL.	Management of Placement Learning in Higher Education
QAAss.	Assessment of Students
QAAtmcms.	Assessment Terminology, Criteria and Marking Schemes
QAAFbk.	Giving Assessment Feedback to Students
QAMc.	Mitigating Circumstances
QAPcaum.	Plagiarism, Cheating and Unfair Means

Department Contacts: Quality and Standards (Higher Education)
Rm: 3H06 (01472) 311222

Additional guidance can be obtained by visiting www.qaa.ac.uk and referring to QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Section B8: Programme monitoring and review, 2011

**This document is available in alternative forms
on request from the Quality and Standards Department**

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this code of practice is to make clear the Institute's responsibilities for governing quality and standards and the effective discharge of its procedures for the periodic evaluation, monitoring and review of programmes (irrespective of their location)
- 1.2 Within the context of this code the term 'periodic review' is used to describe the principles and processes through which the Institute will monitor and take a broader review of its programmes in an agreed 5 year cycle
- 1.3 The code further defines the respective roles, responsibilities and authority of different boards/ committees/ bodies involved in periodic review to ensure that staff, students and external participants are clear about the hierarchy of procedures and about which body will take final responsibility
- 1.4 Whilst the purpose of periodic review is to seek assurance over the safeguarding of academic standards and the quality of the Institute's higher education provision, its approach to periodic review is considered developmental and is based on dialogue between peers, self evaluation and strategies for quality enhancement
- 1.5 The Institute recognises the importance of assessing and evaluating the effectiveness, relevance and validity of its programmes alongside the quality of the student experience
- 1.6 Using enhancement led activities; the process of periodic review aids the Institute in assessing and planning for how staff development strategies and other activities may include the dissemination of good practice
- 1.7 A key concept within the Institute's periodic review processes is that of continuous evaluation; evaluation processes must not be carried out in isolation from other institutional priorities
- 1.8 Periodic review avails the Institute in being able to assure itself:
 - i. That programmes remain current and valid in light of developing knowledge of the discipline and practice in their application
 - ii. Of school/departmental responses to external or internal changes impacting the provision, including those which are cumulative and those made over time and which may affect the design and operation of programmes
 - iii. Of school/departmental responsiveness to changes to external points of reference, such as subject benchmark statements, relevant PSRB, relevant national legislation/ commitments to European and international processes
 - iv. Of the extent to which intended learning outcomes are appropriate, achievable and being attained by students
 - v. Of the continuing effectiveness of curriculum and assessment in relation to the intended learning outcomes
 - vi. Of the existence of effective school/departmental strategies and planning for actual or potential changes in student demand, employer expectation and employment opportunities

- vii. Of school/departmental understanding, evaluation and action planning for enhanced data relating to student progression and achievement
- viii. Of effective school/departmental systems for the collection, review and action planning using student feedback, including any National Student Survey results
- ix. Of the continuing availability of staff and physical resources
- x. Of current research/ scholarship/ scholarly activity and its application to the relevant discipline(s) and developments in teaching and learning
- xi. Of the accuracy and completeness of published information

2. Annual Monitoring Report (AMR)

- 2.1 Each Programme must complete an AMR on the template provided by their validating body.
- 2.2 An ideal AMR is reflective, open, honest, concise, constructive and forward looking.
- 2.3 The AMR should draw on all data sources to produce a trustworthy account of the programme, document enhancements made during the year of review and suggest areas for future improvement.
- 2.4 A first draft AMR should be produced in July. This submission should be monitored by curriculum managers.
- 2.5 A final draft of the AMR should be uploaded to the AMR submission group by the end of September by the curriculum manager for the area.
- 2.6 A review of these AMR submissions will be completed by the Quality Managers. Those who are judged to not meet minimum standards will be invited in to an AMR review meeting.
- 2.7 The AMR review meeting panel will consist of:
 - i. The Vice Principal - Higher Education
 - ii. Academic Registrar
 - iii. Group Director of Quality
 - iv. SU president and Vice President Higher Education

3. Self Evaluation and Enhancement Document (SEED)

- 3.1 Annually each faculty must produce a Self Evaluation and Enhancement Document (SEED) regardless of subsequent periodic review activities
- 3.2 The SEED must be written in accordance with the Institute's template and guidance notes **an ideal SEED is reflective, open, honest, concise, constructive and forward looking**
- 3.3 Whilst description of a school's context may be necessary, the SEED is not a descriptive document, rather its emphasis must be evaluative and based on rigorous analysis of evidence to support judgements made.

- 3.4 The SEED should build on existing processes of evaluation within the school, especially student feedback, annual monitoring of programmes, consideration of external examiner reports, and any previous periodic or other review. It should not be a mere repeat of what was said in any previous SEED
- 3.5 The length of the SEED will vary according to the complexity of provision however the narrative within the SEED should be concise and critically effective
- 3.6 The first draft of each school SEED must be submitted to the Institute's Quality and Standards department via upload to the submission group
- 3.7 Each SEED will undergo a process of moderation. The Curriculum Manager(s) and Associate Principal will defend their SEED at a meeting. Following which written formative feedback will be provided to the Associate Principal
- 3.10 Moderation of school SEEDs will be carried out by:
- v. The Vice Principal - Higher Education
 - vi. Academic Registrar
 - vii. Group Director of Quality
 - viii. Where practicable, a suitably experienced external advisor
 - ix. SU president and Vice President Higher Education
- 3.11 Following moderation, revised SEEDs must be submitted to the Institute's Quality and Standards department via upload to the submission group by the stated deadline

4. Periodic Review Audits

- 4.1 During each period a range of supportive documentation must be made accessible to the review team. The review team must have access to electronic module boxes and VLE used by the team. All information must be stored in these.
- 4.2 A series of audits will occur throughout the academic year conducted by the quality team. The audits for the academic year will be published in September each year in the minutes of the HE meetings Progression Quality and Standards Committee and Programme Leaders and Coordinators Committee.
- 4.3 The audits will be conducted by the Quality Team and the report and resulting actions will be reported into the minutes of PQSC.
- 4.4 Suggested audits will include: Marking Audit, QIP Audit, Student Engagement Audit, IAG Audit, Induction Plan Audit, AMR Audit, Module Handbook Audit and Programme Handbook Audit.

5. Thematic Review

- 5.1 The institute is committed to the continual enhancement of programmes and provision through the periodic review process guided by Quality Improvement Plans (QIPs). In

addition to this we are committed to strategically improving student experience through the selection of a review theme.

- 5.2 The theme will be selected by the Vice Principal HE and will be launched during the Teaching and Learning Conference in summer. The criteria for theme selection are as follows: student experience and HE ethos must be effected and all of HE should be able to engage in the theme.
- 5.3 In September each curriculum manager will be required to submit their plans for the year of review. These plans should make provision for changes within their area leading to improvements in student experience. The aim of these is for measurable impacts for current and future student groups.
- 5.4 In October a Panel Meeting will be convened to discuss and validate the thematic review plans. Each Curriculum Manager will be present the plans for their faculty. The panel will have opportunities to ask questions to elicit further information.
- 5.5 The panel will consist of:
 - i. Vice Principal HE
 - ii. Academic Registrar
 - iii. Student Representatives
 - iv. External Employer Representative
 - v. University Partner Representative (Optional)
- 5.6 In May an impact assessment will be compiled. Each Curriculum Manager must provide an impact assessment and examples of good practice from their area.
- 5.7 In June a Panel Meeting will be convened to discuss and validate the thematic review impact. Each Curriculum Manager will be present the outcomes for their faculty. The panel will have opportunities to ask questions to elicit further information.
- 5.8 Following this meeting the committee will produce a Thematic Review Report for circulation within the group.

Appendix 1

SEED Review Document

Date of Panel Meeting:

Reviewers:

Curriculum Team:

Notes from Meeting:

Targets for Improvement:

Deadline for Changes:

Date of Panel Meeting 2:

Reviewers:

Curriculum Team:

Notes from Meeting:

