

Contents		Page
Introduction		3
Purpose		3
Process		3
Student SWOT analysis		4
Review meetings with members of the department		5
Review meetings with students		5
Recommendations/conditions		5
Action planning and follow-up		6
Re-approval		6
Process for appointment of external panel members		6

Appendices		Page
1	Documentation required for periodic review	7
2	Role of review panel members	9
3	Agenda setting and notional questions for departmental team	14
4	Typical schedule for periodic review	18
5	Timescale for periodic review process	19
6	Template for periodic review report	21
7	Template for action plan	22
8	Example of student SWOT	23
9	Draft schedule 2017/18 – 2021/22	24

Introduction

Departmental periodic review of programmes is a regular and systematic part of the process of quality assurance across the University. Review engages a variety of strategies for assessing progress towards the achievement of aims, analyses performance in this context, and proposes appropriate approaches to the enhancement of student learning opportunities.

The primary aims of the process are to review the provision and to identify and share enhancement activities that have proved effective, and, where appropriate, to re-approve programmes within a department. The process also assures the Academic Board and Board of Governors that the student learning experience is enhanced and standards are maintained. Departmental periodic review panels operate a supportive but rigorous approach.

The calendar of reviews is established by AQSS, and the date and time of each review will be agreed by AQSS, in consultation with the Head of Department, as will the nature of the review (and whether any re-approval activity is to be included) and whether it includes the entire department or whether the department will be broken down into smaller elements for the purpose of review (this may be extending the days for the review process or splitting it across more than one academic year, for example).

The function of the review is to allow departments an opportunity to review the quality and standards of academic provision over time, through measuring student performance, the impact of change, merits of curriculum design, and local strategies for learning, teaching and assessment. The process should also enable the University to more broadly audit the implementation of policies and processes for enhancing the student learning experience.

Purpose

The purpose of periodic review is to facilitate reflection on:

- external reference points for academic standards; requirements of professional, statutory and regulatory bodies, and relevant European frameworks
- the quality of the student learning experience, with reference to learning, teaching, assessment, staff development, resources to support learning, student guidance, equality of opportunity, and widening participation
- student progress and attainment
- the compatibility of programme developments with institutional strategy
- academic and resource planning
- the extent to which the intended learning outcomes are achieved by students
- the continuing effectiveness of the curriculum and assessment
- future enhancement of programmes
- the learning experience of students at partner organisations
- the effectiveness of quality management processes within the department.

Process

AQSS will organise reviews, and will publish schedules; provide professional support for reviews in the form of review officers, and will publish guidance for the management of the review process.

Reviews will usually take place at intervals of five years. All relevant taught programmes, including those delivered by partner organisations, will be considered. Where programmes have ceased to recruit students in between reviews, these must still be considered.

Reviews will be conducted by a team of peer reviewers usually comprising:

- Chair
- Internal panel member from another department
- Internal panel member from the department under review
- A suitably qualified student, such as a Student Voice, from another department
- A review officer from AQSS
- An employer representative (external)
- An academic representative (external), sufficient to cover the scope of the programmes within the department.

Internal panel members should have relevant experience of teaching and quality management. Chairs must have participated in a periodic review or similar previously. The department will make nominations for the external panel members.

The panel will be formally appointed by AQSS (following approval by the ASC Scrutiny Group).

AQSS will agree the timing of the review with the appropriate Head of Academic Department, depending on the scope and complexity of the provision to be reviewed.

The panel will, as far as possible, make use of existing documentation (see appendix 1). Review documentation will be made available to all panel members at least four weeks ahead of the review. Panel members will be asked to provide brief written contributions to inform the initial agenda setting.

A week prior to the review, local panel members will meet to agree a preliminary agenda which identifies key areas for discussion. Responsibilities for the review will be established at this meeting, for example which panel members will visit collaborative providers if appropriate. The member of the panel representing the department will be invited to attend this. The initial agenda agreed will be shared with the department in the interest of transparency. Any requests for additional documentation will be agreed at this meeting.

After the review, the officer, in consultation with all panel members will prepare a report to be circulated to both the panel and Department for comments upon factual accuracy. The report will be accompanied by an action plan, completed by the department, for the following meeting of ASC.

The report and action plan should be made generally available to students. The action plan should be monitored by the department and any follow-up considered in the next round of annual monitoring.

Teaching will not usually be observed. However, the panel will wish to see evidence of the operation of the University scheme for the peer observation of teaching.

The review team should maintain an awareness of the University's inclusivity agenda. For example, the panel may wish to consider the department's approach to students with disabilities or the ethnic mix of its students.

Process for the appointment of an external panel member

The head of department should make nominations for an external academic panel member, an external employer or industry representative panel member. Where appropriate, PSRB representatives should be appointed. AQSS will make all logistical arrangements, including contacting panel members to confirm availability. The forms for such nominations are available from AQSS. All nominees should be of appropriate academic or professional credibility, and should not have any conflicts of interest with the programmes under review. Please contact AQSS for any additional guidance.

Student written submission

It is considered good practice to allow students to input directly to quality management policies and processes implemented by the University. This can be achieved through including a student submission made to the panel undertaking the periodic review.

The submission may take one of a number of formats (such as a ChiPlayer clip, for example), but the crucial point is to ensure that it is prepared by students, for students. It cannot be written by staff and agreed with students. It is also important that the submission is as representative of the majority of students as possible.

Students from the department under review may undertake a SWOT analysis, facilitated by either representatives from the Students' Union or staff. This is the preferred approach in that it allows for both a retrospective and prospective analysis of the subject under review.

Review meetings with members of the department

The purpose of the meetings is to test and explore issues that have arisen from the panel's reading of the documentation. The number of meetings will depend on the scale of the review and will be agreed with the Head of Department. Individual members of the department do not necessarily need to be present at every meeting, but it would be helpful to field a range of members from the department so that the review engages the full spectrum of staff involved. AQSS should be provided with a list of attendees prior to the review. The head of department will have discretion and final responsibility for deciding who attends. 'Parallel meetings' of any kind will not be held as it would mean that one meeting would not have officer support, and would therefore be 'un-minuted'.

Review meeting with students

The purpose of these meetings is to allow the panel to hear directly from students themselves about the quality of their learning experience. Usually, two students per level for each programme should be invited. Students should be asked about

- the quality of teaching and whether information is imparted in a clear and coherent fashion.
- mechanisms for feedback, whether these are effective, and whether staff are responsive to suggestions from students.
- the curriculum, and assessment, and whether it is consistent with published information, such as the student handbook.

- feedback on their work, whether assessment criteria are communicated clearly, whether the workload is appropriate, and whether work is returned promptly.
- academic and pastoral support.
- accessibility to resources.
- support with employability.

Recommendations/conditions

Recommendations are those matters considered desirable to achieve in enhancing or improving the student learning experience, but which will not directly affect academic standards. Conditions are those matters that must be addressed by the department.

The panel has a broad remit but may not make conditions or recommendations that concern resource planning, for example, 'a further two posts in the area of x must be created', as this is subject to a separate process (business planning). Recommendations and conditions must be achievable, and should identify the issue, rather than the solution as the department is best placed to know its staff specialisms, resources, students etc. Recommendations or conditions relating to procedures or services external to the area under review need to be framed in such a way as to reflect the subject area's interaction with those external. For example, a review may identify that accreditation by a PSRB is at risk due to a resource issue. The review can not make a condition or recommendation that additional laboratory space be provided, but can recommend that the subject under review consider this area and develop proposals for the appropriate authority within the University to consider.

Action planning and follow-up

The department will be required to provide an action plan that addresses the conditions and recommendations (the template is provided as an appendix).

ASC will consider the extent to which the action plan will address the conditions and recommendations identified, examples of enhancements that may be disseminated more widely within the University, and any particular points that require further action.

Not every recommendation will require an action but it must be demonstrated that serious consideration has been given to each. Where it is proposed not to implement a recommendation of the panel, a clear explanation of the reasons for this must be provided. The document should be as precise as possible in terms of citing evidence to indicate that progress has been made.

Re-approval

Where existing programmes are to be re-approved, this should be discussed in advance with AQSS to enable the planning of the schedule to allow for consideration of the programme/s to be re-approved, as well as the appointment of appropriate panel members. Re-approval would need to consider curriculum development and planning, teaching and learning, student support, student achievement and employability, and research.

Appendix 1

Documentation required for periodic review

The **department**/AQSS should provide the following documentation **six weeks** before the review. Documentation should be provided electronically, ideally in an electronic format:

- Annual monitoring reports, and their action plans, from the previous three academic years (including those for partner organisations);
- External examiners' reports, and their responses, from the previous three academic years;
- A sample of the analyses of module evaluation questionnaires (including those for partner organisations);
- National Student Survey data, from the last three academic years;
- DLHE data, from the last three academic years, and information on collaboration with the wider community;
- Any publicly available information, such as the prospectus (including those for partner organisations);
- Data about student admission, progression, retention and achievement over the last three years, compared with institutional and sectoral trends;
- Information on the approval of any new programmes since the previous review (award titles) and an analysis of where Black and Minority Ethnic inclusivity is promoted within the curricula;
- Evaluation of updated information on resources, any relevant capital/revenue expenditure, any development of learning resources provision;
- Evaluation of current information on staff research, continuing professional development, consultancy, and any other scholarly or external activity underpinning the subject, and staff CVs;
- Student programme handbooks;
- Minutes of the Departmental Board and any sub-committees of the Board for the last three years, including staff/student liaison committees;
- Records of minor changes made to the programmes since the last periodic review;
- Any relevant PSRB or other reports;
- Evaluation of any collaborative activity (including international activity);
- If re-approval is to be included, relevant documentation for that process;
- Any other documentation requested by the panel, such as programme board minutes.

The department should make arrangements for the panel to have access to samples of material held on Moodle.

Other documentation to be provided by AQSS:

- The University's Strategic Plan
- L&T Strategy
- Copies of this document.

Appendix 2

Role of review panel members

CHAIR

The chair will be suitably qualified (for example, will have acted as a member of a periodic review panel previously, will have acted as an auditor/reviewer for QAA or similar). Written guidance is intended to ensure consistency of approach in the management and reporting of departmental periodic review. The primary role of the chair is to manage and direct the review process. The chair will convene a pre-meeting to agree the final agenda, will chair all meetings held during the course of the review, will provide oral feedback to the department at the conclusion of the review, will approve the draft report, and will receive professional support from the servicing officer.

Key responsibilities include:

- reading, analysing and preparing written commentaries of the documentation submitted by the department and any other documents sent in advance
- chairing meetings
- participating in the review in order to gather, share, test and verify evidence
- contributing to and commenting on the compilation of the report of the review to agreed schedules and deadlines

Person specification

Knowledge, including:

- experience, knowledge and understanding of higher education provision in general
- understanding of the structure, policies and procedures for managing and delivering higher education programmes
- familiarity with external reference points relevant to the subject
- understanding of programme entry requirements and the ability to interpret progression statistics including withdrawal, transfer and failure rates and destinations data
- familiarity with academic support strategies and the functions of academic tutorials
- understanding of quality assurance processes employed by the University.

Skills including ability to:

- conduct meetings with staff
- conduct meetings with a range of current and former groups of students
- meet exacting timescales and deadlines; Chairs are responsible for ensuring meetings do not overrun.
- work effectively in managing the periodic review process
- maintain confidentiality.

Chairs might find it useful to structure meetings in the following way (an example question follows each point below):

- Establish the line of enquiry (e.g. “We note that the department is committed to the implementation of a Peer Review mechanism”)
- Initiate discussion with open questioning (e.g. “With respect to Peer Review, how is progress being monitored?”)

- Further exploration (“What guidance is provided for reviewers and those being reviewed? How are outcomes recorded?”)
- Initiate a conclusion with closed questioning (e.g. “Is Peer Review available to all members of staff, full- and part-time?”)
- Summarise (“Am I correct in understanding the situation, if I describe it as.....”)

Chairs might start discussion by establishing the line of enquiry. Panel members then ask the open, exploratory and concluding questions. Chairs summarise by providing a brief synopsis of discussion points.

To maintain consistency during review events, Chairs should:

- Make introductions
- Briefly explain the process to stakeholders attending the meetings
- Outline the main lines of enquiry
- Ensure that all are involved
- Bring the meeting to a close with thanks.

Chairs should manage the questioning during review meetings and should advise Panel members that questions need to be clear and concise. If someone needs to be stopped in mid answer, because he/she has already provided the necessary information or has digressed, the Chair should be polite and helpful but assertive. They must explain the reason for an interruption so that stakeholders do not feel they have been restricted in their response. Feedback given to departments must be clear. Chairs should cover the key points, but leave fine detail to reports. Retaining a focus on a maximum of five issues will enable Chairs and Panels to concentrate on the main themes.

INTERNAL PANEL MEMBER FROM THE DEPARTMENT UNDER REVIEW

The role provides an enhanced staff development opportunity for a member of a programme team to act as a panel member and consider the quality and standards of its programmes and to be part of a team testing the effectiveness of the provision. The role, nominated by the head of department under review, would allow for increased transparency within the process. It would also allow an opportunity for greater ownership of the process and the further development of an integrated ‘quality culture’ within the University. This person will act as an informed and informing member of the panel. This may mean advising the panel of where specific evidence may be found. The ‘inside knowledge’ that this opportunity promotes may advantage the development of responses to conditions and recommendations. This person should attend all meetings other than those with students. The person should not act as an advocate for the department under review.

Key responsibilities include:

- reading, analysing and preparing written commentaries of the documentation submitted by the department and any other documents sent in advance
- participating in the periodic review in order to gather, share, test and verify evidence
- drawing conclusions and making recommendations on the academic standards achieved and the quality of the learning opportunity provided
- contributing to and commenting on the compilation of the report of the review to agreed schedules and deadlines
- helping the department to draw up its action plan for implementation of any conditions or recommendations

Person specification

Knowledge, including:

- experience, knowledge and understanding of higher education provision in general and within his/her own subject
- understanding of the structure, policies and procedures for managing and delivering higher education programmes
- familiarity with the Academic Infrastructure and other external reference points relevant to the subject
- understanding of programme entry requirements and the ability to interpret progression statistics including withdrawal, transfer and failure rates and destinations data
- familiarity with academic support strategies and the functions of academic tutorials
- experience of external examining
- understanding of quality assurance processes employed by the University.

Skills including ability to:

- conduct meetings with staff
- conduct meetings with a range of current and former groups of students
- meet exacting timescales and deadlines
- work effectively as a panel member
- maintain confidentiality
- influence colleagues within the department and take forwards the action plan.

INTERNAL PANEL MEMBER

The role, selected by AQSS, is designed to provide information about the values, strategies and policies of the University. The purpose of the role is to evaluate the evidence provided within the particular context of the University, bring experience to the panel of the operation, management and delivery of courses elsewhere within the University, provide a point of focus on the delivery of learning, teaching and assessment at the University, and contribute to the development of the agenda for the periodic review.

Key responsibilities include:

- reading, analysing and preparing written commentaries of the documentation submitted by the department and any other documents sent in advance
- participating in the periodic review in order to gather, share, test and verify evidence
- drawing conclusions and making recommendations on the academic standards achieved and the quality of the learning opportunities provided
- contributing to and commenting on the compilation of the report of the review to agreed schedules and deadlines.

Person specification

Knowledge, including:

- experience, knowledge and understanding of University academic policy and strategy
- understanding of the structure, policies and procedures for managing and delivering higher education programmes
- familiarity with the Academic Infrastructure and other external reference points relevant to the subject
- understanding of programme entry requirements and the ability to interpret progression statistics including withdrawal, transfer and failure rates and destinations data

- familiarity with academic support strategies and the functions of academic tutorials
- experience of external examining
- understanding of quality assurance processes employed by the University.

Skills including ability to:

- conduct meetings with staff
- conduct meetings with a range of current and former groups of students
- meet exacting timescales and deadlines
- work effectively as a panel member
- maintain confidentiality.

OFFICER TO PANEL

The role is designed to provide support to the chair of the panel in preparing for the review, liaise with the head of department on the preparation of documents for the review, confirm arrangements with all panel members, including the arrangement of accommodation, distribute documentation to panel members, prepare the initial and final agendas, ensure that rooms for meetings are booked, that any catering arrangements are made, attendance at all meetings, and preparation of the draft recommendations and conditions for immediate circulation, and the circulation of the initial draft report.

Key responsibilities include:

- reading, and analysing written commentaries of the documentation submitted by the team and any other documents sent in advance
- compilation of the report of the review to agreed schedules and deadlines.

Person specification

Knowledge, including:

- experience, knowledge and understanding of University academic policy and strategy
- familiarity with the Quality Code and other external reference points relevant to the subject
- understanding of quality assurance processes employed by the University.

Skills including ability to:

- meet exacting timescales and deadlines
- write clearly
- maintain confidentiality.

EXTERNAL PANEL MEMBERS, ACADEMIC AND/OR EMPLOYMENT/INDUSTRY

The role should allow appropriate subject expertise to be provided to the department, within the wider context of higher education, and employment/industry. Members should evaluate the subject-specific evidence in the context of national and European expectations with particular reference to the educational provision in terms of employability and academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities. This role should provide a focus for broader discussions on quality assurance and enhancement, and relevance to employment/industry.

Key responsibilities include:

- reading, analysing and preparing written commentaries of the documentation submitted by the department and any other documents sent in advance
- participating in the periodic review in order to gather, share, test and verify evidence
- drawing conclusions and making recommendations on the academic standards achieved and the quality of the learning opportunities provided
- contributing to and commenting on the compilation of the report of the review to agreed schedules and deadlines.

Person specification

Knowledge, including:

- experience, knowledge and understanding of higher education provision and/or relevant employment sectors
- familiarity with reference points relevant to the subject
- familiarity with academic support strategies, learning resources relevant to the subject.

Skills including ability to:

- conduct meetings with staff
- conduct meetings with a range of current and former groups of students
- meet exacting timescales and deadlines
- work effectively as a panel member
- maintain confidentiality.

STUDENT FROM OUTSIDE THE DEPARTMENT UNDER REVIEW

The role should allow appropriate expertise from a student on the quality of learning opportunities to be provided to the department. This role should provide a focus for broader discussions on quality and enhancement, and relevance to students.

Key responsibilities include:

- reading, analysing and preparing written commentaries of the documentation submitted by the department and any other documents sent in advance
- participating in the periodic review in order to gather, share, test and verify evidence
- drawing conclusions and making recommendations on the academic standards achieved and the quality of the learning opportunities provided
- contributing to and commenting on the compilation of the report of the review to agreed schedules and deadlines.

Person specification

Knowledge, including:

- experience, knowledge and understanding of the University of Chichester
- familiarity with academic support strategies, learning resources relevant to the subject.

Skills including ability to:

- participate in meetings with a range of current and former groups of students
- meet exacting timescales and deadlines
- work effectively as a panel member
- maintain confidentiality.

Appendix 3

Agenda Setting

1. Introductions, including clarification of roles and the respective responsibilities of review chair, external panel members and institutional members.
2. Reminder of review method:
 - Evaluate attainment of aims and objectives.
 - Assessment should test student's achievement of the intended learning outcomes and the curriculum should have been designed in such a way as to promote this achievement.
 - Tangible evidence needed to support judgements made.
3. Confirmation of aspects of the process and division of responsibility.
 - Academics have particular focus on academic standards, including aims/outcomes, curricula, assessment. Asked to offer advice on enhancement. Guidance on the appropriateness of learning resources should also be offered by external members.
 - Employers to specifically focus on the quality of learning opportunities, including teaching and learning, and progression,
 - Internals to note any issues which contravene practice.

There is no expectation that the panel tackle all the issues listed – the panel may want to use these as prompts for our own questions.

4. Identification of issues to be pursued:

Key points arising from reading of documentation.

Agree strategy and key questions to be adopted to ensure appropriate coverage of these issues. Panel need to agree and allocate questions.

Notional questions for the department

How do the intended learning outcomes relate to external reference points and to the broad aims of the provision?

- 1 What are the intended learning outcomes for a programme?
- 2 How do they relate to external reference points including relevant subject benchmark statements, the qualifications framework, the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area and any professional body requirements?
- 3 How do they relate to the overall aims of the provision as stated by the department?
- 4 Are they appropriate to the aims?

How are the curricula design principles used to permit achievement of the intended learning outcomes?

5 How does the provider ensure that curriculum content enables students to achieve the intended learning outcomes?

6 How does the provider ensure that the design and organisation of the curriculum is effective in promoting student learning and achievement of the intended learning outcomes?

How are the intended learning outcomes communicated to students, staff and external examiners?

7 How are the intended outcomes of a programme and its constituent parts communicated to staff, students and external examiners?

8 Do the students know what is expected of them?

How does the subject provider create the conditions for achievement of the intended learning outcomes?

9 Do the design and content of the curricula encourage achievement of the intended learning outcomes in terms of knowledge and understanding, cognitive skills, subject-specific skills (including practical/professional skills), transferable skills, progression to employment and/or further study, and personal development?

10 Is there evidence that curricular content and design is informed by recent developments in techniques of teaching and learning, by current research and scholarship, and by any changes in relevant occupational or professional requirements?

How does the assessment process work?

11 Does the assessment process enable learners to demonstrate achievement of all the intended learning outcomes?

12 Are there criteria that enable internal and external examiners to distinguish between different categories of achievement?

13 Can there be full confidence in the security and integrity of assessment procedures?

14 Does the assessment strategy have an adequate formative function in developing student abilities?

15 What evidence is there that the standards achieved by learners meet the minimum expectations for the award, as measured against relevant subject benchmark statements and the qualifications framework?

How does the department review and improve the quality of the student learning experience?

16 How does the institution review and seek to enhance the quality of the student learning experience? Does it have strategies for building upon its quality assurance processes to enhance the quality of its provision?

17 How effective is teaching in relation to curriculum content and programme aims?

18 How effectively do staff draw upon their research, scholarship or professional activity to inform their teaching?

19 How good are the materials provided to support learning?

20 Is there effective engagement with and participation by students?

21 Is the quality of teaching maintained and enhanced through effective staff development, peer review of teaching, integration of part-time and visiting staff, effective team teaching and induction and mentoring of new staff?

22 How effectively is learning facilitated in terms of student workloads?

How is students' learning supported?

23 Is there an appropriate overall strategy for academic support, including written guidance, which is consistent with the student profile and the overall aims of the provision?

24 Are there effective arrangements for admission and induction which are generally understood by staff and applicants?

25 How effectively is learning facilitated by academic guidance, feedback and supervisory arrangements?

26 Are the arrangements for support clear and generally understood by staff and students?

27 Are students offered careers guidance?

How satisfactory are learning resources and how are they deployed?

28 Is the collective expertise of the staff suitable and available for effective delivery of the curricula, for the overall teaching, learning and assessment strategy and for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes?

29 Are appropriate staff development opportunities available?

30 Is appropriate technical and administrative support available?

31 Is there an overall strategy for the deployment of learning resources?

32 How effectively is learning facilitated in terms of the provision of resources?

33 Is suitable teaching and learning accommodation available?

34 Are the subject book and periodical stocks appropriate and accessible?

35 Are suitable equipment and appropriate information technology facilities available to learners?

Questions relating to Foundation degrees

36 Has the department ensured that the Foundation degrees meet the needs of employers and individual learners? How is this demonstrated?

37 Is there a Foundation degree sector framework that should have been taken into consideration? Has this been considered and how?

38 Are there national occupational standards? Have these been considered and how?

39 Is RPL utilised? How?

<p>Appendix 4 Typical schedule for periodic review</p>

NOTE: a short preliminary meeting will usually be held for local panel members in the week before the review, possibly via Skype or Lync. Comments from external panel members will be taken at this meeting. A preliminary agenda will be drawn up and items for discussion with the department will be shared in advance of the review.

<i>Day 1</i>	
0900 – 1000	Panel meets for initial discussion; to agree lines of enquiry for meeting with staff
1000 – 1130	Meeting with department
1130 – 1200	Panel meets for discussion; to agree lines of enquiry for meeting with students
1200 – 1300	Lunch and meeting with undergraduate students
1300 – 1330	Tour of learning resources
1400 – 1600	Panel visits partner provider and/or considers documentation provided by the department
1600 – 1700	Panel meets to draw conclusions from the day
<i>Day 2</i>	
0900 – 1100	Panel visits partner provider and/or considers documentation provided by the department
1100 – 1200	Panel formulates questions for meeting with team and/or visit to partner provider
1200 – 1300	Lunch with postgraduate students
1300 – 1345	Panel formulates conditions/recommendations
1345 – 1400	Panel feeds back to the department

Appendix 5

Timescale for periodic review process

Timescale	Action	By
<i>A rolling six-year cycle of periodic review (by department) is created by AQSS</i>		
At least 12 months before review	Confirm department and programmes to be included	AQSS in consultation with the HoAD
At least 12 months before review	Identify specific dates	AQSS in consultation with the HoAD
At least 6 months before review	AQSS to identify internal panel members, and department to nominate external panel members	AQSS / HoAD
At least 3 months before review	Gather supporting documents and data	HoAD, with support from AQSS
At least 2 months before review	Support students in preparing their submission	HoAD
No later than 6 weeks before the review (this does NOT include periods when the University is closed ie Easter!)	Submit documents (and student submission) to AQSS	HoAD
At least 5-6 weeks before the review	Initial preparatory meeting to agree organisational issues and provisional agenda	AQSS, review officer, HoAD
No later than 4 weeks before the review	Circulate documentation to panel members and other officers for relevant feedback	Review officer
No later than 4 weeks before the review	Agree students to attend meeting with panel – final list to be provided to AQSS one week before the review (to include name, award and year of study).	HoAD
No later than 10 days before review	Panel provide brief written feedback to officer	Review panel
No later than 10 days before the review	Collate initial feedback	Review officer

Timescale	Action	By
No later than 1 week before the review	Agenda meeting (agree final agenda, input feedback from panel members, requests for any additional documentation)	Chair, review officer, HoAD, other internal panel members
3 working days after the event	Prepare draft list of recommendations/conditions/good practice	Review officer to circulate to panel and subject and invite initial feedback
Within 10 working days of the event	Prepare and circulate initial draft report	Review officer to circulate to panel and subject and invite initial feedback
For next meeting of ASC	Proof/edit report for publication	Dir Q&S
For next meeting of ASC	Submit final report to secretary to ASC	Review secretary (final report to panel and subject)
Within 6 weeks of review	Preparation of action plan	HoAD, with support from AQSS
At next meeting of Departmental meeting	Consideration of plan by Departmental meeting	HoAD
At following meeting of ASC	Consideration of plan by ASC	HoAD /AQSS

Appendix 6 Template for periodic review report (Report to be prepared by AQSS)

Periodic review of {department/programmes}

Introduction

1. A periodic review of programme in {DEPARTMENT} was held on {DATES}. The members of the panel were: {NAMES/JOB TITLES/INSTITUTIONS}.
2. The panel met the following: {NAMES}.
3. The panel met students who represented the following programmes: {TITLES}
4. The panel also received {EVIDENCE etc}.

Academic standards

5. Aims and Outcomes
6. Curricula and Assessment
7. Achievement

Quality of learning opportunities

8. Teaching and learning
9. Recruitment, admission and progression
10. Learning resources
11. Employability/collaboration and involvement with the wider community

Enhancement

12. Conclusions on the way the programme/subject enhances its provision and the experience of their students.

Recommendations

13. Any issues for action – conditions which must be addressed as a condition of re-approval, and recommendations for consideration and response.

Appendix 7**Action plan in response to conditions and recommendations.**

The periodic review report will specify a date when conditions should be met and recommendations addressed. The action plan will be received at ASC. Subject teams should complete this action plan template and forward to AQSS:

Periodic review report condition/ recommendation	Action/s proposed	Timescale	Responsibility / resource	Evaluation	Progress on action/s proposed

Appendix 8
Example of student SWOT analysis

STRENGTHS	OPPORTUNITIES
WEAKNESSES	THREATS

Appendix 9 Draft schedule 2016/17 – 2021/22
--

Adventure Education	2020/21
Business School	2017/18
Childhood (2022/23), Social Work & Social Care	2017/18
Creative & Digital Technology	2020/21
Dance	2022/23
Education	2018/19
English & Creative Writing	2017/18
Fine Art	2018/19
History & Politics	2018/19
Music	2019/20
Physical Education	2022/23
Psychology and Counselling	2019/20
Sport Development and Management	2020/21
Sport and Exercise Sciences	2021/22
Theatre	2020/21
Theology, Philosophy & Religious Studies	2021/22

<i>Childhood</i>	2016/17
<i>Dance</i>	2016/17
<i>PE</i>	2016/17