

LTC11D012

Title: Periodic Review Proposal for Partner Institutions
Author: Hannah Coman, Partnerships Manager, Partnerships Office
Date: October 2011
Circulation: Learning and Teaching Committee – 26 October 2011
Agenda: LTC11A001
Version: Final
Status: Open

PERIODIC REVIEW PROPOSAL FOR PARTNER INSTITUTIONS

Issue

A proposal for the introduction of periodic review to replace revalidation at partner institutions.

Recommendation

The Learning and Teaching Committee is invited to approve the proposed process for periodic review for partner institutions (not including University Campus Suffolk who have already adopted this approach for 2011/12) outlined below, with a view to implementation from 2012/13.

Resource Implications

None identified.

Equality and Diversity

Every effort is made to ensure the composition of panels reflects a diverse range of academic staff and applicants. Panels are appointed by the Academic Director of Partnerships according to the Partnerships Handbook. This is reviewed regularly for updates in legislation and those making the decisions also receive regular Equality and Diversity update training.

As a matter of course, Panel members are consulted about any requirements or reasonable adjustments they might need in order to attend a review event.

The potential for changing student populations has been taken into account within the review process and this mechanism will help ensure the needs of minority student groups are considered and embedded within the process as demographics change over time.

Further Information

Hannah Coman, Partnerships Manager, 01603 591603, h.coman@uea.ac.uk

Discussion

The Partnerships Office have been discussing the use of the term 'revalidation', and considered whether an approach that placed more emphasis on review and ongoing development would be more appropriate.

The use of the term revalidation tends to give the impression that something may not be revalidated, and does not adequately reflect the fact that provision is subject to ongoing quality assurance and enhancement procedures to ensure the maintenance of quality and standards. It also tends to result in less focus on self-evaluation and the identification and sharing of good practice. A move to periodic review would enable the adoption of a more developmental approach, encouraging the identification of best practice while still providing an opportunity for internal and external peer review of course content to ensure that provision continues to be relevant and up-to-date.

Documentation Requirements

In preparation for the revalidation event, the course team currently have to provide new validation documentation, an up-to-date Student Handbook and a self-evaluation document. This results in a large amount of documentation, particularly where courses are combined for the purposes of revalidation, and much of the material is duplicatory. There is a tendency for course teams to invest a significant amount of time in producing an up-to-date validation document to the detriment of the more evaluative elements of the process. An approach that places greater emphasis on the self-evaluation document would encourage a more developmental approach, requiring course teams to reflect in more detail on the quality of their course and ways in which it could be developed and enhanced in future.

While having an up-to-date validation document (or definitive course document) is useful in providing the university and the partner institution with a regular snapshot of all validated provision, a lot of the material in the validation document is duplicated in the Course Handbook, including:

- course rationale, aims, learning outcomes (as outlined in the programme specification)
- course structure and module specifications
- assessment strategy, regulations, schedule and grading criteria
- learning and teaching strategy / methods
- details of placements / work-based learning
- information on learning resources
- student feedback mechanisms.

It is therefore proposed that the documentation requirements for periodic review are limited to an up-to-date Course Handbook and a detailed self-evaluation document drawing on the last three years' AMR/SARE reports (which should be appended to the documentation). The Course Handbook should include the programme specification and all relevant module specifications, which it is proposed should represent the definitive course documents for the validated programme.

Dealing with major changes to provision through periodic review

Some course teams currently use the revalidation process as an opportunity to introduce significant changes to course structure and content and it is important to ensure that any move from a revalidation to periodic review process does not result in inadequate scrutiny of major course changes.

It is therefore proposed that a form is produced specifically for periodic review. This would be contextualised to the periodic review process and would provide an opportunity for course teams to identify any significant changes that they wish to make to the course as part of periodic review process. In considering the form, the university and the partner institution would be able to make a judgement whether:

- a) the changes could be adequately dealt with via the periodic review process, without detrimentally affecting the developmental aspects of the process
- b) the changes would be better dealt with via a course variation process prior to periodic review
- c) the changes are so significant that they would be better dealt with via the course validation process
- d) the course has given rise to significant concern and should proceed to a full validation event.

Updates to the Partnerships Handbook

To inform the Learning and Teaching Committee's discussions, the proposed new section of the Partnerships Handbook relating to periodic review is provided below.

Partnerships Handbook

9. PERIODIC REVIEW OF COURSES

9.1 Introduction to the periodic review process

Periodic review is the formal process by which a course or group of courses is evaluated and UEA is assured of the continuing quality of the provision. The process normally takes place every five years and is the basis for re-approval with effect from the following academic year. The review process can be brought forward at the discretion of the Academic Director of Partnerships where there is a major variation to a course, or where either the partner institution or the University has a particular concern. Internal and external peer review is a normal part of periodic review, as it is of the initial validation process.

The purpose of periodic review is:

- to review the continuing validity and relevance of the stated aims of the course(s) and the intended learning outcomes, in accordance with QAA guidelines
- to ensure that students continue to be provided with learning opportunities of an appropriate quality
- to enable an external subject expert or experts to contribute advice on the course(s)
- to identify good practice for wider dissemination
- to identify areas for enhancement
- to audit the procedures of partner institutions for quality assurance and enhancement and the maintenance of academic standards as they apply to the course(s) under review
- to report to the Learning and Teaching Committee with a specific, reasoned recommendation about the future of the course(s).

9.2 Periodic review panels

Periodic review panels are appointed by the Academic Director of Partnerships and typically comprise:

- Chair (a senior member of the partner institution academic staff)
- at least one academic subject expert, external to the University and its partner institutions (selected by UEA)
- relevant employer and/or Sector Skills Council representative(s)
- professional, accrediting and/or statutory regulatory body representative(s) as appropriate to the award(s)
- a member of academic staff from UEA (where possible from a cognate discipline area)
- partner institution's Head of HE or nominee
- student representative (normally currently registered on the course, although a recent graduate may alternatively be appointed)
- a representative of the Partnerships Office (UEA)

The secretary to the review panel will be a Partnerships Manager from UEA. UEA is responsible for identifying the external academic expert(s) and UEA members of the review panel. The partner institution is responsible for nominating all other members of the panel, including the employer and/or professional body representative. These nominations should be submitted to the Partnerships Office and are subject to approval by the Academic Director of Partnerships.

The course team should normally consist of key members of staff involved in the delivery of the course(s) under review, normally up to a maximum of eight (with the approval of the review panel Chair required if this maximum is to be exceeded).

It is expected that panel members will normally meet with students during the periodic review event and where this is not the case, a rationale should be agreed in advance by the Chair.

In the absence of any panel members on the day of the event, the decision as to whether the review event should proceed is at the Chair's discretion.

Up to two peers from the partner institution may be invited to attend a periodic review event as an observer, to facilitate staff development and the sharing of good practice, subject to agreement by the Chair.

9.3 Duties of the review panel

It is the duty of the review panel to:

- critically examine the review documentation and undertake discussion with the course team in order to make a collective judgement as to the continuing quality and academic standard of the course(s), and to ensure that the award(s) conferred by the University of East Anglia is of an equivalent standard to comparable awards
- recommend to UEA whether or not the proposed course(s) should be reapproved.

A checklist setting out guidance for review panel members is available at Appendix [x] below and is sent out to all panel members with the review documentation.

9.4 Review documentation

The course team is required to submit review documentation in an agreed format to the Partnerships Office at least four weeks in advance of the review event. A longer timescale may be required when professional/accrediting bodies are involved. A briefing pack containing relevant documentation is sent to members of the review panel two to three weeks in advance of the event.

The periodic review pack typically includes:

- a) a list of panel members
- b) an agenda for the review event
- c) an explanation of the periodic review process and procedures
- d) guidance for panel members
- e) a detailed self-evaluation document prepared by the course team(s) under review drawing on the last three years' SAREs/AMRs
- f) an up-to-date course handbook for students, including the programme specification and all relevant module specifications (this document will represent the definitive course documents for the validated programme)

The periodic review documentation is normally compiled by the course team(s) under review, supported by senior staff at the partner institution and at the University.

9.5 The self-evaluation document

The self-evaluation document is a crucial part of the review process and should take the form of a critical commentary cross-referenced to any other documentation provided and should identify those issues the course team would find it helpful to explore in greater depth. The structure of the reflective document should correspond to the broad agenda themes for periodic review and should include the following information:

- a) a list of courses to which the report applies
- b) details of any professional, statutory or regulatory body accreditation (with any recent PSRB reports and course team responses included as appendices)
- c) details of any course that includes study abroad, work placement or work-based learning
- d) the main characteristics of the course(s) covered by the review – a short (no more than two paragraphs) comment about the distinctive features of the provision, including what distinguishes it from provision at other institutions
- e) the last validation or revalidation/periodic review report, accompanied by a summary of follow-up action taken
- f) a self-evaluation of the course(s) under review, drawing on recent SAREs/AMRs and including major developments since initial validation or the last review. The evaluation should include, in summary, a reflective account of the quality of the provision under review and an indication of how the course team see the provision developing over the next few years. A template for the self-evaluation document is attached at Appendix [x]

The evaluation should draw upon a wide range of evidence including statistical data, feedback from students, feedback from external examiners and PSRB reports, and should be structured under the following headings:

- curriculum (including evidence of how any relevant QAA subject benchmark statements have influenced the courses under review)
 - learning, teaching and assessment (to include issues arising from work-based learning, placement learning or study abroad, and the promotion of equality of opportunity and diversity)
 - student recruitment and student entry profiles
 - student retention, progression and achievement and graduate destinations
 - student support mechanisms
 - learning resources
 - staffing (with staff CVs included as appendices)
 - staff development activity
 - employer engagement
 - any other issues
- g) A summary of the key themes for consideration at the review event, identifying those issues the course team would find it particularly helpful to consider as part of the review. These should be drawn from issues arising from the more detailed evaluation of the course(s) and/or SARE/AMR reports.

On receipt of the review documentation from the course team, the Head of HE or nominee may carry out a critical appraisal. Should this raise significant concerns, the Head of HE or nominee will consult with the Chair of the review panel to decide upon an appropriate course of action, which may include cancellation of the event should the documentation have significant omissions and/or require significant revisions that cannot be undertaken within an appropriate timeframe.

9.6 Periodic review event

A periodic review event normally takes place over a half or full day depending on the size and nature of the award(s) being reviewed. The agenda is based upon a standard programme that may be modified as appropriate for each review event. An example of an indicative agenda for a review event may be found in Appendix [x].

The Chair will normally commence the event by:

- explaining the purpose of the event
- inviting panel members to introduce themselves
- confirming the agenda
- explaining periodic review procedures and the responsibilities of the panel
- identifying any collective or individual issues raised by panel members in relation to the review documentation.

The agenda will include one or more blocks of time in which the panel may discuss the course(s) in detail with the course team, and in which the course team will have the opportunity to respond to points raised. The panel will need to be assured of the continuing rationale for the course(s) concerned and that the course team has the necessary resource base for the continued successful running of the provision. In addition, the panel would expect to be assured that issues identified through the

SARE/AMR process, including the comments of students and external examiners, have been addressed.

The Chair is responsible for highlighting positive aspects of the course(s) under review and raising issues in a constructive but critical manner. A successful review event will be characterised by constructive dialogue, structured around the self-evaluation document provided by the course team under review.

A meeting will normally be held with a group of students registered (or previously registered) on the course under review (avoiding students who are also members of staff at the partner institution wherever possible). The course team will not be present for this part of the review. Guidance for students involved in this meeting is available in Appendix [x] below. Where appropriate, a tour of facilities and specialist resources will also be included in the programme.

After debate, it is usual for the course team to depart to allow the review panel members to determine their recommendations. The Chair normally commences this second private meeting of the panel by summarising the issues and the course team's responses and s/he will conclude the meeting by agreeing the outcome of the event with the panel before inviting the course team back for verbal feedback. A unanimous decision of the panel is normally required for the conclusion of the review event, but in the event that an individual panel member disagrees with the majority decision, then the Chair of the review panel shall have a casting vote.

During the feedback session, the Chair will announce the outcome of the event and notify the course team of any conditions, requirements and/or recommendations that should be addressed or considered. Deadlines will be set by which conditions and/or requirements should be met and recommendations should be responded to (usually within six to eight weeks of the event) and a decision made by the Chair as to whether the conditions should be met via a conditions meeting or by correspondence. The Chair and Secretary will liaise to ensure that draft conditions, requirements and recommendations are circulated to the course team within five working days of the event.

9.7 Periodic review report

The periodic review report summarises the panel's conclusions and specifies any conditions that are to be met to successfully complete the re-approval process. It is usual for the panel to specify the date by which the conditions and/or requirements must be met and to recommend the period of re-approval, which for most courses is five years. The report template is available at Appendix [x].

There are normally two possible outcomes from a periodic review event, one of which will conclude the report:

- recommendation to reapprove the course(s), in which case no further action by the course team is required
- recommendation to reapprove the course(s) with conditions, requirements and/or recommendations, in which case the course team must provide the Chair with evidence, within any agreed timescales, that the conditions and/or requirements have been met, and must respond to any recommendations.

In exceptional circumstances the report may recommend course team undertakes a major revision to the course under review and submits the course for scrutiny under

the revalidation procedure. In this circumstance the timescale may be such that the course may not run in the planned academic year.

Commendations allow the panel a chance to congratulate the course team on aspects of good practice, which could usefully be shared within the institution and across the UEA partnerships.

Conditions are those issues that must be addressed to the satisfaction of the review panel prior to successful re-approval, by agreed deadlines.

Requirements are those issues on which action will be expected beyond the start of the following academic session, by agreed deadlines, and progress will be monitored through the Joint Board of Study.

Recommendations are those issues on which action is to be considered, possibly beyond the start of the following academic session.

The review panel may not set further conditions and/or requirements after it has reported.

The Academic Director of Partnerships considers the outcomes of the periodic review process and makes a recommendation to the University Senate via the Learning and Teaching Committee that the course(s) be reapproved for delivery at the partner institution for a given period of time, normally up to five years.

The Academic Director of Partnerships may recommend re-approval of a course to the University LTC only on the grounds of a recommendation from a properly constituted review panel. LTC may in exceptional circumstances amend the conditions and/or requirements set by the panel or set further conditions and/or requirements although this would be very unusual. In such a case, these amendments or additional conditions/requirements would over-ride the conditions/requirements set by the review panel and the partner institution would be obliged to adhere to them.

9.8 Course team's response

The course team makes a formal response to the periodic review report, by the agreed deadlines, evidencing how specific conditions and/or requirements have been met and addressing any recommendations that were made. This response is submitted to the Partnerships Office for onward submission to the review panel Chair, and the Joint Board of Study monitors the responses and reports to LTC.

The formal response should include:

- amended documents (using tracked changes to highlight any amendments)
- a brief summary of how each condition and/or requirement has been met, with reference to the amended documents
- how each recommendation has been considered
- any other appropriate evidence.

The template for the formal response is attached as Appendix [x]

9.9 Approval of response to conditions, requirements and recommendations

Conditions are usually signed off by correspondence under Chair's Action, drawing on the advice of other panel members as appropriate.

If it is decided that the conditions have been met, the Chair will confirm re-approval and sign off the periodic review outcome form to evidence this. If any condition has not been met or further evidence is required, the Chair will request additional documentation and to address the outstanding issues. If the conditions are not able to be met, the matter is referred back to the Academic Director of Partnerships to determine an appropriate course of action.

The course team's subsequent response to any requirements should be submitted to [the](#) Partnerships Office by the agreed deadline(s). These are considered by the Academic Director of Partnerships and are monitored by regular reports to the Joint Board of Study.

University of East Anglia

GUIDANCE NOTES FOR PERIODIC REVIEW PANEL CHAIRS, PANEL MEMBERS, PANEL SECRETARIES AND STUDENTS

Please use the checklist below to guide your consideration of the course proposal. The notes draw upon guidance in the section of the QAA Code of Practice on programme design, approval, monitoring and review (Section 7, September 2006) available to view at:

<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Documents/programmedesign.pdf>

Guidance notes for panel members

Before the periodic review event

- Take time to read the documentation in advance and ask for any supplementary documentation or seek clarification on any points of ambiguity via [the](#) Partnerships Office before the event.

At the periodic review event

- Your role as a panel member is that of a 'critical friend' who is there to discuss the course in detail, identifying areas of good practice and making suggestions to the course team on how the course could be improved, arising from your scrutiny of the periodic review documentation.
- Aim to foster an atmosphere of constructive critical dialogue with the team rather than one of confrontation, for example by avoiding aggressive questioning styles that put the course team on the defensive and by highlighting positive aspects of the course rather than focusing exclusively on areas of concern.
- Do not leave major concerns unvoiced - these cannot be considered if they are not documented at the event.
- If you are a panel member as a result of your subject expertise, please ensure that you are familiar with the appropriate QAA subject benchmark statement.
- *External academic panel members* should be prepared to challenge assumptions held by the course team or the University/partner institution, and offer a fresh critical but constructive perspective.
- *Industry professional or employer representatives* should offer a view on the continuing value and relevance of the course in relation to industry, the profession and/or employer needs, and give close consideration to any work placement, work-based learning or employment-related aspects of the course.

- *UEA academic panel members* should act as a critical friend to enhance the course, drawing on their experiences at UEA and their subject expertise, where relevant.
- *Student members* of periodic review panels are full members of the panel and should offer a student perspective on the course under review, including thoughts on course content, learning, teaching and assessment methods, access to resources, student support mechanisms and the opportunities for students to provide feedback on their learning experience. Further information is available in the 'Guidance for students involved in the course review process below.
- *Head of HE or nominee from partner institution panel members* are full members of the panel and should be prepared to answer any queries regarding the institution's policies, procedures and regulations and background information about the institution.
- *UEA Partnerships Office panel members* are full members of the panel and are able to provide information on the relationship between the University and the institution, policies, procedures and regulations and should advise the panel on quality assurance issues from the University's point of view.
- A meeting with students is arranged wherever possible, as this helps you to form a more holistic view of the provision and allows you to ask about course delivery arrangements and learning and teaching from a student's perspective. The student experience should be a key focus of the panel's considerations.
- Regulations and rules of assessment at the partner institution have been approved by the University and therefore cannot be challenged at a periodic review event.

Guidance notes for periodic review panel chairs

- Open the event by welcoming review panel members and asking everyone to introduce themselves.
- Use the panel secretary as a source of knowledge and consult with him/her to confirm that the aspects to be explored during validation have been addressed.
- Outline the purpose of the event, the structure of the day, the role of the review panel and the range of possible outcomes of the event. Ensure that all panel members are clear about their own and others' roles.
- Set a constructive tone to encourage productive dialogue with the course team. Encourage all panel members to participate and do not allow an individual panel member to dominate the discussion.
- Ensure that the role of staff and student representatives on panels is clear, to avoid them answering questions that are more appropriate for the course team.
- Ensure that all panel members are given an equal opportunity to question the panel.
- Ensure that discussions are conducted in a manner that is easily understood by external and student panel members, for example by avoiding excessive use of acronyms.
- When you open the initial closed panel discussion, invite the external academic representative(s) to offer their views first, as they have been asked to join the panel because of their subject expertise. An appropriate 'batting order' might be:

external academic experts, internal academic experts, employer/professional body representative(s), student representative, other panel members (who might include other university staff, Partnerships Office representatives, etc)

At the end of the panel's initial discussion, summarise the main points raised and add any issues or questions of your own. This summary will form a framework for the panel's meeting with the course team. Course teams will be expecting you to structure the discussion by grouping issues under the headings on the following pages (*Aspects to be explored during periodic review*).

- Plan the discussion with the students and the course team by agreeing which panel member will lead questioning in specific areas, ensuring that the amount of time allotted to discussion of each topic aligns with its importance.
- It can be helpful to invite the course team to offer an initial short presentation of their self-evaluation as a preliminary to the discussion with panel members (this should normally be considered and agreed through the panel secretary in advance of the event).
- At the start of the meeting with the course team, ask all present to introduce themselves again (including course team members) and set a positive tone by thanking the team for attending and giving some positive feedback from the panel before commencing discussion of the issues.
- Ensure that all issues that might lead to conditions, requirements and/or recommendations are covered in the meeting with the course team, so that any conditions, requirements and/or recommendations do not come as a surprise at the end of the event.
- Discuss the outcomes of the course team meeting with panel members at the next closed panel session, summarising those issues where a satisfactory response was given, noting any queries that were not fully resolved and agreeing any points of good practice that emerged during discussion.
- Discussion with students is conducted formally, with all panel members present.
- Allow panel members some time after meeting students to feed back any fresh issues raised, queries resolved, or points of good practice mentioned.
- At the conclusion of the event, state clearly the panel's decision and any conditions, requirements and/or recommendations and associated deadlines, but remind teams that the periodic review report will be the definitive record of conclusions reached and any conditions, requirements and/or recommendations set.
- After the event, agree the draft periodic review report with the panel secretary.

Guidance for panel secretaries

- Your role is to take an accurate record of the meeting and to help the Chair to formulate conditions, requirements and recommendations.
- When you arrive, ensure that panel members have all the information they require.

- If not, try and arrange for it to be provided as soon as possible.
- Ensure that refreshments have arrived and that external panel members are appropriately supported (for example in terms of travel arrangements at the end of the day and fee and expenses claim forms).
- Ensure that name cards have been distributed (if not, improvise).
- Work with the Chair to ensure that the points on the checklist have been covered as far as possible.
- Try to ensure that the Chair drafts a full set of conditions, requirements and/or recommendations prior to the final meeting of the panel.
- Circulate draft conditions, requirements and recommendations to the course team as soon as possible (following approval by the Chair).
- Agree the draft report with the Chair, circulate to all panel members for comment and, once finalised and approved by the Chair send the final report to the partner institution for onward circulation.

Checklist

Aspects to be explored during periodic review
Rationale and Market Demand
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does there continue to be adequate student demand for the course(s) under review, and are there adequate employment opportunities upon graduation, both locally and further afield?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the skills and knowledge acquired during the course continue to be of use to students in their future careers?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Taking into consideration student performance data and feedback from students on their experiences, are student entry profiles appropriate?
Course Design and Curriculum Content
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the course continue to provide an up-to-date and relevant learning experience for students, which will prepare them well for their future careers?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do learning outcomes continue to reflect published QAA Subject Benchmark Statements, FD benchmarks (where appropriate), the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ), national occupational standards and any relevant Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body requirements?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the curriculum content continue to be appropriate to each stage of the course, and to the level of the award? Is the course balanced, for example in terms of academic and practical elements and the breadth and depth of the curriculum?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the design of the curriculum enable academic and intellectual progression by imposing increasing demands on the learner in terms of the acquisition of knowledge and skills, the capacity for conceptualisation, and increasing autonomy in learning?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the design of the course continue to be inclusive of disabled students?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Foundation degrees: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> how have employers been involved in the ongoing development of the course? is work-based learning adequately embedded in the programme of learning? Has there been ongoing engagement with appropriate Sector Skills Councils?
Delivery
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does there continue to be a suitable range and variety of learning and teaching methods to meet the needs of a diverse range of students, including those with disabilities?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are students satisfied with the quality of teaching on the course?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are levels of student retention and achievement satisfactory?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the Virtual Learning Environment used to good effect to support the delivery of the course?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are arrangements for work-based learning operating well, and does work-based

Aspects to be explored during periodic review
learning contribute to the overall coherence and integrity of the course?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are students satisfied with arrangements for course management and organisation?
Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do assessment methods continue to be appropriate, sufficiently varied and inclusive?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do assessment outcomes confirm that academic standards continue to be maintained?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there adequate opportunities for formative assessment, in order to support the development of students' abilities?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are students provided with adequate and timely feedback on their work?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Foundation degrees: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are employers involved in the assessment of students? If so, are there sound quality management processes in place?
Student Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are students provided with an appropriate level of academic support?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are arrangements in place to ensure that any additional needs of students are identified and reasonable adjustments are put in place to meet them?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are arrangements for tutorial support clear and generally understood by staff and students?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are student and course handbooks and other information for students clear and complete?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Foundation degrees: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are Learning Agreements in place to define the specific outcomes intended for the workplace learning, the responsibilities of the employers, students, mentors and academic tutors?
Facilities and Learning Resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do subject-specific learning resources continue to be appropriate to the course?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is adequate teaching and learning accommodation available?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are learners supported by appropriate and accessible library resources? Are reading lists up-to-date?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do students have access to adequate equipment (including ICT)?
Staffing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are staff teaching on the course appropriately qualified and experienced?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is appropriate technical and administrative support available?

Aspects to be explored during periodic review

- Are adequate staff development opportunities available to support the continuing professional development of the course team (including engagement in scholarly activity)?

Guidance for students involved in the course review process

These guidance notes provide information on the process for the review of courses (known as 'periodic review' of courses), which normally takes place every five years. The notes have been written to support students involved in the process, either as a member of a review panel or as a participant in a student meeting at a review event.

What is a periodic review event?

A periodic review event provides an opportunity for a course, or a group of related courses, to be reviewed to ensure that they continue to provide students with a high quality learning experience. The process allows the course team an opportunity to step back from the day-to-day running of the course and evaluate whether the course remains fit-for-purpose. It also provides an opportunity for the UEA who approve all of the institution's awards to oversee the quality of courses on offer.

Why is my involvement important?

UEA and the institution are keen to capture your views on the courses you are undertaking and the facilities for learning and support that are available to you. We value your opinion on your experiences, and are keen to ensure that you are able to take an active role in developing and improving learning opportunities at your institution.

What happens at a review event?

A review panel is formed to consider the course(s) under review. There are typically around 10 members of the panel, including academic staff, administrative staff, students and external representatives (including employer representatives).

Two or three weeks before the event, panel members are sent a pack which contains details on arrangements for the event and information on the course (prepared by the course team). This gives panel members a chance to find out more about the course before the event and to identify any things that they would like to discuss on the day.

The review panel meets at the institution and during the event (which usually starts at around 9:30am and finishes by 3pm), the panel gets a chance to view facilities, meet with students and discuss the course with the course team.

At the end of the event, the panel reaches a decision about the quality and future of the course, and has the opportunity to commend positive aspects of the course and identify areas where there is scope for improvement. These conclusions are recorded in a written report.

The course team is expected to revise the course in light of any recommendations by the panel, and this is overseen by UEA.

I am a panel member – what is my role?

You are a full and equal member of the review panel and your views will be valued by other panel members. Please participate honestly and constructively, and don't be afraid to ask questions, make suggestions or tell the panel and the course team how you and other students feel about your experiences on the course.

Some of the things you might want to consider are:

- Is the course meeting your expectations?
- Are the teaching methods appropriate?
- Are timetables and workloads manageable?
- Do you have adequate access to the necessary resources (e.g. labs, computers, the library)?
- Do you feel that the course is preparing you well for future employment or future study?
- Is information in course handbooks and on the Virtual Learning Environment clear and up-to-date?

- Are you clear about how your work is assessed? Do you get useful and timely feedback on your work from members of the course team?
- Do you feel that there is sufficient support (both academic and personal) to help you during your time at your institution?
- Does the course team seek your views on the course on a regular basis? Do you feel that your views are listened to? Are there matters that students have previously raised with the course team that you feel need to be addressed further?
- What do you like most about your course?
- Is there anything that could be improved?

If the panel does not ask questions about something that you feel is important, do not be afraid to bring it to their attention as you have a unique and valuable perspective on the quality of the course. If there is anything that you do not understand, please feel free to ask any member of the panel for clarification.

Although the experience may initially seem daunting, please rest assured that your thoughts and suggestions are incredibly valuable and the panel will be keen to make you feel welcome and to hear your views.

I am taking part in a student meeting with the panel – what is expected of me?

Review panels find it incredibly useful to meet with students, to get a real feel for how the course is operating and how it is viewed by students. Members of the panel will ask you questions about your experiences on the course, some of which may be similar to the questions listed in the section above.

Although it can seem a daunting prospect to meet with the panel, please do not feel intimidated as the panel will be keen to hear your views. Please speak freely and honestly about your experiences on the course, highlighting any aspects of the course that you like and any areas where you think there is room for improvement. If the panel does not ask questions about something that you feel is important, do not be afraid to bring it to their attention.

Your feedback will be treated with discretion and your views will not be individually attributed to you in either the written report of the event or in verbal feedback to the course team.

What's in it for you?

Firstly, you will be helping to improve the course for yourself and your fellow students. You get to have your views listened to and taken seriously, and you will have a real input into decisions that are made that will affect your course.

You will get to meet new people, and it will also provide an opportunity to gain new skills and enhance your CV. It's a real chance to put your communication skills into action, and for student representatives on the panel it provides an opportunity to demonstrate your teamwork, time management, negotiation and presentation/meeting skills. As one former student panel member noted about the role, "this was truly an experience I am glad I participated in" and "I would actively encourage other students in the future to be involved".

Where can I go to for further advice?

If you would like further information or advice on taking part in a periodic review event, please get in touch with the Partnerships Office at UEA, who will be happy to advise you or point you in the right direction of someone who can help. Their contact details are available on the web at <http://www.uea.ac.uk/partnerships/people>

[NAME OF] COLLEGE SELF-EVALUATION DOCUMENT

PERIODIC REVIEW OF [LIST OF COURSES]

[DATE OF PERIODIC REVIEW EVENT]

This document can be provided in a larger font or alternative format if required.

Guidance for completion of this self-evaluation document:

The self-evaluation document is a crucial part of the review process and should be a critical commentary of the course(s) that identifies those issues the course team wish to explore in greater depth.

The evaluation should draw upon a wide range of evidence including recent [SARE/AMR] reports, statistical data, feedback from students, feedback from external examiners and professional and statutory or regulatory body reports. It should be a reflective account of the quality of the provision under review and an indication of how the course team see the provision developing over the next few years.

Please complete all sections of the document.

Further detailed guidance can be found in section 8 of the Validation Handbook.

The following documents are attached as Appendices:

The last validation/revalidation report

Any other external/PSRB reports where appropriate

The last three years' [SARE/AMR] reports

The last three years' External Examiner reports

Current course handbook (including the programme specification and all relevant module specifications)

Staff CVs

1. Courses covered by this self-evaluation:

2. Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body accreditation details:

3. Study abroad, work placement or work-based learning details:

4. Comments on the distinctive features of this provision, including comparisons with similar provision at other institutions:

5. Self-evaluation summary

a) Curriculum:

b) Learning, teaching and assessment:

c) Student recruitment and student entry profiles:

d) Student retention, progression and achievement and graduate destinations:

e) Student support mechanisms:

f) Learning resources

g) Staffing:

h) Staff development activity:

i) Employer engagement:

j) Any other issues:

6. Key themes for consideration at periodic review:

Appendices

Appendix 1

The last validation/revalidation report

Appendix 2

Any other external/PSRB reports where appropriate

Appendix 3

The last three years' [SARE/AMR] reports

Appendix 4

The last three years' External Examiner reports

Appendix 5

Current course handbook (which includes the programme specification and all relevant module specifications)

Appendix 6

Staff CVs