

**POLICY FOR THE PERIODIC REVIEW OF TAUGHT PROGRAMMES**

AU-LTC-20-3163-A

**2020/21**

**Policy Summary**

This Policy, approved by the University’s Learning and Teaching Committee, sets out a process for the University’s Periodic six-yearly Reviews of Taught Programmes. In implementing the reviews the University is also revalidating the programmes for their future delivery.

**Related Regulations, Policies, and Guidance**

This policy has some features in common with the University’s policies for the Annual Review of Taught Programmes and the reviews of Student-facing Professional Services. Data from the annual reports of the reviews of taught programmes is part of the dataset for Periodic Review.

**Version Control**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No** | **Version** | **Responsible Officer** | **Approved by** | **Approval Date** | **Effective Date** |
| AU-OLTC-19-2318 | A | Sarah Davies | Operational Learning and Teaching Committee | 8 October 2019 |  |
|  |  |  | Learning and Teaching Committee | 4 November 2019 | 4 November 2019 |
| AU-LTC-20-3163 | A | Yvonne Henderson | Learning and Teaching Committee | 4th December 2020 | 4th December 2020 |

Contents

[1. Introduction and Purpose 4](#_Toc58575803)

[2. Data for Review 5](#_Toc58575804)

[3. Panel Membership 6](#_Toc58575805)

[3.1 Review Panels normally consist of: 6](#_Toc58575806)

[3.2 Further guidance for each Panel position is provided below: 6](#_Toc58575807)

[4. Review meetings 8](#_Toc58575808)

[4.1 Periodic Review Pre-Meeting 8](#_Toc58575809)

[4.2 Review Day 9](#_Toc58575810)

[5. Review Outcomes 10](#_Toc58575811)

[6. Review Outcomes – the Report and Responding to the Report 12](#_Toc58575812)

[7. Overview Report 13](#_Toc58575813)

[8. Evaluation of Process 13](#_Toc58575814)

[APPENDIX ONE: EVIDENCE BASE 13](#_Toc58575815)

[APPENDIX TWO - QUALITY TEAM AND COLLEGE RESPONSIBILITIES 15](#_Toc58575816)

[APPENDIX THREE - INDICATIVE REVIEW TIMETABLE 17](#_Toc58575817)

[APPENDIX FOUR - COLLABORATIVE PROVISION 18](#_Toc58575818)

[APPENDIX FIVE - PERIODIC REVIEW OF JOINT PROGRAMMES 21](#_Toc58575819)

[APPENDIX SIX - PERIODIC REVIEW EXPECTATIONS 22](#_Toc58575820)

## 1. Introduction and Purpose

1.1 All taught programmes are reviewed at least every six years, with individual programmes often being considered as part of a small group of subject-related programmes. The full schedule of reviews for the next ten years may be found at the Periodic Review and Revalidation intranet page:

<https://www2.aston.ac.uk/clipp/quality/a-z/programmereview6-year/index>

1.2 The schedule for the year’s reviews will be received by the University’s Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC), at the beginning of each academic year. The University’s Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) will approve the policy for Periodic Review and overview reports; the Learning and Teaching Committee will approve the annual schedule of reviews and consider the implementation of the policy and individual reports and responses.

1.3 Subject areas may request changes to the schedule to accommodate an accreditation visit, or request that a review be held jointly with a professional, regulatory or statutory body, with all applications to the Quality Team being considered on an individual basis. If you have any queries about the schedule of review or the specific programmes that will be within its scope, please contact a member of the Quality Team, via the Education Quality Team email address: [clipp\_quality@aston.ac.uk](mailto:clipp_quality@aston.ac.uk)

* 1. Periodic Review aims to promote continuous improvement in the student academic experience and to ensure that programmes are achieving the objectives the University has set for them. In developing its review procedures, the University has considered the advice on Monitoring and Evaluation in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education; the Office for Students Securing student success: Regulatory framework for higher education in England February 2018, OfS 2018.01; the standards set out in the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG 2015), and University Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).

Reflecting the Expectations of the UK Quality Code, the purposes of programme review are to ensure that:

* the academic standards of courses meet the requirements of the national qualifications framework
* the value of qualifications awarded to students at the point of qualification and over time is in line with sector-recognised standards
* students have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers
* when working in partnership with other organisations, the University has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are secure irrespective of where or how programmes are delivered or who delivers them.

The University also uses programme evaluation to:

* confirm that the portfolio of programmes aligns with University strategic priorities
* consider the currency and validity of programmes
* identify any problems that need to be resolved
* highlight where improvements are possible and enable good practice to be identified and shared.

1.5 As part of the review, subject areas are asked to provide a self-evaluation document (SED) providing a commentary on a range of data (see Data for Review in Section 2 below), highlighting any issues and how they are being addressed, and highlighting areas of potential good practice. If subject areas have recently submitted, or are about to submit, a self-evaluation document as part of an external accreditation exercise, this document may also be suitable for internal Periodic Review; subject areas should consult a member of the Quality Team at an early stage to discuss.

[Appendix Four](#_APPENDIX_FOUR_-) offers additional guidance on the review of collaborative programmes

[Appendix Five](#_APPENDIX_FIVE_-) offers additional guidance on the review of Joint Programmes.

1.6 The University also conducts reviews of research degrees, with oversight provided by the Graduate School Management Committee. More information about research degree reviews may be found on the [Aston Graduate School Research Degrees](https://www2.aston.ac.uk/current-students/graduate-school/index) intranet page.

## 2. Data for Review

2.1 The data to be considered at Periodic Review is listed in [Appendix One](#_APPENDIX_ONE:_EVIDENCE). In order to prevent over-burdening both the subject team and review Panel members with data they do not necessarily need and may not have time to review, subject areas are asked to limit their review submission to a Self-evaluation document that does not normally exceed 3,000 words and to the additional data indicated in [Appendix One](#_APPENDIX_ONE:_EVIDENCE).

2.2 The submission of the data for Periodic Review is the responsibility of the Programme Director(s), but it is expected that the material will be provided following consultation with students, the wider programme delivery team, other subject area staff, and the appropriate Associate Dean/s, and College Quality Officer. The self-evaluation document should be the only document that needs to be prepared specifically for the review.

All documents should be submitted electronically to the Review Secretary

2.3 The Programme Directors and Quality Officer of the areas to be reviewed will be invited to a briefing meeting with their Review Secretary, who is normally a member of the Quality Team, to support preparation for the review. This meeting will cover

* the scope of the review
* brief outline of the process
* student involvement in the process
* preparation of the SED and supporting data
* the pre-meeting
* the review meeting
* the review report and response
* action planning and sign off
* operational aspects of the review,

and will aim to address any questions the subject area may have. Further information on the respective responsibilities of Colleges and the Quality Team in managing review events, and a timeline for this activity, is set out in [Appendix Two](#_APPENDIX_TWO_-).

2.4 The data for review should be submitted to the Quality Team in the Education Team at least six weeks in advance of the review date to allow all Panel members to provide feedback in time for a review Pre-meeting (see guidance on the Pre-meeting below). If data is not submitted in good time this may lead to the cancellation of the review and potentially that the programmes will not be permitted by LTC to recruit for the following academic year.

## 3. Panel Membership

### 3.1 Review Panels normally consist of:

* a minimum of two independent external Panel members: one an external academic member, and the second a representative of a professional body or an employer of graduates in this area. External representatives should not be past, current or intended External Examiners, nor be representatives of a client for whom a bespoke programme is being delivered
* at least two members of the LTC, or University staff nominated by the Chair of LTC. The representatives will normally be staff from different Colleges to the area being reviewed
* a minimum of one student representative, normally selected from a pool of trained student volunteers and elected representatives of the Students’ Union
* a member of the University’s Quality Team, who will also act as the review Secretary.

The Quality Team will appoint a Chair from the internal members of the Panel and the Chair may co-opt additional members to the Panel as considered appropriate, for example, an expert in the delivery of Higher Education in a particular country. Each review panel member will undertake a specific role, with each member focussing on two or more of the Expectations set out in [Appendix Six](#_APPENDIX_SIX_-). It is the role of the Chair to maintain oversight of all aspects of the review. Student representatives will normally focus on the student experience and the effectiveness of student engagement. For more information on the roles of the respective Panel members see 3.2 below.

Subject areas are invited to nominate external Panel members to the Quality Team, but where nominations are not received or are considered unsuitable for the role, the Quality Team will access wider quality networks to identify and appoint the Panel members.

### 3.2 Further guidance for each Panel position is provided below:

#### Chair

* overall responsibility for the delegation of work to ensure full coverage of the Expectations set out in [Appendix Six](#_APPENDIX_SIX_-)
* to ensure meetings are conducted in a timely manner
* to orally present the review findings to the subject area at the end of the review day
* to work with the review Secretary to complete and agree the final report and to be signatory to the report as presented to LTC
* to act as a scrutineer of the subject area’s progress against the action plan
* in the event of a review resulting in a short-cycle review outcome, where possible, the Chair will continue in this role for the short-cycle review.

#### Internal Panel Members

* to undertake initial reading of material in advance of the Pre-meeting
* to support the Chair in devising lines of enquiry
* to take the lead in asking questions relating to their areas of responsibility
* to contribute to the final report and action plan.

#### Student Reviewer

* to be a full panel member with the same responsibilities as other Internal Panel Members (see above)
* to focus on the student experience and the effectiveness of student engagement in all aspects of the review.

#### External Panel Member

* to be a full panel member with the same responsibilities as other Internal Panel Members (see above), providing initial feedback to the Chair and Secretary in advance of the Pre-meeting
* to provide subject-specific expertise to the review in areas such as the curriculum; professional body requirements; employability and academic standards.

#### Secretary

* to be a full panel member with the same responsibilities as other Internal Panel Members (see above)
* to liaise with the subject area on behalf of the review panel
* to draft and finalise the written report for LTC in consultation with the wider panel
* at the end of each review, to canvass the views of the Panel and College Facilitator on the process of Periodic Review to feed into the overall annual review of policy and process carried out by the Learning and Teaching Committee.

**Other key roles:**

#### *College Facilitator (normally the College-based Quality Officer*)

* key liaison point between the subject area, the Lead Student Representative (see below) and the review Secretary throughout the review
* attends the Pre-meeting
* observes all meetings throughout the review day, except those with students and the meeting where the Panel agrees their final report.

#### Lead Student Representative

The subject area’s staff and students may wish to consider the appointment of a Lead Student Representative to take the following role:

* key liaison point between the subject area’s students, the College Facilitator and the Quality Team throughout the review
* attends the Pre-meeting
* observes the Panel meeting with the students
* coordinates the student contribution to the SED.

## 4. Review meetings

### 4.1 Periodic Review Pre-Meeting

The purpose of the pre-meeting is

* for Review Panel members to address any remaining questions about the review
* to discuss the information provided and identify any additional information that needs to be provided and within what timescales
* to set an indicative agenda for the review day
* to identify the responsibilities of each Panel member with respect to the review Expectations (see [Appendix Six](#_APPENDIX_SIX_-))
* to confirm practical arrangements for the review day.

External Panel members are requested to provide the Review Secretary with brief initial notes prior to the pre-meeting, particularly on the curriculum, the learning outcomes, and the learning and teaching and assessment methods. The feedback will be shared with the internal members of the Panel and will be used to agree the main review agenda.

The attendees for the pre-meeting should be the internal Panel members, key staff from the subject area preparing for review, and representatives of the College: normally the Programme Directors, Associate Dean Learning and Teaching, and the College Quality Officer.

### 4.2 Review Day

The Panel, including external panel members, will meet senior staff, students, support staff and teaching staff:

**Review Day**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Expected Attendees** |
| Senior Staff | Executive Dean or nominee, Associate Deans, Programme Directors for each programme under review.  College Quality Officer and Facilitator (if not the same). |
| Students and graduates | Student representatives for each programme and each year of the programmes under review.  A student taking, or having taken, a placement for each programme under review.  The Lead Student representative (if appointed, see above).  Graduates of the most recent cohort are also welcome to attend this meeting. |
| Professional services staff | Key professional services staff in the areas of admissions, assessment, learning technologies and other areas impacting on the student experience.  A member of staff from the Library, from the Learning Development Centre (LDC), from Careers + Placements.  College Quality Officer and Facilitator (if not the same). |
| Teaching Staff | Programme Directors, Admissions Tutors and Placement Tutors for each programme. Module Leaders for each core module.  College Quality Officer and Facilitator (if not the same). |
| Feedback Session | Executive Dean, Associate Deans, Programme Directors for each programme under review.  College Quality Officer and Facilitator (if not the same).  Lead Student Representative (if appointed).  All other review attendees who wish to be present. |

* the meeting with senior staff will be focussed on strategy and portfolio planning and development
* meetings with students are fundamental to the review process and the subject area will be asked to invite students to meet the Panel. Students should be representative of the student body and include students who are on placement and who have returned from placement. Where a large proportion of students study away from campus, consideration should be given to talking to those students via Skype or video-conferencing
* the meeting with teaching staff will explore curriculum design and delivery as well as issues raised in other meetings, such as the meeting with students
* the meeting with professional services staff provides an opportunity for staff to inform the Panel on how administrative processes operate, and to describe how students are supported and the interaction between academic and support staff. University Library, LDC, and Careers + Placements staff who are the main links between these central services and the area under review, should be invited by the College to attend this session
* the College Quality Officer, in their role as the College review Facilitator, will be invited to observe all meetings throughout the review day, except those with students and the meeting where the Panel agree their final report.

At the end of the review day all attendees are invited to a feedback session where key findings will be orally reported by the Chair of the Panel, and the Programme Director(s) will be invited to make a response.

Please see [Appendix Three](#_APPENDIX_THREE_-) for an indicative timetable for the review meetings.

## 5. Review Outcomes

**Judgements**

Review panels are asked to make a Judgement about the aspects under review using the Expectations set out in [Appendix Six](#_APPENDIX_SIX_-). A report will be made to LTC, together with the subject area’s plans to address any recommendations. LTC will confirm if recruitment to the programmes may continue and the date of the next review, and will monitor the action plan to completion. Any LTC decision that the programme should not be offered in the next, or subsequent academic years, must take into account the transition arrangements needed for current students and for those holding offers of a place on the programme.

The review panel arrives at a judgement about each of the Expectations based on the evidence of the data provided and the discussions that take place during the review event itself.

**One of Four Judgements is possible:**

* Commended- the subject area meets University Expectations and has a number of examples of good practice that merit further dissemination
* Meets Expectations – the subject area meets University Expectations
* Requires improvement to meet Expectations: the subject area is failing to meet a significant number of review Expectations or failing to meet some Expectations by a large margin
* Pending – a decision will be deferred until further information has been provided or action taken, within a timescale specified by the Review Panel.

A subject area that ‘Requires improvement to meet Expectations’ will have a further Periodic Review in one, two or three years, depending on the nature of the concern and as recommended by the Review Panel and confirmed by LTC. Where there are very serious concerns, or where a subject area fails to provide the further information or take the necessary action linked to a ‘Pending’ decision, LTC may take the decision to end recruitment to the programme as a temporary or permanent measure. Subject areas that ‘Meet Expectations’, or which are ‘Commended’ are regarded as having their curriculum revalidated and will have their next Periodic Review in six years’ time.

Reviews at less than a six-year interval (or ‘short-cycle reviews’) consider the progress of the subject area towards meeting the recommendations of the original Periodic Review, and may also make any additional recommendations required. A short-cycle review does not consider the full range of issues and evidence considered in a Periodic Review and does not replace a Periodic Review. The Panel recommending a short-cycle review may specify in what form the review should take place, including the composition of the Panel, with whom it should meet, and the evidence it should see.

**In addition to a Judgement, the Review Panel will agree Recommendations, Commendations and Affirmations** **as part of each report.**

* **Recommendations** will be matters that need further action, will be classed as ‘Essential’, ‘Advisable’ or ‘Desirable’, and will indicate the timeframe within which the Review Panel considers the recommendations should be acted upon:
* Essential recommendations represent serious shortcomings which must be urgently and fully addressed
* Advisable recommendations represent shortcomings which must be promptly and fully addressed
* Desirable recommendations represent potential enhancements which should be considered for adoption.
* **Commendations** describe the practice the Panel has observed which is considered exemplary, and/or innovative
* **Affirmations** acknowledge developments already in place or planned to address previously identified issues.

The subject area is given initial oral feedback on the Judgement, Recommendations, Commendations and Affirmations at the end of the review event, and the Programme Director(s) will be invited to make a response. This will be followed by a written report.

At the end of each review, the Review Secretary will canvass the views of the Panel and College Facilitator on the process of Periodic Review to feed into the overall annual review of policy and process carried out by the Learning and Teaching Committee.

## 6. Review Outcomes – the Report and Responding to the Report

6.1 The report will be drafted by the Secretary, normally within two weeks, agreed by the Panel members, and forwarded to the key review contacts in the subject area. The key contacts will check that the report is factually accurate and, in partnership with students, draft an action plan to address any recommendations, returning the plan to the Review Secretary, normally within four weeks. The response should identify who is to take forward the actions and within what timescale. The report may also identify actions to be taken at College and University level, which the Review Secretary should discuss with the appropriate areas and include their responses within the report before it is forwarded to LTC.

6.2 Depending on the sequence of review, College and LTC meetings: the agreed report may be submitted to LTC as one document which includes the action plan from the subject area, or may be submitted initially as a report with the response to follow. LTC will also consult the Panel Chair for their view of the action plan and its capacity to address the review recommendations. Unless LTC determines otherwise, all actions must be completed within the timescale recommended by the Panel, and all actions should normally be completed within one academic year.

The Chair of LTC will determine when the next update to the response will be required, until the point that all actions are complete. Review outcomes should also be considered at Student staff meetings, Programme Committee and College Learning and Teaching Committee meetings as a standing item, at regular intervals, until all actions are complete.

6.3 Following LTC consideration of the report and response, the Secretary of LTC will inform the subject area of the feedback from LTC. The named key contacts for the review are responsible for disseminating the findings of the reports to colleagues within their Colleges, ensuring that actions take place and that good practice is disseminated within the College. The Quality Team are responsible for disseminating the findings of the reports across the institution and to the Students’ Union, and considering either the need for further action on an institutional basis, or, if there is good practice and enhancement, where it should be implemented more widely.

Please see [Appendix Two](#_APPENDIX_TWO_-) for a summary timetable of the reporting process.

6.4 The Senate acts as the academic scrutineer for the University’s Council and reviews the monitoring and review processes on an annual basis (Council M16/131, 28 November 2016).

6.5 Council, as the University’s governing body, has oversight of academic governance and is required to provide assurance statements to the Office for Students (OfS) to evidence that the University is meeting the ongoing conditions for registration with the OfS.

6.6 Appeal

Any College that wishes to appeal the outcomes of a Periodic Review should, as a first stage, enter into a dialogue with the review Chair. If such discussions fail to reach agreement, a written appeal should be sent by the Executive Dean to the Chair of LTC within fourteen days of receipt of the review report. The appeal will be considered by the Chair of LTC, whose decision shall be final.

## 7. Overview Report

The main findings of reviews will be periodically summarised in an overview report by the Quality Team for consideration by LTC and Senate. The report will include:

* common themes
* areas of good practice
* recommendations for further action.

## 8. Evaluation of Process

The University Learning and Teaching Committee will review regularly the Periodic Review process to ensure that it remains fit for purpose and that review outcomes continue to contribute to the enhancement of the student learning experience.

Edu/SJD/September2019

## APPENDIX ONE: EVIDENCE BASE

**University data:**

Aston Strategy 2018-2023

University KPIs (as set out in the Expectations in [Appendix Six](#_APPENDIX_SIX_-))

Student Equalities Report

University programme design principles

University Student Representation Framework

**Subject and Programme data:**

* Self-evaluation document
* Programme and Module Specifications, and curriculum maps for each programme under review, setting out any proposed changes to these documents for the next delivery of the programmes
* access to reading lists for each module under review
* Annual Monitoring and Review Reports for the past three years
* most recent internal Periodic Review report and response
* most recent internal Interim or Short-cycle review and response (where this has taken place)
* Student Handbooks
* On-line prospectus
* Information on placements and the take up of placements, student and employer feedback
* The most recent External Examiner’s report and response
* The most recent National Student Survey(NSS) /Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) and University Pulse survey results
* Student Staff Committee Minutes for the past year
* Programme Committee Minutes for the past year
* School/College Forum minutes for the previous year
* Minutes of any employer Advisory Board, or equivalent, for the past year, other evidence of feedback from employers and placement employers;
* most recent professional body report and response, if any; and any other PSRB feedback
* feedback from collaborative partners (where appropriate)
* a structure chart and list of staff involved in the delivery of the programme with role titles (both teaching and support staff);
* statistical data for the past 3 years –
* recruitment patterns, including applications and conversion rates and percentage of undergraduate numbers recruited from Clearing
* progression rates; completion rates; degree outcomes
* employment outcomes

**Quality Team data**

* outcomes from a Quality Team administered questionnaire issued to qualifying year undergraduate students and postgraduate students.

All information provided to staff and students as part of the Periodic Review process must be treated as confidential and used for the purpose of the review only. Reviewers should keep all data secure throughout the review process.

## APPENDIX TWO - QUALITY TEAM AND COLLEGE RESPONSIBILITIES

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Task** | **When** | **Who** |
| **CONFIRM DATE OF REVIEW AND AGREE KEY CONTACTS IN THE QUALITY TEAM AND COLLEGES** | -16 weeks | Quality Team and College\* |
| Inform all staff who will attend the review (academic and support staff within and outside of the College), of the date of the review and ask them to keep the full day clear until a specific meeting slot on that day is confirmed. Request that the College Executive Dean or nominee, and appropriate Associate Deans also keep the morning free. Provide Quality Team with the names of those attending. | -16 weeks or as soon as review date is known. | College |
| Inform all students of the review date and ask for nominations to meet the review Panel. All elected student programme reps are expected to attend. | -16 weeks or as soon as review date is known/term starts/student reps for those cohorts have been appointed. | College |
| Provide Quality Team with names of two proposed External Panel members to check suitability. | -16 weeks | College |
| Check suitability and availability of External Panel nominees. | -16 weeks | Quality |
| Confirm with External and Internal Panel members their appointment.  Book accommodation for External Panel members at Aston Conference Centre if needed. | -16 weeks | Quality |
| Make arrangements for pre-meeting. | -16 weeks | Quality |
| Submit supporting evidence to Quality Team. | -6 weeks | College |
| Distribute survey (web link provided by Quality Team) to students (excluding final year undergraduate students) | -6 weeks | College |
| Distribute supporting evidence to all panellists. | -6 weeks | Quality |
| \* *In this context the ‘Quality Team’ refers to those staff located centrally and not Quality staff located in Colleges, who would more often take the role of review Facilitator. Within the College the key contacts will normally be the Programme Director and Quality Officer; a lead Programme Director may need to be nominated where a range of different programmes are reviewed.*  Cont… | | |
| **PRE-MEETING**  Pre-meeting of internal panellists and from the College - the Programme Director and Quality Officer (and Facilitator if not the same) as minimum. Confirm the timetable for the review day, identify lines of enquiry, and request any additional information. | -2 weeks | Quality Team and College |
| Distribute student experience survey results to panellists. | -2 weeks | Quality |
| Provide review Panel Chair and Secretary with any additional evidence requested at pre-meeting. | -1 week | College |
| Arrange a briefing of all student programme reps and other students who will be meeting the Panel. | -1 week | College |
| Book catering as per timetable agreed at pre-meeting. | -1 week | Quality |
| Create name plates for all attendees. | -1 week | Quality |
| Distribute newly received evidence requested at pre-meeting to all panellists (if any) | -1 week | Quality |
| **REVIEW DAY** | 0 |  |
| Draft report to Panel members | +2 weeks | Quality |
| Authorise payments to External Panel members. | +1 week | Quality and College |
| Response of subject area/programme team to the report. | 4 weeks from receipt of report | College |
| Report and response from subject area to LTC. | At next meeting of LTC following the review. LTC to then continue to receive the reports until any actions are completed | Quality and College |
| Feedback from LTC to the College. | Following each meeting of LTC where the report is considered | Quality |

## APPENDIX THREE - INDICATIVE REVIEW TIMETABLE

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 10:00 – 11:00 | Panel session |
| 11:00 – 12:00 | Panel meets senior staff |
| 12:00 – 1:00 | Panel meets students |
| 1.00 – 2:00 | Panel working lunch |
| 2:00 – 2:30 | Panel meets support staff |
| 2:30 – 3:30 | Panel meets teaching staff |
| 3:30 – 4:30 | Panel session |
| 4.30 | Feedback session for staff/students |

## APPENDIX FOUR - COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

This Appendix provides additional guidance for Periodic Reviews of taught programmes where there is collaborative provision i.e. where the delivery of the programme’s learning outcomes are dependent upon another institution or organisation. The University remains responsible for student outcomes and the quality of the student academic experience wherever the students are based. Subject areas are advised to consult the Quality Team in the Education Team if there is any doubt about which programmes fall within this category.

The normal review procedures and timing of review may be amended depending on the nature of the collaboration. The University’s Collaborative Provision Strategy Group (CPSG) will make the final decision on the format for each review, which may include a visit to the partner organisation(s).

**Purpose**

In addition to the normal purpose of Periodic Review set out in the policy document, collaborative review also:

* re-visits the risk assessment
* considers whether or not the collaboration continues to have a strategic purpose
* considers the effectiveness of the arrangements set out in the collaborative agreement
* considers whether or not the arrangement should be renewed for a further period.

The risk assessment made by the review Panel needs to take into account:

* the complexity of the collaboration
* the status of the partner organisation, and whether there is a need for the due diligence carried out at programme approval to be re-visited or carried out at a more detailed level
* the University Ethical Framework
* the level of experience of Aston in this type of arrangement
* whether the activity meets the University’s strategy
* the scale of this activity
* the resources to support the arrangement (both at Aston and the partner), and on-going oversight.

The University’s Head of Strategic Risk and Insurance is able to provide further guidance on the assessment and management of risk as necessary.

Any recommendation that the collaboration should not continue must take into account the transition arrangements needed for current students and for those holding an offer of a place on the programme.

**Costs**

Unless there is a financial agreement which specifies otherwise, all costs incurred in the review process, including the fees and reasonable expenses for the external member(s) of a Panel, will be borne by the University.

**Panel Membership**

The CPSG or the Panel Chair may wish to co-opt additional external panel members who, for example, have expertise in the country of operation or of a particular type of collaborative provision.

**Site Visit**

Arrangements for any site visit will be made by the Education Quality Team in liaison with the College and collaborative partner. The site visit will include meetings with key staff and students, together with a visit to view the resources available to students and staff. In

addition to meetings with teaching and support staff, the visit may include a meeting with the Head of the organisation, or nominee.

**Preparation for Review, and Report and Response**

The collaborative organisation should be fully involved in preparation for the review, in providing the supporting documents and in providing any commentary on the data. Representatives of the organisation should attend the main review meetings.

Following the review, the partner organisation should be offered the opportunity to correct any factual errors in the report and to submit comments to the review Panel.

A copy of the report will be forwarded to the Collaborative Provision Strategy Group for comment as well as to the LTC.

The collaborative organisation should also be involved in the response to the review and advised of the outcome of University committee consideration.

If a collaborative Agreement is to be renewed, a draft Agreement should be drawn up by the subject area in consultation with the Quality Team and Legal Services, for approval by the Collaborative Provision Strategy Group.

**Documents**

In addition to the data set out in [Appendix One](#_APPENDIX_ONE:_EVIDENCE), the following should be provided:

* a copy of the collaborative Agreement
* copies of promotional material
* minutes and the reporting line for the committee with responsibility for programme management
* a list of staff at the collaborative organisation who contribute to delivery, identifying their date of appointment, teaching and administrative responsibilities, with a brief statement of experience and qualifications
* details of the facilities provided by the collaborative organisation e.g. teaching accommodation, library and computing facilities
* the most recent evidence of due diligence being carried out on the partner
* the most recent risk assessment
* the most recent costings
* the most recent interim review report and response (if any).

The Panel may also request the most recent country report for countries identified by CPSG as being of higher risk.

**Meetings**

CPSG or the Panel Chair may wish to hold additional meetings with, for example, representatives of the clients for whom a collaborative programme is being delivered.

**Prompts for Meetings involving collaborative provision:**

How has the collaborative organisation been involved in the preparation for the review?

What were the original aims of the collaboration and how far have they been met?

Do the aims remain relevant and/or achievable in the future and does the collaboration fit the strategic plans of the University, College and collaborative organisation? Is the collaboration affected by any funding changes?

When the due diligence on the partner was completed, and does this need to be re-visited?

Has the collaboration operated in line with the Agreement, have there been any specific problems and how have these have been resolved?

Has the student intake remained within any minimum and maximum limits specified in the Agreement, and within the entry requirements stated in the programme specification? Is there a case for changing the minimum and/or maximum intake numbers if the Agreement is to be renewed?

Have the financial arrangements specified in the Agreement been sufficient to at least cover the costs of all parties? If costs have not been met, can the programme team identify the reason (e.g. a lower than expected student intake), and whether any increase or decrease in fees will be needed if the collaboration is to continue?

What is the process for managing changes to the programme and how are they communicated to staff and students?

How do staff ensure that the policy, procedures and Regulations which govern the collaborative programme are aligned to the University’s?

What are the mechanisms for ensuring that the academic standards are comparable with the academic standards of programmes wholly delivered within the University?

How does academic achievement compare with that for programmes wholly delivered within the University?

Where the collaborative organisation is responsible for the assessment of students, by what criteria are staff appointed and how are staff in this role inducted and given ongoing support?

What is the current staff/student ratio?

Have members of staff at the collaborative organisation or students encountered any issues in accessing University facilities such as the Library or VLE?

*Please contact a member of the Quality Team if you need any further advice on collaborative reviews.*

## APPENDIX FIVE - PERIODIC REVIEW OF JOINT PROGRAMMES

Each University **Joint Programme** has a designated ‘home’ subject and College, indicating the lead subject/College for administrative and management purposes. The home subject/College is responsible for leading on the Periodic Review of the programme, which may be included in a review group with other programmes from the same subject. The second subject/College should be consulted at all stages of the Periodic Review including the submission of the supporting evidence. The Periodic Review Panel should ensure that it meets students from the joint programme. It may be appropriate to include an additional subject specialist external panel member from the second subject.

The home subject is responsible for leading on the Periodic Review of the joint honours programme, which will normally be included in a review group with single honours programmes from the same subject. The second subjects should be consulted at all stages of the Periodic Review, including the submission of the supporting evidence. The Periodic Review Panel should meet with students from the joint programmes.

## APPENDIX SIX - PERIODIC REVIEW EXPECTATIONS

| Expectation | Contributing Factors | Evidence in addition to the self-evaluation and review meetings |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. The subject area actively engages with students and students are genuinely involved in a range of activity related to quality management and enhancement and understand the relevant processes. | The methods of collection and impact of student feedback on the curriculum, on decision making and change.  The engagement of students with decision making and committees (including students studying off campus).  The extent to which students understand and are aware of processes by which they are particularly affected, such as academic appeals. | Student staff committee minutes.  Programme Committee minutes.  School/College Forum minutes.  Student Representation Framework. |
| 2. Programme design enables standards to be set, allows students to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes and meets the University’s programme design principles. | The way in which the College ensures programmes are fit for purpose and current.  The use of benchmarks and PSRB requirements.  The externality of the programme.  The extent to which the curriculum meets University and College goals and targets.  The use of student feedback to inform curriculum design and development.  How assessment tasks are designed and agreed and processes for marking and moderation.  How feedback on assessment is provided to students.  Programme Design   * modernising and enhancing the curricula, good curriculum design * ensuring cohesive curricula * curriculum team reviewing programmes on a regular basis * integration of digital technologies in curriculum design * sufficient appropriately and qualified staff * sufficient facilities and learning resources.   Assessment and Feedback   * clear assessment and marking criteria at all levels * assessment aligned with the learning objectives.   Student awareness of receiving feedback. | Programme and module specifications and planned changes.  Curriculum maps.  Student continuation and completion data.  Programme Committee minutes.  Credit and Qualifications Framework.  UK Subject Benchmark Statements.  Staff list |
| 3. Admissions and Recruitment – there is a market for the programmes, the programmes are able to recruit a sufficient number of suitably qualified students from a diverse range of backgrounds and are recruiting to target.  ***Note*** *that the University’s KPI target is an average tariff score of 322 for young first time degree students, based on qualifications included in the UCAS tariff and Level 3 qualifications in the National Qualifications Framework.* | Data on recruitment patterns: have targets been met and how have they been met. Is there an over-reliance on recruitment through Clearing?  Over/under recruitment patterns, are there trends that may suggest unplanned or unmanaged growth or contraction.  • Have entry grades changed over the last 3 years and what is the plan for the next 5 years?  • Has the student profile changed in the last 3 years - locally domiciled, first in family to attend HE and BAME characteristics? | Applications, offers and acceptances, including those for students with different characteristics.  Changes in student entry requirements and the qualifications profile of students on entry.  On-line Prospectus. |
| 4. Students have a high degree of satisfaction with their programmes and student satisfaction is meeting University targets.  ***Note*** *that the University’s KPI targets for the University UG Pulse Surveys (to commence for second and final year students from October 2019) is 90% satisfaction.*  *The NSS target is 90% satisfaction with ‘Teaching on my course’ and 90% Student Satisfaction overall.*  ***Note*** *that the University’s KPI target for the University PGT Pulse Student Survey, to commence January 2020, is ‘Upper Quartile’, and the KPI for the national Postgraduate Taught Student Experience (PTES) survey is Upper Quartile for ‘Satisfaction with my course’* | The number, nature and pattern of any upheld complaints to the OIA.  The number, nature and pattern of any upheld complaints to the University. | National Student Survey (NSS) /Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES).  Quality Team student questionnaire to qualifying year students.  Student staff committee minutes.  Student complaints to the University and OIA that have been upheld. |
| 5. The subject area is responsive to feedback from students and other stakeholders. | How feedback is gathered and responded to.  Use of feedback in the enhancement of programmes. | External examiners’ reports and responses.  Any feedback from employers, placement providers, collaborative partners, professional bodies or alumni.  Any Advisory Board minutes.  Programme Committee minutes. |
| 6. Student continuation meets University targets and final degree classifications are monitored for any unexplained grade inflation.  ***Note*** *that the University’s KPI target for undergraduates is 97% continuation from first to second year.* | Degree outcomes including those for students with different characteristics.  If there is an upward trend in student end of Stage outcomes and degree classifications, can that data be explained: while acknowledging that grade inflation is often justifiable grade improvement, the University has an obligation under its registration with Office for Students to ensure that qualifications awarded to students hold their value over time. | Continuation – number of students failing to complete, who are trailing modules or have referred or deferred assessments.  End of Stage and Final degree outcomes, including outcomes for students with different characteristics.  Any differences in attainment between cohorts.    Number of academic appeals.  Student Equalities Report. |
| 7. Governance and quality assurance processes ensure that standards are secure and that there is an expectation of continuous improvement: the subject area has addressed, or has plans in place to address, the areas of focus identified in University KPIs. | College-level implementation of University quality management framework and academic plan.  Shared awareness and understanding of quality management processes across the subject area.  Committee structures and lines of decision making.  Mechanisms for sharing good practice.  Clarity and transparency of monitoring and review processes.  Use of data to inform practice.  Good practice in learning, teaching and assessment is disseminated. | Annual Review and Monitoring reports.  Periodic Review report and response.  External Examiners’ reports and responses.  Programme Committee minutes.  Structure chart.  Staff list. |
| 8. Published information for the intended audience about the programme(s) is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy. |  | Student Handbook.  Access to VLE.  On-line Prospectus.  Library and IT resources. |
| **(Where appropriate)**  9. Placements – students are successful in gaining rewarding placements and the subject area is meeting its placement targets.  ***Note*** *that the University’s KPI target is 80% of current placement students on a one year placement or formal short placement, and 60% of the graduating cohort to have taken some form of integrated work experience during their studies.* | Is there evidence of employer demand for placement opportunities  What are the trends in student uptake – have numbers increased or decreased over the past 3 years? | Student data on securing placements.    Student feedback.  Employer feedback. |
| 10. The subject area is meeting agreed benchmark targets for student employability as agreed with the Head of Careers. | Graduate employment and in particular progression to professional jobs and postgraduate study.  How do current graduates in this subject area perform against the sector average nationally? Has this changed in the last 3 years? | Student employment data, progression to professional jobs and postgraduate study. |
| **(Where appropriate)**  11. The management of collaborative provision is effective and the student experience is high quality, irrespective of where or how programmes are delivered and who delivers them. | The subject area’s processes for maintaining oversight.  Alignment of processes with University policy.  Arrangement for approval of public information. | Collaborative Agreement.  Minutes of Programme team meetings and meetings involving students.  Annual Review and Monitoring reports.  Public information  Student Handbook |