Periodic Subject Review Policy

Version I

July 2017

Next Review in July 2019

The Periodic Subject Review Process (Period Review) assures the College that Course Teams are effectively managing quality assurance and enhancement procedures and processes, in line with the College quality framework and Higher Education Strategy and are providing high quality, valid, relevant and inclusive learning opportunities that enable students to achieve the higher education awards and qualifications validated by Edexcel Pearson. Foundation Degrees are periodically reviewed by their validating HEI.

Requirements

1.1 Periodic Review covers all Pearson/Edexcel validated courses within the College's portfolio.

1.2 Courses are reviewed on a four year cycle as follows:

Periodic Review Cycle 2014-2020		
2017/2018	Summer	Construction Management
2018/2019	Summer	Civil Engineering
2021/2022	Summer	Construction Management
2022/2023	Summer	Civil Engineering

2. Governance

Periodic Review is organised by the Higher Education Office on behalf of Academic Board and the Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC).

Requirements

2.1 ASQC approves all final Periodic Review Reports on behalf of Academic Board.

2.2 Any changes to the Periodic Review process are approved by ASQC and ratified by Academic Board.

3. Periodic Subject Review framework

Periodic Review assesses the effectiveness of the management of quality and standards and of the students' learning opportunities. The process enables the College to undertake a broad periodic review of quality management processes, and the opportunities afforded to students, beyond the routine monitoring of the effectiveness of courses, which takes place via the process of annual monitoring (including external examiner reporting) and via Course Teams' local assessment of the continuing currency and relevance of their courses.

Requirements

3.1 Periodic Review focuses on two aspects:

a. Aspect 1: Standards and quality management;

b. Aspect 2: The quality and enhancement of student learning opportunities.

3.2 These aspects are assessed through a number of methods:

a. Consideration of the Reflective Analysis Document, produced by the course team in preparation for the review:

b. A compliance check, undertaken by the Higher Education Office prior to the event, using evidence provided by the Course Team of information relating to quality management and enhancement processes, which determines the Team's compliance with required quality management processes;

c. Course-level review of quality management processes via a set of course audit trails;

d. Discussion with the relevant Course Manager, current students, tutors and other external stakeholders during the review event.

Explanatory notes

- Academic quality represents the effectiveness of the learning opportunities provided to the students in order for them to achieve their award.
- We are concerned here with the quality of the learning opportunities offered (in terms of, for example, teaching, learning resources, assessment, academic and personal support).
- Enhancement of these learning opportunities involves strategic and deliberate steps to improve the quality of learning opportunities and the review process is interested in harnessing and sharing such practice.
- The higher education office will notify the school 6 months in advance of the planned review and schools are advised to begin preparations at this point.

4. Review expectations

Periodic Review aims to establish whether broad expectations associated with both aspects under review have been met.

Requirements

4.1 The review panel is required to make a judgement about both aspects under review, and uses the following expectations and indicative factors in order to reach this judgement.

Aspect 1: Standards and quality management

Expectations	Factors
1. **The application of quality management processes ensure that academic standards are secure, and provide a sound framework for course development and enhancement**	The approach of the Course Team to the implementation and evaluation of quality management procedures Course level implementation and monitoring of the College's quality management framework The operation of quality management policies

	and processes at course level The extent of shared awareness and understanding of quality management processes across the team The use of student representation in quality management and decision-making, and the briefing of students for this purpose Staff development, research and scholarship Effective operation of course committee meetings, lines of communication and sharing good practice The extent to which information about courses for prospective and current students is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy
2. **Course design and development enables standards to be maintained; allows students to demonstrate learning outcomes; and is aligned to college HE strategy**	The way(s) in which the Course Team ensures courses are fit for purpose, current, and meet the needs of students The use of benchmarks and PSRB requirements to inform the course curriculum and level The use of externality to inform course design and curriculum The extent to which course and curriculum meet the College's strategic aims and initiatives The use of student feedback to inform course design and development
3. **Design, moderation and review of assessment is effective in ensuring that students have the opportunity to demonstrate learning outcomes**	How assessment tasks and schedules are designed and agreed The processes for marking and moderation How feedback on assessment is provided to students How assessment tasks, schedules and feedback are monitored and reviewed
4. **The use of external examiners is strong and appropriate**	The external examiners' contribution to the maintenance and enhancement of standards The use of external examiner comments in the development of courses The response to external examiners
5. **Monitoring and review processes are effective and inform enhancement activity**	The alignment of annual course review to the College framework The clarity and transparency of monitoring and reporting processes to all parties The use of quantitative and qualitative data to inform review and understanding of student outcomes including external examiner comments, student feedback and the NSS, and data relating to the student journey
6. **Students are genuinely involved in a range of activity related to quality management and enhancement and understand relevant processes and practice**	The impact, of student feedback on modules and courses The engagement of students with course committees The extent to which feedback from students

| | informs decision-making and change |
| | The extent to which students understand processes and practices by which they are particularly affected, for example student appeals, academic irregularities. |

Aspect 2: The quality and enhancement of the student learning opportunities

Expectations	Factors
1. **Deliberate steps are taken to improve the quality of students' learning opportunities**	The strategic planning of, and evidence base for, enhancement initiatives The use of quality assurance processes to identify opportunities for enhancement The extent to which the team expects and encourages enhancement of student learning opportunities The opportunities for the identification, support and dissemination of good practice
2. **Professional standards for teaching and learning are supported**	The extent to which research, scholarship and/or professional practice informs teaching Staff induction, support and development strategy and practice The extent to which there is a shared understanding of the Course's learning and teaching strategy The extent to which curriculum design, content and structure are informed by recent pedagogic developments, external sources and College goals for its HE provision
3. **The quality of learning resources is appropriate**	The collective expertise of staff for effective delivery of the curriculum and assessment of learning outcomes Staff development opportunities The facilitation of learning through the provision of appropriate resources, including academic support and a range of appropriate teaching methods
4. **The quality of learning opportunities meets the needs of protected groups, international students, and 'hard-to-reach' students**	The arrangements for monitoring the effectiveness of the provision for protected groups (including disabled students), international students and 'hard-to-reach' students (including, part time students, and students studying from a distance) The systems used to evaluate these students' progress and to identify opportunities for enhancement
5. **The quality of learning opportunities delivered as part of collaborative arrangements is managed effectively to enable students to achieve their awards**	The quality and effectiveness of communication with students and collaborative partners The opportunities for sharing practice across collaborative arrangements

	Staff induction, development and support for College and partner staff
6. **The quality of learning opportunities delivered through work-based learning and placements is managed effectively**	The extent of opportunities provided for work-based learning, placements and professional learning The management of work-based learning and placements
7. **Effective arrangements are in place to support students in their learning**	Career education, information, advice and guidance Pastoral support for all students Student induction

5. The review panel

The review panel ensures that externality, seniority, quality management expertise and subject specialist knowledge informs the discussion and review outcomes.

Requirements

5.1 The review panel comprises a minimum of seven members:

a. Review Chair: a member of the College's Senior Management Team

b. Review Manager; Higher Education Manager

c. External Panel Member: a senior member of an institution external to the College, whose knowledge is based in a similar area, who has experience in HE quality management, and who has had no connection with the College in the past three years;

d. Two internal panel members; one academic colleague who does not teach on the course, and the Quality Manager;

e. Student Representative;

f. Employer Representative

- Each review panel member undertakes a specific role. Two members (usually one internal member and the Quality Manager) focus on Aspect 1: Standards and Quality Management; and two panel members (usually an internal and the external member) focus specifically on Aspect 2: The Quality and Enhancement of the Student Learning Opportunities. It is the role of the Chair and the Review Manager to maintain oversight of both aspects. The Student Representative is expected to pursue the effectiveness of student engagement and the student voice across both aspects and contribute to the discussion accordingly.
- The employer representative is expected to comment upon collaboration in design of learning opportunities and work-based learning.
- The Course Team identifies a Periodic Review Lead, normally the course leader, who takes primary responsibility for the oversight of the review process.
- The Pearson Standards Verifier will normally be invited to take part in the review panel as part of the verification visit
- The detail of the responsibilities associated with different roles are provided in the supporting documentation.

6. Review outcomes

The review panel arrives at a judgement about each of the aspects that have been considered, based on evidence from the documentation provided in advance, and the discussions that take place during the review event itself.

Requirements

6.1 For each aspect, the following four judgements are possible:

a. Commended;

b. Meets College and UK expectations;

c. Requires improvement to meet College and UK expectations;

d. Does not meet College and UK expectations.

6.2 The panel will use the following framework in order to come to the review judgement for each of the two aspects under review:

Framework for Periodic Review Judgements			
Commended	**Meets COLLEGE and UK expectations**	**Requires improvement to reach COLLEGE and UK expectations**	**Does not meet COLLEGE and UK expectations**
The majority of expectations have been fully met. Any expectations that are not fully met are mostly met.	All, or nearly all, expectations have been fully or mostly met.	Most expectations have been fully, mostly or partly met.	Several expectations have not been met, or are partly met, or there are serious gaps in one or more expectation.
There may be some minor omissions or oversights in some of the evidence provided to the panel, but these do not compromise the overall quality of the approach and provision.	Any expectations not met are not considered to present significant risk.	Those expectations that have not been met, may not present significant risk at present, but if unaddressed have the potential to compromise quality.	Those expectations that have not been met, or are not sufficiently met, do pose serious risks. There is concern about the control mechanisms in place to mitigate these risks.
Likely to be characterised by at least some of the following: • compelling evidence of the Course Team's commitment to achieving excellence in standards and quality management and in the quality and enhancement of student learning opportunities. • numerous and widespread examples of good practice. • a strategic approach for building on good practice. • where appropriate, examples of developments, planned or in train, which seek to address issues previously identified.	Likely to be characterised by at least some of the following: • evidence that the Course Team is able to maintain and promote the quality and standards appropriate for its provision. • several examples of good practice. • the need to give further thought to a particular factor(s) which contributes to an expectation not being fully met. • the need to address details in documentation which do not materially affect practice. • the need to update or amend minor omissions or oversights. • the need to further develop activity already planned, to more fully meet expectations.	Likely to be characterised by at least some of the following: • significant weakness(es) in some Course Team processes, or which have some shortcomings. • a lack of awareness by the Course Team about the potential problem(s) identified by the panel. • failure to take prompt and appropriate action to address a problem previously identified.	Likely to be characterised by at least some of the following: • ineffective operation of Course Team quality management processes. • significant gaps in process, structures or procedures relating to quality management. • a lack of compliance with COLLEGE quality assurance policy. • a lack of awareness by the Course Team about the problem(s) identified by the panel.

6.3 The panel also agrees any recommendations and commendations.

6.4 The Course Team is given feedback on these judgements at the end of the review event.

6.5 The rationale and evidence base for these judgements, recommendations and commendations are articulated in the Periodic Course Team Review Report which is approved by ASQC on behalf of Academic Board.

6.6 A follow-up meeting between the review panel Chair and the Course Manager representatives takes place after the Course Team's receipt of the report, in order to agree any action plan related to the recommendations made by the panel.

6.7 Progress on these actions is reported in the following annual Course annual monitoring report.

7. Appeal against review outcomes

7.1 If the Course Team wants to appeal the outcome of the Periodic Review, the Course Manager must present an appeal to ASQC within 14 days of the receipt of the confirmed report.

7.2 If a matter of dispute is not resolved by ASQC, the Course Manager may make a direct submission to Academic Board.

7.3 Academic Board will consider the matter itself or by means of a working party. The appeal body, whether Academic Board itself or its working party, may exclude members involved in the earlier decision. It will receive the representation of both parties, together or separately, and may:

a. confirm the decision of the Periodic Review;

b. refer the case back to the Periodic Review Panel with instructions to consider the re-consider the proposal

c. rescind the decision and make recommendations for action toward further progress; or

d. make such other arrangements for the determination of the issue as it deems appropriate.

7.4 The decision of the appeal body will be final.