

Periodic Course Review.

What is the purpose of PCR?

At its simplest, periodic course review can be described as updating a course, its structure, curriculum content and assessment strategy to ensure that it is up to date.

Usually a course is approved for a period of 6 years. Course teams should use the continuous improvement process to regularly update the course throughout its approval cycle. The PCR process begins in year 5 of the cycle and is a systematic and comprehensive evaluation of a course to ensure that it is still fit for purpose; that it:

- Meets academic and sector standards
- Provides a suitable student experience
- Continues to be financially viable and sustainable

Key elements of the process

All of the stages listed below are actions for the course team, unless otherwise stated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| 1 Collation of data, metrics, student feedback by course team | 2 Submit planning forms to FPPE. | 3 Agree focus areas for PCR with Head of School | 4 Update course documentation and note changes made on PCR tracker | 5 Submit updated course documents to Faculty scrutiny |
| 6 Make any amendments requested by scrutiny panel | 7 FQO confirm updated course can be released for University review | 8 QSO arrange University Standing Approval Panel to review | 9 Standing Approval Panel give decision (see box on right) | 10a Make any amendments requested by standing approval panel |
| 10b If the proposal is rejected by panel, return to step 3 of the process | 11 Panel Chair confirms they are happy to recommend the course for University re-approval | 12 QSO arrange approval sign off by Academic Board | 13 Systems team update University records system | 14 New cohorts can commence |

Role of the University Standing Approval Panel

- Panel composed of: Head of School (Chair) , FDLT, FDQ, a Faculty Registrar (or senior member of Planning and Academic Administration) and a senior academic (each from a School different to the course under review), and a QSO representative
- Review the submission from the course team
- Receive the Periodic Review Tracker outlining the development of the course in Faculty and its scrutiny process
- Confirm that University processes have been followed
- QSO on behalf of Chair advises the Course Development team of the outcome:

APPROVAL

Recommend the course to the University as presented *or* Recommend with minor drafting alterations

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT

Proposal returned to the Faculty for further consideration, identifying development required and resubmission date

REJECT

Reject the proposal in its current form with reasons for the decision

Next steps

A detailed process flow can be found on the Periodic Course Review web page. Review the University academic framework and regulations which will assist you in updating the course documentation.

You will be required to submit the following documentation for the Periodic Course Review. Click each to view the template.

- **Planning Proposal Part 1 (PPP1) and Part 2 (PPP2)**
- **Course Specification**
- **Course Document**
- **Module specifications**
- **Periodic Review Tracker**

If you have any queries, you can seek advice from your Faculty Director of Quality, Faculty Director of Learning and Teaching, Head of School or contact the Quality Officers on quality@canterbury.ac.uk