

# Periodic Course Review PROCEDURES & GUIDELINES

## Contents

Introduction.....	1
Process.....	2
Stage 1: Production of the Periodic Review Documentation .....	2
Course Evaluation Document.....	2
Stage 2: Review Event and Outcome Report.....	2
Part 2: Review Event.....	3
Part 3: The PCR Panel Outcome Report .....	3
Stage 3: Head of School and Faculty Sign-Off.....	3
Guidelines for developing CED .....	3
The Course Evaluation Document (CED) .....	4
Course Team reflection activity .....	5

## Introduction

Periodic Course Review (PCR) is an important component of quality monitoring and continuous improvements. PCR provides an opportunity to ensure that:

- the course continues to meet University strategies, Vision 2030 and OfS conditions,
- course content remains relevant, coherent, and updated as appropriate,
- the learning, teaching and student academic support, continue to provide an excellent student experience,
- the course continues to meet the intended student outcomes.

The University views PCR as one of the main activities for course continuous quality monitoring and enhancement. PCR replaces the requirement for six-yearly course reapproval.

The PCR should ensure continued course alignment with the following:

- The University [Academic Framework](#).
- University [Vision 2030](#) and University Learning, Teaching and Assessment strategy.
- PSRB specific frameworks where applicable ([Quality Assurance Framework for Work-Based Learning](#) and [PSRB-framework/PSRB-Framework.pdf](#)).

## Process

The June ASC meeting (15 months prior to periodic review) will receive notification from FPPE about the courses which are due to undergo periodic review in the forthcoming academic year. At this point ASC has the opportunity to ask for more detail on the course. If none is requested, Periodic Review proceeds as outlined. Where a Head of School determines the course is to be withdrawn then there is no case for periodic review and the withdrawal process will be followed.

Periodic Course Review (PCR) will be coordinated by the faculty quality team with each school. The process will involve course team's reflection, development of the Course Evaluation Document (CED) and PCR Panel discussions. The four stages of PCR are explained below.

## Stage 1: Production of the Periodic Review Documentation

### Course Evaluation Document

Every course team will complete a Course Evaluation Document (CED). The CED will be completed following a review of the performance of the course since its last periodic review, identifying good practice that can be built upon and areas that need improvement or further development.

Additionally, the course team will reflect on the extent to which the course is still meeting the intended outcomes, whether the content remains relevant and the continuous alignment with current University imperatives. The review and reflections will be data-informed, and the evidence provided in the CED (see the guidance section).

- During the development of the CED, the faculty will appoint the PCR Panel and set an event date for the Panel meeting.
- Once CED is developed, it is submitted to the faculty together with all relevant evidence.

## Stage 2: Review Event and Outcome Report

### Part 1: Review Panel members

The PCR Panel will be appointed by the faculty and the meeting(s) organised by the Faculty. The members will include:

- Head of School or a member of the Faculty Executive (appointed by the Dean) as Chair.
- Learning and Teaching representative who may be a member of LTE, FDLT, LTE academic developer, or School Director LT (from another School).
- Quality representative who may be a member of QSO, FDQ, or School Director of Quality (from another School).
- Academic member of staff (outside of the School but within the Faculty).
- Relevant PSRB expert where required (internal)/External advisor.
- Industry advisor/placement representative.
- A student representative (from the faculty, independent of the course).

The Panel may invite additional members where this is necessary or needed.

### **Part 2: Review Event**

At least two weeks prior to Panel sitting, CED and all documents should be submitted to the PCR Panel, providing ample time for each Panel member to review the documents. Prior to the review event meeting, the Panel will meet for a briefing and formulation of questions. The review event meeting timing will depend on the course.

- The course team may provide a summary of the CED as a short oral presentation.
- The Panel will discuss the CED with the course team and triangulate information.
- The Panel may hold discussions with other stakeholders.

### **Part 3: The PCR Panel Outcome Report**

Following the discussions at the event meeting the PCR Panel will use the PCR outcome report document to provide advice and recommendations to the course team to act on. This will be submitted to the Head of School (HoS) for action and taking forward.

- The Course team will reflect on the advice and recommendations, developing actions plans and timelines for completion.

## **Stage 3: Head of School and Faculty Sign-Off**

The HoS will provide the course team an opportunity to engage with the Panel suggestions and recommendations. The course team will identify changes it would like to take forward and include these in the table provided in the outcome report.

- The course team action plans and the PCR outcomes will be submitted to the Head of School (HoS) for sign-off and to monitor completion.
- Following HoS sign-off, the documents will be submitted to FPPE.
- FPPE will notify ASC of any proposed changes and resource implications.
- In the event that there are no changes, FPPE will notify ASC of the plans for the course to continue to be offered.

Course changes are dependent on the comments and recommendations by the PCR Panel, the course team's own analysis and the Head of School's sign-off. If changes are required, then the course change process will follow the standard process see [Course Changes](#).

The Board of Studies will be expected to receive the final report and monitor progress of the course.

## **Guidelines for developing the CED**

For the PCR to be useful to the course team in enhancing the course, it is essential for the course team to engage in a reflection on all aspects of the course performance – reading course documents, handbooks, considering data, reflecting on the information gathered and responding to what the information indicates about the course. This reflection results in the completion of the template, the Course Evaluation Document (CED).

In the reflection, the course team is encouraged to adopt an honest self-reflection approach, being candid about the course, using data/information – highlighting the positive and the less positive

areas, being self-regulating against the standards and OfS conditions thereby reassuring themselves (course team) and the University of the quality assurance and enhancement activities of the course.

## The Course Evaluation Document (CED)

- The Course Evaluation Document (CED) is the main piece of evidence which will be considered by the Periodic Course Review Panel, alongside supplementary course data/resources.
- The purpose of the CED is to document the course team's critical evaluation and assessment of their course's strengths, vulnerabilities and opportunities, in relation to the purpose of the course and the extent to which the course:
  - continues to meet University strategies, Vision 2030 and OfS conditions,
  - content remains relevant, coherent, and updated as appropriate,
  - learning, teaching and student academic support remain appropriate,
  - continues to meet the intended student outcomes.
- The CED is arranged in the following University priority areas:
  - Course Successes
  - University Strategy
  - Student Outcomes
  - Student Views
- The CED forms the basis of the dialogue between the Course team and the PCR Panel. The PCR Panel will use the CED and the data/information available to provide the course team with recommendations for development and enhancement based on any vulnerabilities, risks and opportunities the course team and Panel has identified.
- The Course Director (Section Director/Lead) is responsible for leading the course team in the development of the CED and will normally be the main author of the CED. But evaluation of course performance as a whole is expected to be a collaborative process, involving all members of the course team.
- The CED should be clear, concise and data informed, making clear references to data sources within MS Power BI reports, the Course Performance Plans and other qualitative and quantitative sources such as External Examiner reports. The reflection reporting in each section should be brief, two to three short paragraphs.
- This is an illustrative list of the evidence/resource base which should be made available to the Panel along with the CED:
  - Course Performance Plans
  - Course documents including course and module templates.
  - PSRB reports (where applicable)
  - Industry reports (where applicable)
  - External Examiner reports and responses
  - Student feedback: for example, module evaluations + any other form of student feedback
  - BoS and student fora minutes
  - The course teams will need to reflect on the cumulative data available from MS Power BI reports such as:
    - Course Registration and Application Conversion Rates
    - Subject Health
    - Student outcomes
    - Course changes – particularly for placement courses
    - NSS/ PTES

## Course Team reflection activity

Course team reflection, to inform the reporting in the CED, should involve reading all the course documents (including course and module specifications), considering student data and feedback. The reflection happens through asking clear questions about the course; therefore, the reflection should be guided by questions such as:

- What was the course designed to achieve and how do we know that it is achieving the intentions?
- What was the intended impact of the course and is this being achieved? – How do we know this?
- Are there some innovative activities that were planned? How do we know that these have worked?
- What were the plans in place for teaching delivery and enhancing student engagement, how was this plan put in place and how do we know that the implementation is effective? - any information/data to inform effectiveness?
- Are there changes in the discipline landscape, for example industry needs and employability of graduates, and how does this impact on our course – what data/information do we have to help us judge this?
- What changes have we made to the course and or modules (minor or major) – what informed the changes, what has been the impact of the changes? – What data/information can we use to inform us of the effectiveness of changes.
- What changes/enhancements have been made to ensure that the course continues to meet the University strategy and national imperatives/ OfS conditions? How do we know that these changes have been effective? – information/data as evidence.