

Section 3: Internal monitoring and review

PERIODIC EVALUATION AND ENHANCEMENT REVIEW (PEER)

1. The purpose of Periodic Evaluation and Enhancement Review (PEER) is to:
 - evidence the high quality of the education offered by the University
 - support the continual enhancement of the student experience
 - identify and propose action to address areas of weakness
 - enable good practice to be shared systematically between and across Schools.
2. PEER is designed to:
 - be light-touch, risk-based and data-driven, flexible, and adaptable to the requirements of different disciplines
 - focus on outcomes rather than processes
 - focus on enhancement while helping in identifying and solving thematic issues within Schools and across the University
 - be supportive, collaborative and provide practical help and advice to Schools
 - provide a credible and effective approach to enhancement with minimal administrative overhead
 - work in tandem with the portfolio management process to enable timely and constructive support for Schools
 - avoid duplication with the Strategic Alignment Process
 - align with regulatory conditions (OfS B conditions)
 - utilise student and external expert input.

Frequency

3. A Periodic Evaluation and Enhancement Review will normally consider undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes (including taught modules of professional doctorates and other research degrees) in a School or Department on a six-year cycle. The planning of the PEER cycle will have regard to the schedule for the Strategic Alignment Process. However, Schools may request UBTLSE to agree a variation in this timing to support their consideration of an aspect of their provision, their preparation for, or coincidence with, a PSRB review, or for other good reason. Equally, UBTLSE, acting either on its own initiative or on the recommendation of UPB or DELT, may agree that a review be held, whether in-cycle or out-of-cycle, to support the School in considering one or more specific issues. A recommendation from UPB for a review to be held would normally be based on analysis of data metrics at its January meeting (or following subsequent actions and responses from the School).

In the case of Henley Business School, Undergraduate, Pre-experience postgraduate, and Post-experience postgraduate will normally be considered separately within the six-year cycle.

Scope

4. A PEER may explore and consider one or more of the review areas listed in Appendix 1, which broadly align with the relevant OfS B conditions.

5. In the case of a standard review (i.e. one which has not been initiated by or through UBTLSE), the scope of the review (i.e. the number of review areas to be considered) would be determined by the School and T&L Dean. A review should be as light-touch as possible, risk-based, flexible, and adaptable to the requirements of the school. Accreditation requirements may also inform the scope of a review.
6. Where a review has been initiated by or through UBTLSE, the scope (i.e. number of review areas considered) would include areas identified by the body requesting the review. The review might usually consider area 1 and/or 2 and any number of areas 3-6 proportionate to the risk identified (see Appendix 1 for descriptions of areas). The focus of such a review remains on enhancement and providing collaborative and practical support where help is needed.

7. **Participants**

- (a) The Teaching and Learning Dean for the School will appoint a panel for the review. The panel will normally comprise:
 - (i) Two or three members of academic staff who are not members of the same School and should normally include at least one member from another cluster. One of the academic members will act as Chair; the Chair should not be the Teaching and Learning Dean for the School being reviewed;
 - (ii) one student member, who may be a Senior or Course Representative, member of the Student Panel, a current or previous Student Partner, or a RUSU officer. The student member should not be drawn from the School being reviewed. They should be an undergraduate in Parts 2, 3 or 4 or a taught postgraduate student. They should not normally be a panellist on more than one review in an academic year. Recruitment will be through Campus Jobs.¹
 - (iii) an external member, who will be an academic in the relevant field (but not a current External Examiner in the School); in addition, a relevant professional/industrial practitioner may also be appointed;
 - (iv) a Secretary, normally drawn from CQSD.

In addition, the Teaching and Learning Dean may appoint to the panel a member of professional services (for example, from the Academic Development and Enhancement or TEL teams in CQSD, a member of Marketing, a member of Careers, depending on the focus of the review).

The student member and the external member will be paid a fee of £200 (expenses will be reimbursed).

- (b) The School will identify members of academic staff and students to participate in the review. The panel may request that certain roles or individuals be included.

8. **Format of review**

The School Director of Teaching and Learning (or, where delegated, the Departmental Director of Teaching and Learning), Teaching and Learning Dean for the School, and the Chair will agree an agenda in advance of the meeting.

The review will normally be held in person and will normally be a one-day event.

The review will be based on a round table discussion, and will have a collegial, supportive ethos.

¹ A student panellist can also allocate the hours undertaken as part of Periodic Review to the 35 hours of core activity as part of the RED Award. The student panellist will be required to obtain the signature of the Chair of the Panel/Education Officer (RUSU) on their RED activity checklist.

The School may wish to draw in some different staff/students to different parts of the discussion.

9. **Evidence**

The School will be invited to submit a short reflective summary (approximately two pages) and, where requested, an action plan (in table format) for the UG and PGT provision being reviewed.

The review will draw on the following, as appropriate:

- (a) data from the Programmes Data Dashboard, developed for UPB's portfolio monitoring process;
- (b) a digest of External Examiner feedback provided by the School (which may be the response provided to External Examiners' reports, provided it provides sufficient detail of External's comments to be useful);
- (c) a digest of student feedback and actions being taken, provided by the School;
- (d) a copy of the current STEAP;
- (e) where appropriate, seeking further input from external stakeholders;
- (f) a market position report from MCE (if review area 2 is in scope).

Further suggestions of possible evidence are indicated in Appendix 1. Evidence should be made available at least three weeks before the review.

10. **Outcome**

The panel will prepare a short report (1-2 pages) summarising agreed actions, resource requirements, timescales etc. and also brief reference to issues raised by the School, for submission to DELT (and UPB, where UPB initiated the review) and onward referral to UBTLSE.

DELT, UPB or UBTLSE may require that further actions be taken.

The Teaching and Learning Dean for the School being reviewed will receive a copy of the report.

Appendix 1: Review Areas

Area 1: Successful outcomes are delivered for all its students, which are recognised and valued by employers, and/or enable further study.

A review in this area would be closely integrated with STEAP, portfolio management, and DELT's annual QA review. It may have a particular focus on employability and graduate outcomes.

Evidence: UPB Data dashboard.

Area 2: Programmes are viable and recruit well-qualified students.

A review in this area would be closely integrated with portfolio management.

Evidence: UPB Data dashboard.

Area 3: Programmes are high quality, up to date, challenging and well delivered.

A review in this area would consider, for example, whether programmes are:

- up to date.
- providing educational challenge.
- coherent.
- effectively delivered.
- requiring students to develop relevant skills.

Potential evidence:

up to date provide educational challenge are coherent	EE reports, accreditation, curriculum review, Subject Benchmark Statement
are effectively delivered	NSS, module evaluation, SS partnership group
require students to develop relevant skills	Curriculum mapping; EE reports, accreditation reports.

Area 4: High-quality resources and student support are available to all students.

A review in this area would consider, for example, whether:

- the academic tutor system is working well
- interventions are made where engagement concerns are identified
- suitable resources (staff, lab, digital etc) are available
- staff involved in teaching are suitably qualified and trained
- Blackboard/Canvas content meets minimum expectations.

Potential evidence:

Split indicator data in relation to student performance

Feedback in Student-Staff Partnership Groups, module evaluations, NSS

Data on referrals to Student Welfare and SCAEFS

Achievement of FHEA

Area 5: Students are assessed effectively, and each assessment is valid and reliable.

A review in this area would consider, for example:

- Use of appropriate authentic assessment types.
- Assessments that clearly test achievement of module learning outcomes.
- Constructive, developmental, and timely feedback.
- Marking standards appropriately reflect applicable sector-recognised standards.

Potential evidence:

Curriculum mapping

Assessment strategy

Samples of feedback

Statistics on meeting the 15-day turnaround time

NSS

Outcome metrics

External Examiner Reports

Area 6: Schools engage effectively with annual review and enhancement processes.

A review in this area would consider, for example, whether:

- BOSSEs review relevant data on performance of programmes
- BOSSEs regularly review progress in relation to STEAP priorities
- Schools engage effectively with students as partners in review and enhancement processes, including Senior and Course Reps and Student Partners.

Potential evidence:

BOSSE agendas and reflections

STEAP

Student-staff partnership group minutes/notes

Document control

Version	Section	Keeper	Reviewed	Approving authority	Approval date	Start date	Next review
1.0	CQSD	KHSS	3 years	UBTLSE	19/7/23	01/10/2023	01/10/2026