

Requirements for the Periodic Review of programmes

[For the purposes of the processes described in this document, in Henley Business School the Head of Programmes will be fulfilling the functions of the School Director of Teaching and Learning.]

Introduction

- 1 This policy has been informed by *Chapter B8: Programme monitoring and review* of the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education (<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/quality-code-B8.aspx>), which was published in October 2013.
- 2 This policy and its associated forms and appendices were reviewed in 2016 in order to enhance the reflective and collaborative nature of Periodic Review, to simplify the process for producing a Self-Evaluation Document (SED) and to ensure greater consistency across SEDs. An SED template and accompanying questions (Annex 9: *Questions for the School/Department and Periodic Review Panel*) have been devised to ensure consistency with the Curriculum Framework, as well as with current external requirements, and to emphasise the importance of Schools/Departments carefully considering the relevant datasets when preparing their SED.
- 3 Use of this document is mandatory in the preparation, reflection and submission for the Periodic Review of programmes. It is intended to apply to all award-bearing taught programmes and taught components of doctorate programmes. In addition, any review of programmes requiring recognition by professional bodies must pay due regard to the guidelines laid down by the relevant organisation.
- 4 Where a Periodic Review includes (a) programme(s) delivered in collaboration with another institution, Schools/subject providers should also refer to the University's *Procedure for partner programme review* (www.reading.ac.uk/internal/qualitysupport/guide - Section 11a) for details of adaptations to the Periodic Review method which may be required.
- 5 Where a Periodic Review includes (a) programme(s) delivered at a branch campus, Schools/subject providers are required to make appropriate provision for staff and students at the branch campus to participate in the Periodic Review process including meeting with the review panel. A review will not normally involve the panel or members of the panel visiting the branch campus.

The purposes of Periodic Review

- 6 The purposes of Periodic Review are:

- to consider the way that Schools and subject teams manage and assure the academic standards of relevant degree programmes (including delivery of programmes at branch campuses and collaborative programmes) and the quality of the learning opportunities provided;
 - to enable Schools and subject teams to consider how they might enhance their portfolio of taught programmes and the learning experience of their students, particularly in relation to the Self Evaluation Document and the Action Plan informed by the annual production of Teaching and Learning Plans; and
 - consider, and if thought fit, recommend approval of the programmes to run for a further period of six years (or as appropriate); or
 - consider, and if thought fit recommend, approval of the programmes to run for a initial period of six years (or as appropriate).
- 7 Periodic Review will:
- consider the future plans of the School for their taught programmes;
 - consider the effectiveness of the mechanisms used by the School to manage the quality and standards of the provision;
 - consider the effectiveness of the ways in which the School takes deliberate steps, perhaps in association with other Schools or with central support services, to enhance the experience of its students; and
 - identify examples of good and effective practice.
- 8 Periodic Review should stimulate constructive discussion with subject providers and associated programme teams.

The Review procedure

- 9 Periodic Review will normally take place either in the Autumn Term or Spring Term. If the School is scheduled for Periodic Review during the Autumn Term, the Centre for Quality Support and Development (CQSD) will normally initiate contact in March. If the School is scheduled for Periodic Review in the Spring Term, CQSD will normally initiate contact in the previous July.
- 10 Periodic Review normally involves consideration of one or more subject areas and associated single and combined programmes. Periodic Review will normally include any collaborative programmes with other institutions and the taught elements of any professional doctorate degree programmes. Appropriate arrangements will be made in relation to inter-disciplinary programmes. Reviews will normally take place every six years and will be undertaken by a Panel, specially appointed by the designated Teaching and Learning Dean.
- 11 In the case of single subject programmes, approval will normally be given for the programmes to run for a further six years. In the case of combined programmes, approval will normally be given to the time of the next Periodic Review of the other part of the programme. Such approval may be subject to the programme team addressing any areas of concern identified.
- 12 The designated Teaching and Learning Dean will agree the composition and the timetable of Periodic Reviews with the School Director(s) of Teaching and Learning. Wherever possible the review schedule should take into account the accreditation/re-accreditation cycles of relevant professional institutions.

The Review Panel

- 13 Panels will be appointed by the designated Teaching and Learning Dean and will consist of:
- a **Chair**, who will be either one of the Teaching and Learning Deans, or a member of academic staff who has undergone appropriate University training;
 - a **Panel Secretary** to be provided by CQSD;
 - **two other members of academic staff** with relevant experience, neither of whom should come from the School under review. It would normally be expected that at least one of the members of academic staff would be drawn from a non-cognate area;
 - **two external academic members. Where appropriate, and in addition to the external academic members, a third external member from industry or the professions may be appointed.** Where the industrial or professional member is not appropriate there should still be the two external academic members. Ideally, the external academic members should have experience of review and/or audit, either at their own institution or as part of an external review team (eg QAA or PSRB).
 - a **student member** who shall be a School or Course Representative or Student Officer of the Students' Union. The student member should not come from the School under review and should be drawn from a non-cognate area,
- 14 Internal and external panellists (including the Chair) should not normally participate in two consecutive reviews of the same subject area.
- 15 The University will provide induction for all internal members of Periodic Review Teams. Internal members should not be appointed without appropriate induction either from the University or elsewhere.

External Panellist

- 16 The external members will be the subject experts and the Review will rely on them to provide an expert judgement of the validity and appropriateness of the programmes offered. The appointment form for external members should be completed for approval by the designated Teaching and Learning Dean (Annex 1). These external members should not be or have been within the three years previous to the Review External Examiners at the University in the subject area.
- 17 CQSD will contact the external members of the panel, requesting that they complete the remaining sections of the appointment form and providing further details, regarding:
- Time/date of the Review;
 - Composition of the Review Panel;
 - List of documents to be provided in advance;
 - Details of payment and subsistence and travel expenses; and
 - Overnight accommodation requirements (if any).
- 18 A fee of £450 is payable to each of the external members, as well as a subsistence allowance and travel expenses.

The Student Panellist

- 19 The School Reps and Course Reps schemes for student representation are co-ordinated by the Students' Union and involve students being democratically elected to the position of School or Course Rep.
- 20 Early in the Autumn Term, the Education Officer (RUSU) will circulate a job description for the role of student member of Periodic Review Panels (see Annex 2), including a number of selection criteria (see Annex 3) to all School Reps and Course Reps in Part 2 and onwards. School and Course Reps will be asked to nominate themselves for the role of student panellist. They will be required to submit a nomination form (Part A) (see Annex 3) to the Academic Representation Co-ordinator (RUSU), who will log and confirm receipt of all forms. Those students who have submitted a nomination form will be invited to attend a Periodic Review training session run by RUSU during the Autumn or Summer Term. The Academic Representation Co-ordinator will maintain a record of all eligible School and Course Reps, following their attendance at training, and will provide a list to CQSD on request.
- 21 A student panellist for each Periodic Review will be appointed from this group of nominated students by the designated Teaching and Learning Dean in consultation with CQSD and RUSU, in accordance with the published selection criteria. The Teaching and Learning Dean should complete Part B of the nomination form (Annex 3). Successful candidates will normally be contacted two to three months ahead of the Review visit to check their availability to participate in a specific Periodic Review panel. Subject to their availability and academic timetable, the student member should inform their own School/Department of the dates during which they will participate in a Periodic Review panel.
- 22 To be eligible for the role of student panellist, a student:
- should normally be a Student Officer, Student Officer-elect, a School Representative or a Course Representative at the time of the Review (or have been an elected representative in the academic year prior to the Review if Periodic Review is scheduled to take place in the Autumn Term);
 - must be in Part 2 onwards at the time of the Review;
 - should not be a PhD student;
 - must not be a student of the School under review nor from a cognate-area; and
 - should not normally undertake more than one Periodic Review in a session.
- 23 The student member will be required to have attended either the School or Course Reps and special Periodic Review training offered by the Students' Union and will be required to liaise with the Chair of the Periodic Review prior to the Review. The Chair will provide guidance to the student member on the list of documents to be provided and the areas to be considered by the student and should be mindful of students at international branch campuses and ensure they are able to participate in the review. See Annex 4 for *Student membership of Periodic Review Panels: Good Practice and Guidance for Chairs*.
- 24 A fee of £450 is payable to the student panellist. The Secretary will provide the student member with a payment form and any further guidance in advance of the Review visit.

- 25 The 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 Award¹. The student panellist will be required to obtain the signature of the Chair of the Panel/Education Officer (RUSU) on their RED activity checklist.

Documentation to be provided for Review Panels

- 26 The Panel will be provided with a number of pieces of documentation to help them in their deliberations. The majority of this documentation will be provided 4-weeks in advance of the Review Visit, but a small amount will be made available in situ in the main relating to samples of marked student work and feedback. All documentation should be reviewed by the School in their preparation for the Periodic Review.

Advance Documentation

- 27 The list of documents required in advance of the Periodic Review can be found in Annex 7 of this document. The documents should be uploaded to a Blackboard Periodic Review Organisation, which will be created by CQSD using a standard template.
- 28 CQSD will liaise with IT Services to arrange personal user accounts for external members of the panel, and will provide access to the Blackboard Periodic Review Organisation for all panel members.
- 29 In particular, two key documents to be produced in advance of the Review are:

- **A Self-Evaluation Document (SED).** Annex 5 provides University guidelines on and a template for producing Self-Evaluation Documents for the purposes of Periodic Review.

Schools and Departments should also refer to Annex 9 of this document, *Questions for the School/Department and Periodic Review Panel*, when completing Section 2 of the SED and reflect upon and respond to the questions under each heading in the corresponding section of the SED, as appropriate. The Panel will also consider these questions and the evidence provided by the School/Department when identifying their recommendations and preparing the Periodic Review Report.

Schools should provide CQSD with an electronic copy of the SED.

Schools will be advised and supported during the preparation of their SED and other materials by CQSD.

- **Student Submission:** Annex 6 is a *Guide to producing the Student Submission for Periodic Review*.

Documentation to be provided during the Review Visit

- 30 Annex 7 also provides details of the information that will be required by Periodic Review Panels during their visit. Schools and disciplines do not, however, need to provide special copies of this documentation for Panels.

Student Work

¹See: <http://www.reading.ac.uk/internal/readingexperienceanddevelopmentaward/reda-doingtheaward.aspx>

- 31 A small sample of student work (perhaps one or two examples only) should be provided in order to support the Review Panel's understanding of students' development of skills and knowledge as follows:
- to demonstrate how the relevant School's assessment strategy is articulated into actual student work; and
 - to provide, through student work, examples of good and innovative practice.
- 32 Schools are not asked to provide a large sample of student work for the Review Panel to consider. The University believes that as External Examiner(s) have already seen and considered an appropriate sample of work, and commented on academic standards, it is not necessary to provide an equivalent sample for the Periodic Review.

The Review Visit

- 33 A Periodic Review visit to the School(s) concerned will be arranged, during which the Panel will meet members of the relevant Programme Teams, including, where relevant, Programme Team members in branch campuses, and any other relevant key people involved in order to seek clarification from them that the degree programmes are well-designed and delivered. The Periodic Review visit will normally be a two-day event, although in exceptional circumstances and after discussion between the Chair and the relevant Teaching and Learning Dean, the length of the visit may be varied. Where a programme area under review delivers programmes at a branch campus, the duration of the review may be extended to three days to ensure participation of staff and students based at the relevant branch campuses.
- 34 CQSD will write to all members of the panel in advance of the Review, to confirm/provide:
- The schedule for the Periodic Review (including: timings, location and arrangements for travel, refreshments and accommodation)
 - The scope of the Review
 - Composition of the Panel
 - Advance Documentation (including instructions on using Blackboard)
 - Allocation of areas of focus for each member of the panel
- 35 It is suggested that Review Panels will wish to meet with some or all of the following:
- Programme Director(s)
 - Programme Advisors
 - School Director(s) of Teaching and Learning and any other academic members of staff having a role relevant to teaching and learning in the programme area(s)
 - Staff with responsibility for resources and staff development in the School(s) - Head of School
 - Admissions Tutors, and any other staff responsible for student recruitment and Open Days
 - Examinations Officer(s) and the Chair of Examination Boards
 - Discipline staff responsible for liaison with central services, such as IT Services and the Library, Careers
 - Senior Tutor(s)
 - Staff responsible for student induction

- A group (or groups) of students, for example separate meetings with undergraduate and taught postgraduate students
 - A group of recent graduates
- 36 A suggested programme/timetable for the Periodic Review visit can be seen at Annex 8.
- 37 A set of 'questions' is supplied to guide the Review Panel as to the questions they should be addressing during the visit and in their Report; these questions have also been considered by the School/Department in the preparation of their SED (see Annex 9). However, this list of questions is indicative only and should not constrain the Panel from discussing broader issues where appropriate.
- 38 The internal and external Review Panel members will be asked to lead on particular areas, allocated by the Review Panel Chair prior to the Review itself, and derived from the issues raised in the SED and Student Submission. The internal and external Reviewers will be asked to prepare in advance a bullet point commentary and a series of issues to be investigated relating to their particular areas, which can then be developed and refined into the sections of the final Report as the Review Visit advances. It is hoped that this structure will help Review Panel members to focus their activities during the visit, although it is expected that all will feed in their views on all aspects of the provision. The Panel should note that, in their SED, Schools/Departments are asked to confirm their adherence to the relevant policies and procedures and the Panel may wish to ask for specific examples of practice during their visit and meetings with staff.
- 39 The student member will not be asked to lead on a particular area, but will be asked to consider questions listed under section 9 of Annex 9 in advance of and during the Review, focussing on the student experience, and to pay particular attention to the contents of the Student Submission. The final Report of the Periodic Review Panel does not include a corresponding heading on the student experience, as information obtained in this respect should feed into other sections of the template.
- 40 The Chair of the Panel will normally liaise with the student and internal members prior to the Review to identify areas of focus and for further development to offer further support and guidance to panellists.
- 41 The internal, external and student members will be asked to contribute to each of the Panel's discussions and meetings, and may be required, by the Chair, to undertake a further review of documentation provided, such as Blackboard pages, minutes of any meetings or module descriptions, during the Review.

The Student Submission and students from the subject area under review

- 42 The subject area will be asked to inform all of its students (across all levels/campuses) of the Review process at an early stage and provide them with details of how they can be involved.
- 43 Students in the subject area under review will be invited to prepare a Student Submission for consideration by the Periodic Review Panel. The Subject Provider will contact student representatives (copying in the Academic Representation Manager in the Students' Union) asking them to prepare a Student Submission and explaining the benefits for their participation in the Periodic Review process. For Periodic Reviews due to take place in the Autumn Term, it is important that students be contacted and start preparation of their submission in the preceding Summer Term in order that

students at all levels have an opportunity to feed into the submission. The *Guide to producing the Student Submission for Periodic Review* is included as Annex 6.

- 44 Staff in the subject area under review will not normally have any further involvement in the production of the Student Submission and the Students' Union will provide support and guidance to students in the production of their Submission.
- 45 The Student Submission will be owned by the students and students will be able to choose the format in which to present their submission (e.g. written report, SWOT analysis or video). Each Student Submission will therefore be unique and can be tailored to the preferences of the relevant group of students.
- 46 Student representatives will decide on who will lead the preparation of the submission and nominate one or two representatives to act as the author(s). This would usually be undertaken by an experienced Course Rep(s).
- 47 The *Guide to producing the Student Submission for Periodic Review* includes further details around the themes the student author(s) might consider in their Submission and indicates that they should comment upon the strengths and areas for development of the subject area. The *Guide* also provides further details of the documents/data students might wish to consult in preparing their Submission and contains details of where to find the relevant information. It also lists the various methods students can use to obtain the views of other students in their subject area.
- 48 The student author(s) will be asked to confirm that the Submission is the work of students and representative of the majority of students, with all students having had the opportunity to feed into the submission. The final Student Submission should be referred to CQSD at least eight weeks before the Review visit.
- 49 Review Panels should normally meet a group of students and graduates, including the author(s) of the Student Submission, fairly early in the Review to help identify student opinion. Reviewers are not expected to sit in on classes. Schools are responsible for inviting students to attend a meeting (s) with the Panel. Schools should invite a wide range of students, reflecting the profile of those invited in terms of demographics, and ensure a representative sample of students from across the range of programmes, performance range and Parts.
- 50 In addition, Schools are encouraged to consult with students on drafts and the final version of their SED and this might be undertaken via the Student Staff Liaison Committee.

The Panel's Report

- 51 Members of the Review Panel will be provided with the University's Periodic Review Report template shown in Annex 10. Whilst the Review Report is expected to be essentially evaluative of the provision and of the Panel's findings, it should contain a degree of factual information as appropriate, to provide evidence for the Panel's findings and because the SED and Student Submission will not be publicly available. The Report will therefore need to refer to and include quotations from the SED and Student Submission.
- 52 The internal and external Reviewers will be expected to produce a final draft of the section(s) for which they have responsibility within a week of the end of the Periodic Review visit. A complete draft Report, following the standard template, will then be

produced by the Review Chair and the Secretary and will be circulated to all Panel members (including the student member) for review and approval. The Review Panel should bear in mind the intended audience of the Report, which includes staff and students, and ensure the accessibility of their reports.

- 53 A copy will be provided for the relevant School Director(s) of Teaching and Learning to identify any factual inaccuracies only.
- 54 A final version of the Periodic Review Report will be produced within four weeks of the end of the visit.
- 55 The Report will include an advisory statement as to:
- whether the programmes included in the Review should be re-approved to run for a **further** period of six years (or as appropriate); or
 - whether the programmes included in the Review should be approved to run for an **initial** period of six years (or as appropriate).
- Such approval may be subject to the provider's addressing any areas of concern identified.
- 56 The Report will also categorise any issues as follows, in order of priority:
- Those areas where the Review Team believes it is **necessary** for action to be taken urgently to safeguard the standard of provision;
 - Those areas where it is **advisable** that the issues be addressed as soon as possible.
 - Those areas where it is **desirable** that the issue be addressed over a longer time span.
- 57 The Report may also identify issues and associated recommendations to be addressed by the University, in addition to issues to be addressed by the Subject Provider.
- 58 The final Report, while it might contain recommendations on programme re-approval and suggest issues to be addressed, will be advisory rather than prescriptive.

The Response and Action Plan of the Subject Provider

- 59 CQSD will arrange for copies of the Report to be distributed to the relevant Subject Provider, School Board for Teaching and Learning and Teaching and Learning Dean, drawing attention to issues needing discussion.
- 60 The relevant Subject Provider and School Board for Teaching and Learning will be expected to produce a Response and Action Plan within a further four working weeks. In the majority of cases the Subject Provider will be a School or part of a School but this may not necessarily always be so. Where more than one School is involved, a single collective response from all relevant Schools is required.
- 61 The Response should address the Report's recommendations point by point and the School Board for Teaching and Learning will be responsible for implementation of the School-related recommendations arising from the Periodic Review. The Action Plan should be presented in a table and clearly specify: the Periodic Review Report recommendation; the action(s) proposed; the target date; and the person(s) designated to undertake the specified tasks. A template and accompanying guidance notes are provided as Annex 11. An exemplar Response/Action Plan is available on request from the Centre for Quality Support and Development.
- 62 This Response will be superseded one year later by the Subject Provider's 'One-year Follow-up' report.

Outcome

- 63 The Report, Response and Action Plan will be submitted to the next available meeting of the Sub-Committee on the Delivery and Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (DELT).
- 64 DELT will consider the recommendations of the Panel to the Subject Provider and to the University (if any), as well as the Subject Provider's Response and Action Plan and will:
- approve, as appropriate, the Report and its recommendations, as well as the Subject Provider's Response and Action Plan, identify any further areas for development or enhancement within the School/Department or wider University, and liaise with the School/Department, Teaching and Learning Deans and wider University, as necessary. DELT will give particular consideration to the Subject Provider's response to any 'necessary' recommendations. DELT will also identify how any University-level recommendations will be taken forwards;
 - submit the Report, Response and Action Plan to the University Programmes Board, alongside a summary of its discussions. The summary will include confirmation of whether DELT is satisfied with the Subject Provider's response to any 'necessary' recommendations; and
 - recommend to the University Programmes Board on the basis of its discussions either that the programme(s) be approved/re-approved for a further/initial six years or that interim approval be given for one year until further actions are taken or that the programme(s) be discontinued. In certain circumstances, it may be recommended that within a single Review, some programmes will be approved for a further six years whilst others may receive only interim approval or may be discontinued.
- 65 DELT will request an update from the Subject Provider on progress against any 'necessary' recommendations at its next meeting (if necessary) and will continue to monitor progress until the associated actions are considered to be complete. DELT will also be responsible for monitoring progress against any University-level recommendations.
- 66 Following (re)approval of the programmes by the University Programmes Board, the UPB will submit the Periodic Review Report, Response, Action Plan and summary of DELT's discussions, along with a list of programmes which have been (re)approved, to the University Board for Teaching and Learning (UBTL) and will request that the Periodic Review Report be published on the Periodic Review section of the CQSD website and disseminated by the Subject Provider to students, e.g. via Student-Staff Liaison Committee.
- 67 Six months after Periodic Review takes place, the Subject Provider will review progress on actions outlined in the SED and Periodic Review Response/Action Plan. The aim of this is for Subject Providers to identify next steps and any support required for enhancement activity, in order to gather concrete evidence for the 'One-Year Follow-Up' Report.
- 68 One year after the Periodic Review Report is approved by UBTL, the Subject Provider will be required to report on and evaluate the actions which they have taken to address the issues raised in the Periodic Review Report. A standard template for this 'One-Year Follow-Up' Report and accompanying guidance notes are provided in Annex 12. An exemplar One-Year Follow-Up Report is available on request from the Centre for Quality Support and Development. The Subject Provider will send their draft Report to the relevant Teaching and Learning Dean for comment. A final version will

be approved by the School Board for Teaching and Learning, prior to its submission to DELT for approval. Where interim approval was given for the continuation of the programme, DELT will at this stage normally recommend to the UPB the approval of the programme for a further six years. In all other cases, DELT will submit the One-Year Follow-Up Report directly to UBTL for note, alongside a summary of its discussion.

Version	Keeper	Reviewed	Approved by	Approval Date	Effective From
1	AGS	Every year	UBTL	09/07/2013	
2			UBTL	20/11/2014	
3			UBTL	01/02/2016	
4			UBTL	12/07/2016	
5			UBTL	31/10/2016	Spring Term 2017
6			UBTL	11/07/2017	2017/18
7			UBTL	23/04/2018	immediately

Attached annexes

- Annex 1 Nomination of external member of a Periodic Review panel
- Annex 2 Job description and selection criteria for student member of Periodic Review panel
- Annex 3 Nomination of student member of a Periodic Review panel
- Annex 4 Student Membership of Periodic Review Panels: Good Practice and Guidance for Chairs
- Annex 5 Self-Evaluation Document for Periodic Review: *Guidance notes and template*
- Annex 6 *Guide to producing the Student Submission for Periodic Review*
- Annex 7 Standard documentation and data to be supplied to Periodic Review panels
- Annex 8 Suggested programme for the Periodic Review visit
- Annex 9 Questions for the School/Department and Periodic Review Panel
- Annex 10 Standard template for Periodic Review Report
- Annex 11 Standard template for Response to the Report of the Periodic Review
- Annex 12 Standard template for Periodic Review 'One-Year Follow-Up' report

Annex 1 (Requirements for the Periodic Review of programmes)

Nomination of external member of a Periodic Review panel

Part A

For completion by the School Director of Teaching and Learning.

Declaration			
Name and contact details of Nominated External Member			
Periodic Review Panel			
Proposed Term of Visit (Spring/Summer/Autumn 20xx)			
Rationale for nomination			
Names and Institution/ Organisation of other nominated External Members:	Name		Inst/Org
	Name		Inst/Org
	Name		Inst/Org

I confirm that no members of staff associated with the programmes undergoing Periodic Review currently holds an external examinership or has acted as a member of an internal review panel in the same or a closely cognate discipline in the nominee's institution.

Signed	
Position	
Date	

Part B

For completion by nominated External Member.

Part B1	Personal details
Full name	
Title	
Qualifications	
Present Post	
Contact Address	
Telephone No.	
Fax No.	
Email	

Part B2	Relevant experience
Experience of QAA review and/or Audit - for academic nominees (Please give brief details, including dates of reviews/audits undertaken)	
Experience of acting as a member of an internal review panel in other higher education institutions (either as an internal or external panel member)	
Other relevant experience in academic, industrial or professional roles	

Part B3	Potential conflicts of interest
<p>Please state any potential conflicts of interest</p> <p>For example, a direct interest in or tie to the University or its staff or the programmes being reviewed.</p> <p>Please note that external members should not be or have been within the three years previous to the Periodic Review, an External Examiner at the University in the subject areas being reviewed. Panel members should not normally participate in two consecutive reviews of the same subject area at the University.</p>	

<p>I confirm that I am willing to accept this nomination.</p>	
<p>Signed</p>	
<p>Date</p>	

Annex 2 (Requirements for the Periodic Review of programmes)

Job description and selection criteria for student member of Periodic Review panel

Purpose:

All taught programmes at the University undertake an in-depth review at least every six years to ensure the continuing quality of the degrees and the student learning experience and to suggest future enhancements. This process is called Periodic Review and the reviewing panel comprises internal and external academic staff with a student panellist to represent the student view. Four to six reviews are scheduled each year, normally in the Autumn or Spring Term.

The University wishes to identify student members for its Periodic Review panels to be held in the forthcoming academic year.

Main duties and responsibilities:

As part of the total commitment expected of the student panellist, you will be required to:

- undertake the School or Course Reps training offered by the Students' Union to help you make an effective contribution to the review process;
- liaise with the Chair of the panel by way of an informal meeting and other key staff to prepare you for the review itself;
- read, in advance of the review, a substantial amount of preparatory documentation and evidence and consider issues that are of particular importance to the student experience. Some of this evidence might relate to individuals or be commercially sensitive;
- attend a two-day Periodic Review visit, in which you will be expected to take an active part in the review process, which includes reviewing relevant documentation, meetings with staff, students and graduates of the programmes under review. You will be expected to consider issues such as curricula and assessment, learning resources, quality of teaching and learning, use of student management information (including student feedback) and student progression; and
- contribute to the review report (during the review visit and in the weeks following the visit).

Eligibility criteria:

To be eligible for the role of student panellist, a student:

- should normally be a Student Officer, Student Officer-elect, a School Representative or a Course Representative at the time of the Review (or have been an elected representative in the academic year prior to the Review if Periodic Review is scheduled to take place in the Autumn Term);
- must be in Part 2 onwards at the time of the Review;
- should not be a PhD student;
- must not be a student of the School under review or from a cognate area; and
- should not normally undertake more than one Periodic Review in a session.

Selection criteria:

Essential skills/knowledge

- Excellent oral communication and interpersonal skills
- Good organisational and time management skills
- Good analytical and problem solving skills
- An ability to read selectively and absorb a large amount of detailed information
- An ability to maintain confidentiality

Desirable skills/knowledge

- An understanding of quality assurance processes in higher education
- An understanding of current teaching and learning issues in the University
- Experience as a committee member

Nomination and selection process:

School and Course Reps are asked to nominate themselves for the role of student panellist. A student panellist for each Periodic Review will then be appointed from this self-selected group by the relevant Teaching and Learning Dean in consultation with CQSD and the Students' Union, in accordance with the selection criteria.

Successful candidates will normally be contacted two to three months ahead of the Review visit to check their availability to participate in a specific Periodic Review panel. Subject to their availability and academic timetable, the student member should inform their own School/Department of the dates during which they will participate in a Periodic Review panel.

Salary:

£450

Apply by:

Completing the nomination form (*Nomination of student member of a Periodic Review panel*) circulated with this job description.

Please submit your nomination form to Victoria Bundy (Academic Representation Co-ordinator, RUSU) by emailing v.bundy@reading.ac.uk.

For further information:

Please see the University's policy on *Requirements for the Periodic Review of programmes* (available at: <http://www.reading.ac.uk/nmsruntime/saveasdialog.aspx?IID=21144&sID=87193>) or contact the Education Officer of the Students' Union for more information.

Annex 3 (Requirements for the Periodic Review of programmes)

Nomination of student member of a Periodic Review panel

Part A

For completion by applicants for the role of the student member of a Periodic Review panel.

Please complete this form and submit to Victoria Bundy (Academic Representation Co-ordinator, RUSU) by emailing v.bundy@reading.ac.uk.

Part A	Personal details
Full name	
Programme of study	
Current Part (i.e. Part 2-4 or Postgraduate Taught). Students will not be selected for reviews of their own School or cognate subject area.	
School/Department	
Telephone No.	
Email	
Contact Address	
Please state any dates during the next academic year when you will be unavailable, e.g. if on placement.	

<p>Please state whether you are currently a School Rep or Course Rep</p>	
<p>Have you been a member of a Periodic Review or New Programme Scrutiny panel in the past? Please note that students will not normally participate in more than one Review or Scrutiny Panel in a session.</p>	
<p>Please explain why you wish to participate in Periodic Review.</p>	
<p>Please describe what experience you can bring to the Panels.</p>	
<p>What, in your opinion, might be the most challenging aspect of this post, and how would you overcome this?</p>	
<p>Please state here if you would require any additional support in order to participate in the review, for example due to a disability. This information will only be used for these specific purposes and shared with those involved in your application. It will not be shared with anyone else and will be held securely in confidence.</p>	

Some of the evidence under review might relate to individuals or be commercially sensitive. You are therefore required to confirm that you will not disseminate information or views other than through the Report of the Periodic Review Panel, which will be finalised following the Review visit.

Signed	
Date	

Part B

For completion by the Teaching and Learning Dean after discussion with the Education Officer, RUSU.

Declaration	
Name of nominated student member	
Proposed Term of Visit (if applicable) (Spring/Summer/Autumn 20xx)	
School/Department	
I confirm that the applicant satisfies the University's criteria to act as a student member of a Periodic Review Panel.	
Signed	
Position	
Date	

Annex 4 (Requirements for the Periodic Review of programmes)

Student Membership of Periodic Review Panels: Good Practice and Guidance for Chairs

In order to obtain maximum benefit from student representation on Periodic Review panels, Chairs of panels should take steps to ensure that the student member of the panel is:

1. **Adequately informed about the purpose of Periodic Review and their role within the process.**
2. **Well supported in their role, which is likely to be unfamiliar.**
3. **Treated as an integral and equal member of the panel.**

In order to achieve these aims, Chairs should carry out the following:

- **Familiarise themselves with the content of the induction to Periodic Review session provided to all student panellists by the Students' Union** in order to make themselves aware of the students' expectations, what they should know and any potential gaps in their knowledge (contact the Education Officer for details.)
- **Ensure student panellists are provided with all relevant documentation well in advance of the Review and directed specifically to the Student Submission and section 9 of Annex 9** ('Suggested standard questions to guide Review Panel members') of the *Requirements for the Periodic Review of programmes*, which includes questions for the student panellist. This will help focus the student's preparation for, and input to, the Review.
- **Contact the student panellist (and other key panel members if appropriate) in advance of the Review** to outline the specifics of what is timetabled for the Review and answer any questions the student may have.
- **Consider agreeing with panel members the order of their questioning in advance of each meeting** to ensure parity of roles and responsibility is maintained throughout the Review.

Annex 5 (Requirements for the Periodic Review of programmes)

Self-Evaluation Document (SED) for Periodic Review: Guidance notes and template

Guidance notes

- The Self-Evaluation Document (SED) is the major piece of evidence which will be considered by the Review Panel prior to and during the Periodic Review.
- The SED is intended to provide a reflection of the academic provision under review and applies to all award-bearing taught programmes and taught components of doctorate programmes. The SED identifies how the School/Department has made, and continues to make, available to students appropriate learning opportunities, which enable the intended learning outcomes of the programme to be achieved. The SED also evaluates student attainment of academic standards and allows the University to ensure that the portfolio of programmes aligns with its mission and strategic priorities. The preparation and consideration of an SED will enable the School/Department and University to provide assurance and identify any problems which need to be resolved; it also enables good practice to be identified, built upon and shared and contributes to the continuous improvement of the programmes and enhancement of the student experience.
- When preparing the SED, the School/Department should consider and reflect upon all relevant datasets, broken down by demographics, where appropriate. The SED should be evidence-based with reference to datasets throughout - an indicative list of datasets to be considered is included in the SED template. The SED should also draw upon and cross-reference the Annual Programme Reports (APRs) for the relevant programmes, as well as the School Planning and Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (SPELT) process. The SED will act as a synthesis of these annual reports and provides an opportunity for a deeper reflection upon the achievements/progress arising out of these, identifying opportunities for continuous improvement and enhancement of the student experience.
- Production of the SED should be a collaborative process, enabling all relevant stakeholders (e.g. staff, students, employers) in the School/Department to reflect upon quality assurance and enhancement. The SDTL is responsible for managing Periodic Reviews within Schools and will co-ordinate the preparation of the SED, in conjunction with the Head of School. The SDTL/HoS will identify the main author of the SED, who may wish to assign responsibility for completing certain sections of the SED to colleagues or produce the SED collaboratively.
- The School/Department will receive support from CQSD in the preparation of the SED, including liaison with those contributing to the SED and co-ordinating the preparation of the SED; co-ordinating provision of centrally held data and, where

appropriate, analysing data; collating documentation for the submission; and drafting text, where appropriate, on the basis of a clear brief from the School.

- The SED should be clear and concise and the suggested number of pages per section is as follows:
 - Section 1: Introduction: **In addition to tables, up to three pages if there has been significant change in the School/Department since the last Periodic Review.**
 - Section 2: Quality Assurance and Enhancement: **15-20 pages**
 - Section 3: Forward-looking development plan: **five pages**
- Specific guidance on the content of each section is embedded within the SED template.
- It is not necessary to include within the SED significant details of current practices which are operated in accordance with standard University policies and procedures found in the [Guide to Policies and Procedures in Teaching and Learning](#). However, where the School/Department confirms its adherence to the relevant policies and procedures within their SED, the Panel may wish to ask for specific examples of practice during their visit and meetings with staff. The SED template includes references to the relevant policies and procedures under each heading in Section 2 and further guidance on policies to consider can be provided by CQSD.
- Schools and Departments should also refer to Annex 9 of this document, *Questions for the School/Department and Periodic Review Panel*, when completing Section 2 of the SED and reflect upon and respond to the questions under each heading in the corresponding section of the SED, as appropriate. The Panel will also consider these questions and the evidence provided by the School/Department when identifying their recommendations and preparing the Periodic Review Report.
- The School/Department should consult the relevant Teaching and Learning Dean if they believe that additional content would be appropriate under any of the headings contained within the template or if they require additional advice.
- The School/Department is required to submit the SED in electronic format to CQSD four weeks before the review visit for circulation to Panel members.
- SEDs are not published, although copies will be retained within the University, as a record and for consultation by others seeking advice and examples. It is, however, likely that the review report will refer to and include quotations from the SED.
- Examples of previous SEDs are available on request from CQSD (subject to the agreement of the relevant Schools).

Self-Evaluation Document (SED) for Periodic Review of School/Department of X

Section 1: Introduction

Contextual/Background information on the School/Department

1. Please include any contextual/background information on the School/Department under review, including any key changes or developments (e.g. staff, structures, academic provision) since last Periodic Review, which may be pertinent for the Panel. Please also reflect on the One-Year Follow-Up Report to the last Periodic Review in the School and comment upon the impact of these changes.

List of key members of staff:

Head of School	
School Director of T&L	
Head of Department (where applicable)	
Departmental Director of T&L (if relevant)	
UG Admissions Tutor(s)	
Taught PG Admissions Tutor(s)	
Senior Tutor	
Examinations Officer	
Disability representative	
Careers Co-ordinator	
Study abroad co-ordinator	
<i>(Add others as appropriate)</i>	

List of programmes (including partnership programmes), programme directors and associated PSRB, if appropriate, included within the Periodic Review:

<i>Undergraduate programmes</i>	<i>Programme Director</i>	<i>PSRB (if appropriate)</i>	<i>(if required)</i>	<i>Commentary (if required)</i>

Postgraduate Taught programmes	Programme Director	PSRB (if appropriate)	Commentary (if required)

Abstract

2. Include a statement to draw together Sections 2 and 3 (below) and to enable the reader to ascertain the pertinent issues within the SED.
3. The School/Department may wish to raise any specific questions for the Panel or include a brief SWOT analysis at this point of their SED. The School/Department may also wish to identify any areas for enhancement at a University-level or which require University-level support.

Section 2: Quality Assurance and Enhancement

This section provides an opportunity for the School/Department to reflect upon its arrangements for Quality Assurance and Enhancement for its programmes (including programmes delivered with a partner) and indicate how it intends to address any of the issues raised under the various headings/sub-headings.

Within this section, the School/Department is asked to confirm that it operates its programmes in accordance with standard University policies and procedures and provide details of any particular issues encountered or variations, under the relevant headings/sub-headings, where applicable.

The School/Department should highlight any examples of good practice or areas for development under each heading or sub-heading. This includes any strengths, weaknesses or examples of innovative/effective practices.

Schools/Departments should draw upon the relevant datasets, broken down by demographic, where appropriate, and covering a three year period, when completing each section.

The provision of centrally-held datasets will be co-ordinated by CQSD and from 2017-18 onwards, a 'Teaching and Learning Dashboard' is available to Schools/Departments as a comprehensive repository of the relevant datasets. Schools/Departments are responsible for providing some datasets, as indicated below.

Datasets to be considered and provided by CQSD include:

- *Partnership annual review forms for partnership programmes and progression arrangements, where relevant, along with any partner review reports and collaborative partnership agreements;*
- *Standard data that will include datasets relating to recruitment and admissions, student profile, student admission, retention, progression, performance and attainment, and graduate destinations;*
- *External Examiners' reports;*

- Annual programme reports;
- historic UCAS applications, accepters and decliners; and,
- student voice and the Student Submission (including National Student Survey – and optional questions (where available), Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey, the outcomes of student module evaluation).

Datasets to be considered and provided by the School/Department include:

- Number and profile of academic and support staff;
- School/Department SPELT T&L Plans and achievements/progress made;
- the most recent Periodic Review report, response and One-Year Follow-Up Report;
- PSRB accreditation reports and responses, where relevant;
- School/Department Responses to External Examiners' Reports;
- the most recent Programme Handbook for the programmes under review, including the relevant programme specifications;
- minutes of relevant Boards of Studies for the previous three years;
- minutes of the relevant School Board for Teaching and Learning and any School Teaching and Learning Committees for the previous three years (where available);
- minutes of relevant Student-Staff Committees for the previous three years;
- relevant module descriptions;
- student voice (including the outcomes of School/Department's programme evaluation, and feedback from the Student-Staff Liaison Committees);
- any feedback obtained from staff via committees, surveys or other mechanisms; and,
- any data from the Teaching and Learning Dashboard that is over and above the standard datasets provided by CQSD.

Committee Structures

4. Provide an overview of the quality assurance and enhancement committee structures in place within the subject area, including School Boards for Teaching and Learning, Boards of Studies, Student-Staff Liaison Committees and Teaching Enhancement Groups/Forums, if applicable. Please complete the table below for each Board of Studies and Teaching and Learning committee and supplement with a diagram showing the relationship between committees, if possible or provide the relevant membership/terms of reference as an annex.

School Board for Teaching and Learning	(Give name of Board here)
Chair	(Name of current chairperson)
Membership	(List names or titles of members)
Number and timing of meetings per year	(Give number of regular meetings and term(s) when Board meets)

Board of Studies	(Give name of Board here)
Chair	(Name of current chairperson)
Programmes	(List all degree programmes owned by Board. Please also consult the Procedure for partner programme review , if provision includes a collaborative programme.) (List of professional doctorate programmes for which the Board provides taught modules)
Membership	(List names or titles of members)
Number and timing of meetings per year	(Give number of regular meetings and term(s) when Board meets)

Student-Staff Liaison Committee	(Give name of SSLC here)
Chair	(Name of current chairperson)
Programmes	(List all degree programmes within the purview of the SSLC)
Membership	(List names or titles of members)
Number and timing of meetings per year	(Give number of regular meetings and term(s) when Board meets)

Teaching Enhancement Groups/Forums	(Give name of the Group/Forum here)
Chair	(Name of current chairperson)
Membership	(List names or titles of members)
Number and timing of meetings per year	(Give number of regular meetings and term(s) when Board meets)

5. Please confirm whether any arrangements within the School/Department vary from the standard University arrangements for the management of quality processes and structures described in the [Quality Management and Enhancement processes at the University of Reading](#) policy and comment on any specific issues or variations on normal practice.

Programme design

6. Please confirm that Programme Specifications, Module Descriptions and Programme Handbooks are developed in accordance with the University's policies in this area (including the University Credits and Qualification Framework)¹ and comment on any specific issues or variations on normal practice.
7. Please also confirm that programmes are designed in accordance with external reference points, including subject benchmark statements and PSRBs (where relevant) and provide details of any arrangements for PSRB accreditation.

¹ See <https://www.reading.ac.uk/cqsd/QualityAssurance/PoliciesandProcedures/cqsd-PoliciesandProcedures.aspx>

8. Please reflect upon and respond to the questions contained within Annex 9, drawing on the relevant datasets and evidence, as appropriate. Please identify any strengths or areas for development in respect of the questions contained within this section.

Assessment and Feedback

9. Please reflect upon and respond to the questions contained within Annex 9, drawing on the relevant datasets and evidence, as appropriate. Please identify any strengths or areas for development in respect of the questions contained within this section of the Annex and also address the following questions.

Assessment policy, design, methods and arrangements

10. Please confirm that programmes are operated in accordance with the University's *Examinations and Assessment Handbook*² and describe any variations to standard University procedures in respect of the communication of the assessment criteria; submission of coursework (paper and electronic), collection of feedback/results, arrangements for students with disabilities, anonymous marking, step-marking, moderation of marks for exams and coursework, academic misconduct and consideration of extenuating circumstances.

Feedback to students

11. Please confirm that feedback to students is undertaken in accordance with the University's [Policy on providing feedback to students on their performance](#). Please comment on compliance with the University's fifteen day turnaround time; feedback policy; quality of feedback; use of feedback forms; use of electronic feedback; feedback on written examinations and dissertations; and extensions, as necessary.

External Examiners and accreditation

12. Please confirm that external examiners involvement in the programme is undertaken in accordance with the [University's Code of Practice on External Examiners for Taught Programmes](#). Please comment on any variations in practice, including in respect of: the scrutiny of papers; External Examiner meetings with students; whether External Examiners receive papers in advance or view on site; and how/who responds to External Examiners' report (s).

Teaching and Learning

13. Please confirm that Teaching and Learning is undertaken in accordance with the University's [Guide to Policies and Procedures in Teaching and Learning](#), including the [Peer review of learning and teaching](#) and comment on any specific issues or variations on normal practice. In particular, Schools/Departments are asked to include an evaluative review on the effectiveness of the Peer Review process and the outcomes

² The handbook is currently under development and a URL will be available shortly. See also <http://www.reading.ac.uk/exams/>

of the process, identifying the coverage of the Peer Review process and highlighting any issues or areas for enhancement which have been identified through the process.

14. Please reflect upon and respond to the questions contained within Annex 9, drawing on the relevant datasets and evidence, as appropriate. Please identify any strengths or areas for development in respect of the questions contained within this section.

Student admission, retention, progression and attainment

15. Please confirm that admissions are undertaken in accordance with the [University of Reading Admissions Policy](#) and comment on any variations on normal practice.
16. Please confirm compliance with the University's [Policy and procedure for the Recognition of Prior Learning \(RPL\)](#), where appropriate.
17. Please confirm that matters relating to [Academic Engagement and Fitness to Study](#) and [Fitness to Practise](#) are managed in accordance with the University's policies in this area and comment on any specific issues that have been encountered or variations on normal practice.
18. Please reflect upon and respond to the questions contained within Annex 9, drawing on the relevant datasets and evidence, as appropriate. Please identify any strengths or areas for development in respect of the questions contained within this section.

Learning environment and student support

19. Please confirm that arrangements for students with disabilities are informed by [Students with disabilities: key principles for staff, students and applicants](#) and comment on any specific issues or variations on normal practice and how the School/Department works with the Disability Advisory Service/Student Support Centres.
20. Please reflect upon and respond to the questions contained within Annex 9, drawing on the relevant datasets and evidence, as appropriate. Please identify any strengths or areas for development in respect of the questions contained within this section.

Employability

21. Please confirm that programmes are operated in accordance with the University's policies around careers learning and placements³, and comment on any specific issues or variations on normal practice and how the School/Department works with Careers.
22. Please reflect upon and respond to the questions contained within Annex 9, drawing on the relevant datasets and evidence, as appropriate. Please identify any

³ See <http://www.reading.ac.uk/cqsd/QualityAssurance/PoliciesandProcedures/cqsd-PoliciesandProcedures.aspx>

strengths or areas for development in respect of the questions contained within this section.

Enhancement of quality and academic provision

23. Please confirm that mechanisms used for student evaluation (including module and programme evaluation, student meetings, discussions in Boards of Studies, other meetings, School surveys and the National Student Survey) comply with the University's policies in this area, including the [Policy on module evaluation](#). Please comment on any specific issues or variations on normal practice.
24. Please confirm whether any arrangements for student representation vary from the policy on [Student academic representation](#) and comment on any specific issues or variations on normal practice.
25. Please reflect upon and respond to the questions contained within Annex 9, drawing on the relevant datasets and evidence, as appropriate. Please identify any strengths or areas for development in respect of the questions contained within this section.

Section 3: Forward-looking development plan

26. Please provide a forward-looking development plan for the programme provision, covering the following three academic years. The plan should be a synthesis of the issues raised and areas for development identified in Section 2 of the SED, as well as in the relevant Annual Programme Reports and SPELT Teaching & Learning Plans. Please identify the priorities and associated actions/timescales, as well as the relevant stakeholders.

When considering the plan, please also reflect upon the steps taken towards alignment with the Curriculum Framework so far and any further planned work.

Annex 6 (Requirements for the Periodic Review of programmes)

Guide to producing the Student Submission for Periodic Review

What is a Periodic Review?

Each programme undergoes a Periodic Review every 6 years, which is an in depth analysis of how the programme is functioning at an academic and organisational level. It looks at the standard of teaching and learning delivery, the level of service provided to students and running of the programme in general.

The Periodic Review involves a Periodic Review Panel made of;

- A Chair (A Teaching and Learning Dean or other member of academic staff from the University)
- A Secretary (provided by the University)
- Two members of Academic Staff (outside of the School under review, with at least one member of staff from a non-cognate area)
- Two members of external academics (specialising in the subject area under review but external to the University)
- A Student (outside of the School of the programme under review and from a non-cognate area)

These panellists will be provided with a number of documents by the University, including a **Self-Evaluation Document (SED)** produced by the School/Department, as well as a **Student Submission**, to aid them in their review.

What is a Student Submission?

The Student Voice is vital in a Periodic Review and this is captured through the Student Submission, as well as through meetings between the Panel and students and the inclusion of a student panellist in the Review. The Student Submission is an opportunity for you to give good quality feedback on all aspects of your programme, in which ever way you feel would be most effective. The production of the Student Submission is led by relevant Course Reps in partnership with students across all levels and campuses, it is owned by students and must be produced independently from the University (academics cannot help you write it).

The Periodic Review will look into key themes such as;

- Committee structures
- Programme design
- Assessment and Feedback
- Teaching and Learning
- Student admission, retention, progression and attainment
- Learning environment and student support
- Employability
- Enhancement of quality academic provision

So it is important the Student Submission takes a few or all of these into account.

How to produce the Student Submission

1. The Student Submission should be as representative as possible; this is why it is advised that the Course Reps (from all levels) work in a team to complete this. It is important that the lead Course Reps collect data from their entire cohort, taking in to account the different students that exist within their department, including students based on overseas campuses. Undergraduate, Postgraduate, Mature, Disabled, BAME (Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic), International, Part-time and LGBT+ (Lesbian, Gay, Bi, Transgender +) student voices all need to shape the Student Submission. This is not about tokenising voices, but rather getting a well-rounded comprehensive overview of all student opinions. It is also recommended that an experienced Course Rep takes lead on the overall production of the Student Submission, as they will have more experience within the School/Department, but it is still important that all year groups are represented. For more help on how to capture these student opinions contact the RUSU Education Officer.

2. There are many ways to collect feedback from students. You can use the Course Rep Portal, Academic Societies, emails, online surveys, discussion groups, Facebook pages, feedback forms during lectures; anything you can do to get as much feedback as possible! You will also get access to the NSS (National Student Survey) and the PTES (Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey) results and can contact the Centre for Quality Support and Development (CQSD) (cgsd-tandl@reading.ac.uk) for access to data that might inform the Submission. This can be used to shape the discussions you have with students. If students have a problem criticising specifically the teaching and learning they receive on their programme, then ask questions to find out where students feel improvements could be made. Keep note of how many students have contributed to the feedback (be that a survey response or a like on a Facebook post) and include this in the submission. If the Periodic Review is due to take place in the Autumn Term, it is important to start this process in the preceding Summer Term in order to capture the views and experiences of students on one-year programmes.

3. It is completely up to you how to you compose the Student Submission. It could be a written report with subheadings on key topics, a video of student testimonials, a series of graphs and tables, a SWOT analysis- as long as you are able to communicate all of the feedback you have collected then it will be useful to the Review Panel. It is important to remember that the Periodic Review is not just about finding the weaknesses of a programme, it is also vital that the good practice of your programmes is referenced, this can help other programmes at the University learn from what your programme is doing well.

4. The creation of the Student Submission is not intended to be lengthy, but do go into as much detail as you wish; the more comprehensive, the better for the future development and enhancement of the programmes. It is important to remember this is owned by you as students, so it should be what you want it to be. Rather than giving you a template of what to say in the Student Submission, we believe it is better for it to be completely student driven and created. However, if you do have any queries do contact the RUSU Education Officer.

5. The Student Submission, once complete, will be sent to CQSD no later than eight weeks before the Review. CQSD will send it to the lead member of staff in the School/Department under review, allowing them the opportunity to reflect on the feedback and then finalise their own Self-Evaluation Document. Your School/Department will provide you with confirmed deadlines and contact details for CQSD.

6. You, the Course Rep team, students on the programme and recent graduates will be invited to meet with the Periodic Review Panel on their two day visit to discuss the content of the Student Submission in greater depth.

Summary

The Student Submission should be;

- Student led, and as representative as possible with confirmation that all students from the programmes under review have had the opportunity to contribute
- Confirm how many students were involved in shaping the submission

- Identify the programmes strengths and areas for improvement
- Be submitted to CQSD no later than eight weeks prior to the Periodic Review

If you have any questions about the Student Submission or Periodic Review process, please contact the RUSU Education Officer on educationofficer@rusu.co.uk, or 0118 3784130.

Annex 7 (Requirements for the Periodic Review of programmes)

Standard documentation and data to be reviewed by the School and supplied to Periodic Review panels

As stated in the main policy document, documents should be provided electronically and uploaded to the Blackboard Periodic Review Organisation. Datasets should cover a three year period and be broken down by demographic, where appropriate.

1 Advance data

Datasets to be considered and provided by CQSD include:

- Partnership annual review forms for partnership programmes and progression arrangements, where relevant, along with any partner review reports and collaborative partnership agreements;
- Standard data that will include datasets relating to recruitment and admissions, student profile, student admission, retention, progression, performance and attainment, and graduate destinations;
- External Examiners' reports;
- Annual programme reports;
- historic UCAS applications, accepters and decliners;
- student voice and the Student Submission (including National Student Survey – and optional questions (where available) -, Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey, the outcomes of student module evaluations).

Datasets to be considered and provided by the School/Department include:

- Number and profile of academic and support staff;
- School/Department SPELT T&L Plans and achievements/progress made;
- the most recent Periodic Review report, response and One-Year Follow-Up Report;
- PSRB accreditation reports and responses, where relevant;
- School/Department Responses to External Examiners' Reports;
- the most recent Programme Handbook for the programmes under review, including the relevant programme specifications;
- minutes of relevant Boards of Studies for the previous three years;
- minutes of the relevant School Board for Teaching and Learning and any School Teaching and Learning Committees for the previous three years (where available);
- minutes of relevant Student-Staff Committees for the previous three years;
- relevant module descriptions;

- student voice (including the outcomes of School/Department's programme evaluation, and feedback from the Student-Staff Liaison Committees);
- any feedback obtained from staff via committees, surveys or other mechanisms;
- any data from the Teaching and Learning Dashboard that is over and above the standard datasets provided by CQSD.

2 Documentation to be provided during the Periodic Review visit

- A sufficiently representative sample of student work to adequately reflect the programme cohort, e.g. including international students and students studying at branch campuses if appropriate, should be provided in order to support the Review Panel's understanding of students' development of skills and knowledge as follows:
 - to demonstrate the type of feedback provided to students;
 - to demonstrate how the relevant School's assessment strategy is articulated into actual student work;
 - to provide, through student work, examples of good and innovative practice; and
 - to ensure provision is aligned with the diverse needs of the student body.

3 Documentation to support any new programme proposals

- Where the Periodic Review will also consider new programme proposals, relevant documentation will also be required as set out in the Programme Lifecycle Policies

Annex 8 (Requirements for the Periodic Review of programmes)

Suggested programme for the Periodic Review visit

CQSD will arrange the programme in liaison with the Panel Chair and the School/Department using the following suggested programme for the Periodic Review Visit. Any such programme will include enough time for the Periodic Review Team to carry out required reading as well as meetings. Where a programme area under review delivers programmes at a branch campus, the duration of the review may be extended to three days to ensure participation of staff and students based at the relevant branch campuses. The exact arrangements may differ according to the provision being reviewed; for example, in some cases more meetings may need to be held with different groups of students and staff.

Day 1

9.00 am	Review Team arrives <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Initial sharing of bullet points on major areas• Discussion main lines of enquiry of the Review
10.00 am	Introduction with key Teaching and Learning staff
10.15am	Tour of facilities
10.45am	Review Team to look at files and student work, continue discussions and confirm work to be covered in the afternoon.
1.00 pm	Working lunch
2.00 pm	Meeting with undergraduate students*
3.00 pm	Meeting with taught postgraduate students*
4.00 pm	Meetings with staff* It may be sensible to hold separate meetings e.g. with newly appointed staff, senior staff, staff with particular responsibilities for areas of the provision.
5.00 pm	Possible meeting with recent graduates and/or employers where appropriate*
6.00 pm	Review of progress and preparation for Day 2
7.00pm	Dinner

* It is possible for parallel meetings to be held but it is good practice always to have two reviewers present at any meeting

Day 2

8.30am	Meeting with students and staff to include those at the University of Reading Malaysia.
9.30 am	Meeting of the Review Team Panel to begin drafting and identify items which require further investigation.

- 11.00 am Meetings with staff
Meetings with specialist staff may be necessary and could be held at any time throughout the morning.
- 1.00 pm Working lunch to review progress
- 2.00 pm Discussion of final report and initial drafting
- 3.00 pm Oral feedback to School/Department
- 4.00 pm Review Team departs

Annex 9 (Requirements for the Periodic Review of programmes)

Questions for the School/Department and Periodic Review Panel

1. Committee structures

- a) How does the School/Department ensure that the quality assurance and enhancement committee structures in place are appropriate and effective for the management of the programmes?

2. Programme design

- a) How are the programme aims and learning outcomes clearly aligned with the University's key strategies, including the Teaching and Learning Strategy?
- b) What evidence is there that the programme aims and learning outcomes are clear and useful, and shared with students, staff and examiners?
- c) To what extent do the programmes inculcate and progressively develop the graduate attributes in the Curriculum Framework?
- d) Is the collective achievement of learning outcomes consistent with the aims of the programme?
- e) How is progression towards achievement of the programme outcomes facilitated through the design and delivery of component modules of the programme?
- f) How are the aims and outcomes reviewed in light of the cumulative effects of small changes to modules and programmes to ensure their continued alignment?
- g) To what extent do the programmes take pro-active and anticipatory account of the needs of the varied student body in its learning outcomes?
- h) Is the degree programme coherent, and of appropriate breadth and scope?
- i) To what extent do the programmes support students in connecting knowledge and skills from different modules to form a coherent integrated whole?
- j) Does the School/Department promote flexibility in the undergraduate curriculum to provide students with opportunities to undertake language learning and study abroad?
- k) To what extent do the programmes afford opportunities for students to learn about current research in the discipline/s?

- l) To what degree is the curriculum and its delivery relevant to global issues? How is the curriculum reviewed in terms of cultural assumptions and bias? Are students encouraged to critically reflect on/expand their global knowledge base?

3. Assessment and Feedback

Assessment policy, design, methods and arrangements

- a) How is assessment devised at programme-level to measure student progression towards achievement of the programme learning outcomes?
- b) To what extent do the programmes plan assessment to contribute directly to learning and skill development?
- c) What is the balance of formative and summative assessment methods across the programme? How does it progressively support students' assessment literacy and self-awareness?
- d) Does the School/Department consider deadlines to assessments so that student and staff workload can be coordinated across the programme?
- e) To what extent do the programmes incorporate a variety of assessment methods (including use of technology) to allow all students to demonstrate their ability to meet the learning outcomes of the programme?
- f) To what extent do the programmes provide opportunities to enhance students' awareness of, and critical engagement with the assessment criteria?

Feedback to students

- g) Is there evidence that feedback and feedforward to students is high quality, effective and timely?
- h) Does the School/Department make use of a variety of modes of feedback (including electronic), and are these appropriate to the assessment?
- i) How does the School/Department provide feedback on performance in written examinations to students, if sought?

External Examiners and accreditation

- j) Do External Examiners' reports verify that the standards achieved by learners meet the minimum expectations for awards, as measured against any relevant Subject Benchmarking Statements and the various levels of the FHEQ?
- k) How effective are the arrangements for reflecting upon and implementing, where appropriate, the views of External Examiners?
- l) Are there criteria which enable examiners to distinguish between different categories of achievement?
- m) Are the appropriate standards being met where a programme is also professionally accredited?

4. Teaching and Learning

- a) How is the quality of teaching and learning maintained and enhanced (through, for example, staff development programmes, peer review and observation, mentoring of new staff and integration of visiting staff)?
- b) How well do staff draw upon their research, scholarship or professional activity to inform their teaching?
- c) To what extent do the programmes articulate the pedagogies and teaching approaches used and share these with students?
- d) To what extent do the programmes align teaching and learning methods with programme-level learning outcomes?
- e) To what extent do the programmes use diverse and inspiring approaches to teaching and learning?
- f) To what extent do the programmes align with the academic and pedagogic principles of the Curriculum Framework?
- g) To what extent do the programmes provide space for reflection on the characteristics of the discipline/s and its distinctive 'ways of thinking and practicing'?
- h) How is technology used to deliver teaching and enable student learning?
- i) Is there appropriate engagement with and participation by students in their learning?
- j) To what extent do the programmes incorporate a variety of teaching and learning methods to allow all students to demonstrate their ability to meet the learning outcomes of the programme?
- k) To what extent do the programmes afford opportunities for students to learn through research and enquiry?
- l) Are the needs of the diverse cohort pro-actively identified and addressed appropriately through both embedded teaching and learning methodologies and supplemental support? (Consideration of diverse students should include ethnicity, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation, religion and belief, socio-economic background, and previous educational experience as well as students for whom English is not their first language and those unfamiliar with the UK HE educational system/culture.)
- m) To what extent do the programmes provide the opportunity for students to study content and reflect on topics and issues from alternative national and cultural perspectives?

5. Student admission, retention, progression and attainment

- a) Are there effective arrangements for admission, induction, transition and progression, which are understood by staff, applicants and students?
- b) How does the curriculum successfully induct students into Higher Education learning and successfully equip them with the necessary academic and subject skills at the right stages of their studies?
- c) Is there appropriate academic support for students, including written guidance, which is consistent with the student profile and the overall aims of the degree programmes?
- d) How are students' individual needs identified and appropriately addressed?
- e) What is the evidence of student achievement? (External Examiners' reports, professional accreditation reports, destination data, degree classifications, progression data etc.)
- f) What evidence is there that student progression is appropriate to the stated aims and consistent with the attainment of intended learning outcomes?
- g) To what extent do the programmes facilitate progression from guided to autonomous learning within the discipline/s?
- h) How does the School/Department reflect on the performance of its students and evaluate attainment patterns across key demographic categories, including ethnicity, gender and disability?
- i) What evidence is there of a pro-active approach to addressing attainment gaps between different groups of students?
- j) How does the School use student management information, undertake competitor analysis and respond to the outcomes? Is this effective?

6. Learning environment and student support

- a) Is the collective expertise of the academic staff suitable for effective delivery of the curricula and for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes?
- b) Is there appropriate technical, administrative and other support, for example from Technical Services, the Student Support Centres and Careers?
- c) Are there suitable resources in terms of teaching accommodation, equipment, library stocks and IT facilities, and are these deployed in an effective manner?
- d) Is there effective liaison between the academic staff and the support services, including, for example, Technical Services, the Student Support Centres and Careers?
- e) To what extent do the programmes allow for collaboration of students and tutors to create an inclusive community of learners to which everyone feels they belong?

- f) How effective are the arrangements for pastoral support for students, including the Personal Tutorial system?
- g) To what extent do the programmes encourage students to take responsibility for their own personal and professional development?
- h) Are the learning environment and arrangements for student support inclusive and do they support diverse cohorts of students, including consideration of ethnicity, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation, religion and belief, socio-economic background, previous educational experience (e.g. BTEC rather than A level), students for whom English is not their first language or those not familiar with the UK educational system/culture?

7. Employability

- a) What evidence is there that graduates from the programme(s) are well prepared for employment?
- b) How does the programme prepare students for the global workplace?
- c) To what extent do the programmes embed and progressively develop employability across the curriculum?
- d) To what extent do the programmes provide students with opportunities for placements and work-based learning activities? Are arrangements to support placements appropriate?
- e) To what extent do the programmes encourage students to make connections between discipline specific knowledge, skills and attributes and their use in the wider world?
- f) To what extent do the programmes provide students with opportunities to reflect upon and articulate what they have learned?
- g) To what extent do the programmes provide opportunities for employer/alumni engagement in the curriculum? By what means is such engagement facilitated? Is it effective?
- h) How are the programmes informed by changes in employer demand and employment opportunities?
- i) How does the School engage with the Careers service at the University?

8. Enhancement of quality and academic provision

- a) How does the School take deliberate steps to enhance the quality of its provision and how does it identify/disseminate/use examples of good and effective practice?
- b) How does the School make appropriate and effective use of datasets (statistical data, External Examiners' reports, student evaluations, student representation, National Student Survey, Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey)?

- c) How effective are the arrangements for reacting to the views of professional bodies (where applicable) and ensuring 'Interprofessional Education Sessions' are provided, where required?
- d) How are students engaged in the development and enhancement of the curriculum?
- e) How does the School/Department ensure that any issues raised by student module and programme evaluations are dealt with appropriately and in a timely manner, and that students receive informative and timely feedback on the actions taken (or not)?
- f) How effective are internal arrangements for monitoring, evaluating and enhancing academic standards in the programme and its component modules?
- g) Are appropriate development opportunities made available to and taken up by staff, for example, FLAIR?

9. Suggested standard questions to guide the Student Panellist¹

- a) Are the following clearly communicated to students?
 - i. Learning outcomes
 - ii. Teaching, learning and assessment strategies
 - iii. Assessment criteria for modules
 - iv. Expectations of feedback
- b) How is student evaluation collected? Is there clear evidence of the subject area appropriately using datasets? (Statistical data, External Examiners' reports, student evaluations, student representation, National Student Survey, Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey)
- c) Is there evidence of staff drawing on their research, scholarship or professional activity to inform their teaching?
- d) Is feedback to students adequate and timely?
- e) Is there evidence to show that students are able to engage with, participate in and influence their learning/programme(s)?
- f) Is there a suitable variety of teaching methods and learning opportunities for students?
- g) Are admission and induction arrangements generally understood by students/applicants?
- h) Is there appropriate support available for students? Consider the following:
 - i. support in using resources
 - ii. technical and administrative support

¹ Please note that it is not necessary to include responses and evidence in respect of Section 9 as a separate section in the Report of Periodic Review panel, as the suggested questions are pervasive to the current headings included within the Report template.

- iii. support for individual needs
 - iv. extra study skills support
 - v. support for students looking for or undertaking placements
- i) What evidence is there that graduates from the programme(s) are well prepared for employment?

Annex 10 (Requirements for the Periodic Review of programmes)

Standard template for Periodic Review reports

The following is the University's standard template for the writing of a Periodic Review Report. All sections of the template should be completed as part of the final Report.

The Report should include in the General Observations section any general thoughts on the Review, such as the quality of the data and information provided.

The Academic standards, Quality of learning opportunities and Enhancement of quality sections should be produced by the members of the Review Panel as appropriate to the areas of investigation that they have been allocated. These sections must include confirmation that the provision, student attainment and progression and quality management are satisfactory, where appropriate, or a detailed account of any aspects which are not satisfactory. This section should also include explicit reference to collaborative provisions and any partnership reviews which have been undertaken since the previous Periodic Review.

The Recommendations section must include an advisory recommendation to the University as to whether the programmes under Review be allowed to continue running for the following six-year period. It should also include a summary of any issues which it is suggested should be addressed. Where the Periodic Review includes consideration of new programme proposal(s), the Recommendations section should also include an advisory recommendation to the University as to whether the proposed programme(s) be approved to run for an initial six-year period (or as appropriate) and any conditions to that approval.

The final Report, as approved by the University Board for Teaching and Learning, will be published on the CQSD website. It will also be disseminated by the subject provider to students, e.g. via Student-Staff Liaison Committee. The authors of the Report should ensure the accessibility of its content.

Periodic Review of X

Introduction

- 1 An internal review of programmes in [name of subject area] was held on [dates]. The members of the Panel were:
 - [names of panel members]
- 2 The Panel met the following:

- *[name(s) of Board(s) of Studies, DTLs, programme directors, etc.]*
- 3 The Panel met students who represented the following degree programmes:
- *[titles of degree programmes reviewed]*

General observations

4 xx

Academic standards of the programmes

Committee structures

5 xx

Programme design

6 xx

Assessment and feedback

7 xx

Quality of learning opportunities offered by the programmes

Teaching and learning

8 xx

Student admission, retention, progression and attainment

9 xx

Learning environment and student support

10 xx

Employability

11 xx

Enhancement of quality and academic provision

12 xx

Main characteristics of the programmes under review

- 13 [A statement of the Review Panel's overview of the programmes reviewed in relation to their content and academic approach, and any notable strengths of these programmes]

Conclusions on innovation and good practice

- 14 [A statement on any current aspects of the programmes reviewed which the Review Panel feels are particularly innovative or which represent good practice]

Conclusions on quality and standards

- 15 [A statement on the Review Panel's conclusions on whether:
- intended learning outcomes of the programmes are being obtained by students;
 - quality and standards are being achieved; and
 - the programme specifications are appropriate]

Conclusions on new degree programme proposals [where appropriate]

- 16 [A statement providing general comments on any proposal(s) for new degree programmes considered by the Periodic Review panel. Note that the recommendations to the University as to whether the proposal(s) be approved should be included in the Recommendations section]

Recommendations

- 17 [recommendation of the Panel to the University as to whether the programmes reviewed should be re-approved]
- 18 [The report should include definitions of the Panel's recommendations, as follows: 'The report will categorise any issues as follows, in order of priority:
- Those areas where the Review Team believes it is **necessary** for action to be taken urgently to safeguard the standard of provision;
 - Those areas where it is **advisable** that the issues be addressed as soon as possible.
 - Those areas where it is **desirable** that the issue be addressed over a longer time span.']
- 19 [following on from the definitions, any issues which the Panel suggests should be addressed, divided into those the panel considers must be addressed as a condition of re-approval and those which should be considered.]
- 20 [recommendation of the Panel to the University as to whether any proposal(s) for new degree programmes should be approved, along with any issues to be resolved]

Annex 11 (Requirements for the Periodic Review of programmes)

Standard template for the Response to the Report of the Periodic Review

Guidance notes

The following is the University's standard template for the writing of the Response to the Report of the Periodic Review. The Subject Provider will be expected to produce a Response and Action Plan within four working weeks of receiving the Report of the Periodic Review.

The Response should address the Report's recommendations point by point. Subject Providers are asked to approach recommendations constructively, and to include sufficient detail to satisfy the Sub-Committee on Delivery and Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (DELT) that the recommendations are being properly considered and addressed. The Action Plan should be presented in a table, as outlined below, and clearly specify: the Periodic Review Report recommendation (including the level of recommendation - 'necessary'/'advisable'/'desirable' - and whether it is for the Department/School/University to address); the action(s) proposed; the target date; the designated person(s); and what progress has been made so far. Subject Providers may wish to attach particularly relevant additional documentation to their Response as appendices.

Any University-level recommendations should be included in the first column of the Action Plan; DELT will be responsible for identifying how these will be taken forwards.

The Response and Action Plan should be submitted to DELT, alongside the Periodic Review Report. DELT will then approve, as appropriate, the Report, Response and Action Plan and refer them onwards to the University Programmes Board and the University Board for Teaching and Learning.

This Response will be superseded one year later by the Subject Provider's 'One-Year Follow-Up' report (see Annex 12).

Response to the Report of the Periodic Review

Introduction

- 1 An internal review of programmes in *[name of subject area]* was held on *[dates]*.
- 2 The School of [X] has received and approved the Report of the Periodic Review. In response to the recommendations made, the School has produced an Action Plan for submission to the Sub-Committee on the Delivery and Enhancement of Learning and Teaching in the *[name of Term]* Term *[year]*.
- 3 *[The School may wish to include a summary account of the Periodic Review process or include further commentary here.]*

Response

- 4 *[The School should respond to the recommendations of the Periodic Review Report here.]*

Proposed Actions

- 5 The attached table provides details of the action(s) proposed; the target date; the designated person(s); and, where applicable, indicates what progress has been made so far.

Periodic Review Report Recommendation (please include the numbering of recommendations, the level of recommendations – ‘necessary’/ ‘advisable’/ ‘desirable’, and whether the recommendations are for the Subject Provider/University to address)	Action(s) proposed	Target date	Designated person (s)	Progress on action(s) proposed
Necessary recommendations for the School/Department				
e.g. (a) “To review the School’s moderation procedures and ensure compliance with University policy in this area”	SDTL to review the moderation procedures currently in operation across the School and identify any changes required to ensure compliance with University policy	Review of moderation procedures to be undertaken by 31 January 2017. Any necessary changes to be implemented with immediate effect.	SDTL	The SDTL has begun to review moderation procedures in conjunction with Programme Directors.
Advisable recommendations for the School/Department				
Desirable recommendations for the School/Department				
Recommendations for the University				

Periodic Review of Programmes

--	--	--	--	--

Annex 12 (Requirements for the Periodic Review of programmes)

Standard template for Periodic Review ‘one-year follow-up’ reports

Guidance notes

The following is the University’s standard template for the writing of a Periodic Review ‘One-Year Follow-up’ Report. One year after a Periodic Review Report is approved by the University Board for Teaching and Learning (UBTL), the Subject Provider is required to report to the Sub-Committee on Delivery and Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (DELT), detailing and evaluating the actions it has taken to address the issues raised in the Periodic Review Report.

All sections of the template should be completed as part of the Report. Subject Providers should indicate the recommendations in the Periodic Review Report (including the level of each recommendation – ‘necessary’/ ‘advisable’/ ‘desirable’ - and whether it is for the Subject Provider/University to address) and the consequent actions proposed in their initial Action Plan, and then provide details and an evaluation of their progress in implementing these actions. It is important that the University is able to identify actions, rather than intentions.

Subject Providers are asked to approach recommendations constructively. They should include sufficient detail in their reports to satisfy DELT that the recommendations have been properly addressed. Where work to address one or more recommendations is still ongoing, the Subject Provider should provide a clear timeframe for completion of any outstanding actions. Subject Providers may wish to attach particularly relevant additional documentation to their Periodic Review ‘One-Year Follow-up’ Report as appendices.

Since DELT is responsible for identifying how any University-level recommendations will be taken forwards and for monitoring progress against any University-level recommendations, Subject Providers should liaise with the Secretary to DELT in order to include an update against any University-level recommendations in their One-Year Follow-Up Report.

The One-Year Follow-Up Report should be submitted to the relevant Teaching and Learning Dean for comment, and a final version should normally be received by the relevant School Board for Teaching and Learning prior to its submission to DELT for approval.

An exemplar ‘One-Year Follow-Up’ Report is available on request from the Centre for Quality Support and Development.

One-Year Follow-up Report on the Periodic Review of X

Introduction

- 1 An internal review of programmes in *[name of subject area]* was held on *[dates]*. A Report of the Periodic Review and consequent Action Plan was submitted to the Sub-Committee on the Delivery and Enhancement of Learning and Teaching in the *[name of Term]* Term *[year]*.

Progress on proposed Actions

- 2 The attached table provides details and evaluation of progress in relation to the actions proposed in the Action Plan to the Periodic Review Report:

Periodic Review Report Recommendation (please include the numbering of recommendations, the level of recommendations – ‘necessary’/ ‘advisable’/ ‘desirable’, and whether the recommendations are for the Subject Provider/University to address)	Action(s) proposed	Target date	Designated person (s)	Progress on action(s) proposed
Necessary recommendations for the School/Department				
e.g. (a) “To review the School’s moderation procedures and ensure compliance with University policy in this area”	SDTL to review the moderation procedures currently in operation across the School and identify any changes required to ensure compliance with University policy	Review of moderation procedures to be undertaken by 31 January 2017. Any necessary changes to be implemented with immediate effect.	SDTL	A review of moderation procedures was completed by mid-January 2017. All module convenors and other teaching staff were reminded of University policy in relation to moderation and relevant guidance has been incorporated in the School’s Teaching Handbook.
Advisable recommendations for the School/Department				
Desirable recommendations for the School/Department				

Recommendations for the University				

Good Practice

3 [Please comment on any actions taken to disseminate good practice identified].