CODE OF PRACTICE FOR ANNUAL PROGRAMME REVIEW AND PERIODIC REVIEW

Quality Assurance Document Control		
Document owner:	**Responsible office:** Education Services	**Approved by:** CQSC
Version: 4	**Last review date:** Summer 2023	**Approved date:** 28/09/2023
	Effective from date: Immediate	**Superseded version:** 3
Location of master document: https://le.ac.uk/policies/codes-practice		

Quality Assurance Version Control Log			
Version	**Author/reviewer**	**Date**	**Highlighted updates/changes**
0	Quality Office	July 2018	Quality assurance document and version controls added
1	Quality Office	August 2018	References revised to reflect new academic governance structure
2	Education Services	August 2021	Updated to reflect revised Annual Programme Review process, previously approved by Education Committee
3	Education Services	September 2022	Updated to reflect revised Periodic Development Review process, previously approved by Education Committee, with the addition of an out-of-cycle Development Review process
4	Education Services	September 2023	Updated to reflect revised Periodic Development Review process, previously approved by Education Committee

Purpose

1. This Code of Practice sets out the University's requirements for Annual Programme Review and Periodic Development and Enhancement Review. Its purpose is to ensure that:
   - The University has in place annual and periodic processes to monitor the quality and standards of the programmes and awards it offers, ensuring their continued currency and the relevance of learning opportunities, and to identify areas for development, enhancement, and the dissemination of good practice;
   - The University meets the ongoing conditions of registration with the Office for Students, particularly conditions B1 to B5;
   - The Annual Programme Review process provides an opportunity for a regular review of the on-going learning and teaching provision at school level;
   - The Periodic Development and Enhancement Review process provides an opportunity for a more detailed review of one or more aspects of the education

management and standards of academic provision across a school and identification of areas for development and enhancement;

- The University meets the recommendation of the QAA Quality Code for Higher Education (published November 2018) that:
  - The provider reviews its core practices for quality regularly and uses the outcomes to drive improvement and enhancement. In practice, this means that providers regularly review and enhance their provision, reflecting on a range of data sets as they relate to quality to ensure courses and wider services remain fit for purpose and to take account of changing circumstances, demands and pedagogical developments.

Responsibilities

2. Senate, as the University's academic authority, has overriding responsibility for ensuring and enhancing academic standards and learning opportunities through the operation of annual and periodic review processes. Some aspects of this responsibility are delegated as follows:
   - The Education Committee has delegated power to approve significant amendments to this Code of Practice, and receives an annual report on the operation of the process from the Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee;
   - The Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee has delegated power to oversee the development and implementation of this Code of Practice and, in particular, to convene Periodic Development and Enhancement Review and Education Quality Review panels;
   - College Education Committees have delegated powers to implement the requirements of this Code with respect to the Annual Programme Review.
3. Senate maintains oversight of these activities through reports from the Education Committee, through the Annual Academic Assurance report which is considered by Senate and recommended to Council.

Section A

Annual Programme Review

Introduction

1. Annual Programme Review (APR) is a reflective and evaluative quality assurance and quality enhancement process, supplying the opportunity to improve the quality of student learning opportunities and the learning and teaching experience as a whole. It also supplies an opportunity to show student successes and disseminate good practice.

2. The process of APR:
    a. Provides an opportunity for reviewing and improving the quality of the student learning and teaching experience and assuring academic standards and quality;
    b. Strengthens school processes of annual review and monitoring;
    c. Includes a specific focus on enhancement;
    d. Plays a central role in informing the additional review process;
    e. Reports PSRB monitoring and accreditation activities that occur alongside APR;
    f. Clarifies the role played by the College Education Committees in assuring standards and the quality of learning opportunities of programmes offered by schools within the College;
    g. Incorporates National Student Survey (NSS) Action Planning.

3. The output of APR should be school level reflection on the operation and student experience across programmes from the last academic year, identification of areas of good practice and of concern, and the development of an action plan to address the latter.

4. Annual Programme Review builds upon processes that take place at School level for the monitoring and evaluation of programmes and student outcomes. These include the operation of the module review process, the consideration of student feedback via LUMES, engagement with Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) and consideration of external feedback mechanisms such as the National Student Survey.

5. Annual Programme Review informs the Periodic Development and Enhancement Review process.

6. College Education Committees play a key role in the management of APR allowing them to assure standards and the quality of learning opportunities of programmes offered by departments within the College, as well as facilitating the dissemination of good practice.

Annual Programme Review Principles

Responsibilities

7. Heads of School are responsible for ensuring that Annual Programme Review is completed for all taught, award bearing programmes within their School and submitted for consideration within the timelines that shall be set out each year. This responsibility may be delegated to the Director of Education for the School.

8. Education Services are responsible for ensuring that the template and guidance are provided to Schools and updated each year. The Service will also be responsible for monitoring completion rates of APR and following up with Schools to provide support where required. Education Services are also responsible for ensuring that the outcomes of APR are reported through the relevant governance structures.

9. The College Education Committee is responsible for considering APR returns from each School and reporting on outcomes to the Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee. CECs are also responsible for monitoring actions arising from APR where these are identified.

10. Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee is responsible for University level consideration of APR outcomes, for reporting to the Education Committee and Senate, and for recommending any actions required at University level to those bodies.

Operating Principles

11. Annual Programme Review is a reflective process. It is undertaken following the completion of the academic year, and reviews the delivery of programmes and the student experience in the year that has just finished. For undergraduate programmes the review for the previous year should be completed and submitted in the Autumn term of the subsequent academic year. For taught postgraduate programmes submission takes place in the Spring term of the following academic year.

12. Annual Programme Review utilises a standard template that is provided by Education Services in the Division of Student and Academic Services. The template will, where possible, be pre-populated with relevant data relating to the academic year under review. Where data is not pre-populated, Schools will be provided with a range of data sources to consider in order to complete the APR process.

13. The APR forms are designed to encourage reflection on specific issues and the production of a clear action plan. Schools are not required to produce an extensive narrative.

Identification of APRs for completion

14. Schools are responsible for identifying the number of APRs to be completed to ensure appropriate monitoring of the range of programmes across its provision, subject to the overall requirement that every award bearing taught programme must be identified and considered within an APR every year. Schools should identify clusters of programmes for which separate APR reports will be submitted to College Education Committees for approval in each academic year.

15. Undergraduate and PGT APRs should be completed separately, even if there is some overlap in teaching. This is due to the different characteristics of the student population and the data available.

16. As part of the process for identifying clusters for the APR process departments are required to identify APRs for joint provision. Where there is sufficient overlap a single APR may be produced if there are joint programmes in cognate disciplines. Where joint programmes span two departments, both must contribute to the production of the APR report.

17. Where departments offer higher education provision with other partners a separate APR report should be produced for arrangements which involve module delivery, validation, dual or joint awards. For definitions of these forms of collaboration please see the Code of Practice on Managing Higher Education Provision with Others.

18. For other types of collaborative provision, such as progression or articulation agreements, Educational Delivery Partners for distance-learning programmes, placement or student exchange partners a commentary can be provided in the relevant section of the appropriate School's APR.

Provision of data for the APR

19. The APR template requires schools to reflect and comment upon a range of data sources relating to student experience and outcomes. Most sources are drawn from central records but in some instances Schools may need to use local data such as the outputs of the module review process.

20. The various data sources that Schools will need to use are set out in the APR template (Appendix 1) and a list of data sources (Appendix 2). In summary these are:
    - NSS outcomes
    - Recruitment data
    - External Examiners' reports
    - LUMES
    - Progression, continuation and degree classifications
    - Engagement Data
    - Graduate Outcomes
    - PSRB and other accreditation data

Completion of the APR report

21. The APR template requires Schools to reflect on the following broad areas, seeking to identify areas of good practice and concern, and produce an action plan to address the issues identified. The APR requires Schools to focus on the following areas:

    Overall Programme Summary Review

    Schools should produce a concise commentary concentrating on any trends requiring changes/proposals at a programme level arising from module reviews. This section should also comment on the actions from the previous APR.

    Teaching and Learning

    Schools should consider teaching and learning development, engagement in peer enhancement, alignment of teaching and assessment to programme ILOs and relevant benchmarks.

    Assessment and Feedback

    Schools should consider how the performance of students in assessments has met the learning outcomes of the programme(s), how marking criteria are used in the programmes, processes to ensure consistency in the application of marking, and procedures for the timely provision of feedback to students and support for students to act on feedback received.

    Support, Community, Voice and Student Feedback

    Schools should consider feedback arising from Student-Staff Consultation Committees, Internal Questionnaires, Module Reviews, NSS, PTES, and any other formal or informal mechanisms used. Consider how student feedback has been acted upon.

Progression and Awarding

Schools should consider student progression and degree classifications in comparison with previous years.

Skills and Employability

Schools should consider employability data and engagement with the Career Development Service (including Employability Partnership Agreements, the Leicester Award and embedding significant experience into a module).

Organisation and Learning Resources

Schools should consider use of the digital learning environment and associated issues relating to their design and contribution to the overall student learning experience.

External Evaluations and PSRBs

Schools should identify key points arising from the reports from External Examiner reports and PSRB accreditation and annual monitoring activities, including action points and areas of good practice. Please note all accreditations, removal of accreditations (intentional or otherwise), and re-accreditation.

22. Schools are required to comment specifically upon any differentials in outcomes, experience or other measures that exist between different demographic groups including gender, ethnicity, disclosed disability and mature students.
23. Schools should ensure that a full range of staff have the opportunity to contribute to the drafting of the APR.
24. The APR document focusses reflection and clear actions in response to issues identified. Reports should be concise and focussed on specific areas of good practice or concern. These should be articulated in the action plan along with those responsible for undertaking the action and the timescale for the action. The report should highlight where support from across other areas of the College or University are required to address issues identified.

Process for Approving Annual Programme Review Reports

25. Each APR report should be considered at School level by the School Education Committee or equivalent. At this point the final version should be approved by the Head of School and Director of Education and submitted to the College Education Committee.
26. The APR for undergraduate programmes will be considered by the College Education Committee in the Autumn term of each academic year. The APR for taught postgraduate programmes will be considered in the Spring term.
27. Following the consideration and approval of reports a summary report will be produced for each College which will inform an annual report to the Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee and from there a single summary will be submitted to the Education Committee and reported to Senate.

Monitoring and further actions

28. College Education Committees will identify any issues raised through APR which require monitoring at College level and will receive updates on the progress of these updates through the academic year. The Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee may also seek reports on the progress of items requiring oversight at University level.

29. Schools are required to comment upon the progress against their previous APR action plan in the subsequent year's APR process.

30. The Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee may use evidence gathered through the APR process to identify where a school would benefit from closer analysis and support via either a Periodic Development and Enhancement Review, or an out-of-cycle Development and Enhancement Review, the process for which is set out in Sections B and C.

Section B

Periodic Development and Enhancement Review

Introduction

1. Periodic development and enhancement reviews are an important means by which the University satisfies itself that departments, Schools, and collaborative partners are fulfilling their requirements for the maintenance of academic standards and teaching quality. The reviews are informed by the Annual Programme Review process and other regular reviews of academic provision undertaken by departments.

2. The University's aim is that the process should be a positive and beneficial experience which, in opening up practices to wider scrutiny, should stimulate discussion and comparison, and encourage standardisation in those areas where the University might be expected to operate consistent and coherent policies.

3. The process allows for both broad reviews of academic provision and targeted interventions out of the normal review cycle.

4. Reviews will be based upon evidence and focus on particular themes or areas where enhancement opportunities have been identified, and the process will emphasise engagement with Schools regarding the specific issues identified over a 4-6 week period in which the Review is taking place.

5. The PDER process focuses upon educational provision within the School and the processes which underpin this. The process does not therefore incorporate consideration of financial or commercial viability issues, research activity and management or wider School resourcing, although PDER panels make recommendations in this regard where the issue in question relates directly to education.

6. The promulgation of good practice and identification of areas where University procedures might be developed or enhanced is considered to be another important feature of the process.

7. Periodic development and enhancement reviews are also the means by which the University meets the recommendation of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education that an institution should monitor and evaluate the continuing validity and relevance of its programmes of study.

Periodic Development and Enhancement Review Processes

8. The Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee undertakes periodic development and enhancement reviews of academic departments on a rolling six-year programme through the establishment of PDE Review Panels.

9. The schedule of reviews will be agreed by the beginning of each academic year. A School due for review will be given at least one term's notice of the intended review process.

10. A schedule of review meetings will be agreed in advance between the Review Secretary and the Head of the relevant School. Arrangements for the production of the required documentation and the format and focus of the meetings will also be agreed. The Review Secretary will be a member of staff of the Education Quality Enhancement and Development Team.

11. Support for the review process is provided by the Review Secretary and guidance is published to provide the information required for departments to undertake the process.

12. The Review process will incorporate:

- The drafting by the School of a Self-Evaluation Document (SED) and the preparation of a range of documentation with support from EQED;
- Review by the Panel of documentary evidence to confirm the standard of the awards within the School, the management of learning opportunities for students, the standard and quality of assessments and feedback, and the quality of the public information overseen by the School;
- A series of meetings over a 4-6 week period in the term in which the Review takes place, where members of the Review Panel will meet with the Head of School and a range of staff and students drawn from across the School to explore various issues.
- These meetings will focus on issues identified within the SED. Additional concerns may be raised in the initial meeting by the Review Secretary and the Head of School.
- It is suggested that these meetings each focus on a thematic strand of the type below, where appropriate:
    o Teaching and Learning
    o Assessment and Feedback
    o Student Outcomes and Support
    o Skills and Employability
- It is suggested that there is a visit by panel members to observe a teaching session within the School, where issues are prompted by the Self-Evaluation Document, Teaching Quality metrics, or other measures including the Peer Observation of Teaching;
- Students should be included in the majority of Review meetings.

13. During the review the Panel will assess departmental arrangements against best practice defined nationally through the UK Quality Code and at institutional level through Senate Regulations, Codes of Practice, and other procedural documents approved by Senate.

Composition of Review Panels

14. All Periodic Development and Enhancement Reviews will be conducted by a Panel which will undertake the review on behalf of the Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee, the membership of which comprises:
    - A Chair approved by the Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee
    - An External Reviewer
    - The Dean of Education of the College in which the School is located or their nominee
    - An academic member of the Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee, or College Education Committee, or nominated representative
    - A lay member of Council
    - A member of the Careers and Employability Team
    - A member of the Students' Union Sabbatical Team
    - A member of EQED will act as Secretary to the Review Panel

15. All panel members, including student members, will receive briefing and guidance on their roles.

Nomination of External Reviewers

16. The Head of the School under review will be asked to nominate three potential external reviewers to serve on the Review Panel.

17. Nominations should be made on the standard form (included in the Guidance for Schools). Nominations will be reviewed by the Chair of the Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee who will determine whether one of those nominated should be approved.

18. An invitation to serve as an external reviewer will be sent by the Review Secretary on behalf of the Chair of the Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee.

19. The Secretary to the Review Panel will be responsible for making all arrangements with the external reviewer.

20. The reviewer will be a senior member of academic staff of another University with appropriate disciplinary knowledge and experience. They must have knowledge of the recommendations of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

21. Where appropriate, a reviewer from industry, commerce, or the public sector may be selected, in addition to the external academic reviewer. Current and recent (i.e. within the last five years) external examiners may not serve in this capacity. More than one external reviewer may be appointed where this is necessary to cover the full range of a department's activities.

22. The following criteria should be considered in the nomination of an external reviewer:
    - Knowledge and understanding of the UK sector agreed reference points for the maintenance of academic standards, quality assurance, and enhancement opportunities;
    - Competence and experience in the fields covered by the School under review;
    - An understanding and awareness of current developments in the design and delivery of curricula and of designing and operating assessment procedures;
    - Competence and experience relating to the enhancement of the student learning experience;
    - Fluency in English, and where programmes are delivered and assessed in languages other than English, fluency in the relevant language(s).

23. External reviewers shall not be nominated if they are:
    - A member of the University's Council or of the governing body of a partner institution, or a current employee of the University or one of its collaborative partners;
    - Anyone with a close professional, contractual or personal relationship with a member of staff or student involved with the School;
    - Anyone required to assess colleagues who are recruited as students to the School;
    - Anyone who is, or knows they will be, in a position to influence significantly the future of students within the School;
    - Anyone significantly involved in recent or current substantive collaborative research activities with a member of staff within the School;
    - Former staff or students of the institution unless a period of five years has elapsed and all students taught by or with the External Reviewer have completed their programme(s);

    External reviewers also cannot be appointed if there is:

    - A reciprocal arrangement involving cognate programmes at another institution;
    - An External Examiner for the School by a colleague from the External Reviewer's home department and institution.

24. External reviewers will be asked to focus specifically on the curriculum content and the quality and standards of a School's provision, to provide assurance to the University that the programmes offered continue to meet threshold standards for the discipline.

Preparation of Review Documentation

25. The Secretary to the Review Panel will liaise with the Head of School and their nominated representatives to agree a schedule for the production of documentation relating to the review.
26. With the exception of the Self-Evaluation Document, it should not be necessary to produce new documentation for the review and departments are encouraged to use existing documentation.
27. EQED and other sections of Education Services will assist with the identification of certain documentation which is available at University level, for example, data from the Student Records System (SITS).
28. A list of the typical documentation required for a review is given in the Guidance for Schools.
29. Documentation should be provided by one of the following means:
    - Via a secure OneDrive folder.
    - Via Blackboard site to which access can be arranged for all panel members.

Self-Evaluation Document (SED)

30. One of the main aims of the Periodic Development and Enhancement Review process is for the School under review to undertake an evaluation of, and reflect upon, the provision and processes under review. To this end, Schools are required to produce a Self-Evaluation Document (SED).
31. Through the preparation of the Self-Evaluation Document (SED), the School is given the opportunity to explore and identify areas for possible strategic growth and development of the curriculum. This includes ways of improving its delivery with a view to enhancing the quality of the student experience and educational opportunities offered while assuring the standards of awards.
32. The Panel will review the SED and use it to identify areas it wishes to explore in detail with particular staff or students at review meetings.

Identification of Themes for Review

33. Upon receipt of the SED, the Review Secretary shall meet with the Head of School and the Chair of the Review Panel to identify areas it wishes to explore in detail.
34. Areas identified should be grouped under the following thematic strands. Inclusivity and accessibility should be embedded in each of the discussions as appropriate:
    a. Teaching and Learning – areas of focus may include pedagogical methods, the student learning environment, or building community amongst students;
    b. Assessment and Feedback – areas of focus may include assessment scaffolding, diversity and suitability of assessment types across programmes, the use rubrics or marking criteria, or opportunities for enhancement of feedback provided to students;
    c. Student Outcomes and Support – areas of focus may include demographic achievement gaps, student conversion or completion rates across programmes, the student learning environment, links to student support services, personal tutors, or other areas of support;
    d. Skills and Employability – areas of focus may include employment rates post-completion, the use of skills logs across programmes, and opportunities to embed employability skills across the programmes.

35. The Review Secretary and Head of School should then identify appropriate students and staff to be nominated to attend meetings with the Review Panel.

36. A schedule of meetings should be produced by the Review Secretary and circulated to nominated staff and students, as well as Panel members, at least two weeks in advance of the meetings.

Nomination of staff and students to attend meetings with the Review Panel

37. The Review Panel will meet with a range of staff and students drawn from across the School. The precise composition and format of the review meetings will be determined following review of the SED at the initial meeting between the Review Secretary and the Head of School.

38. Typically, in advance of these meetings, the Head of School will be asked to nominate the following members of staff and students:
    - Academic staff with extensive current experience of undergraduate and postgraduate teaching*;
    - Academic staff responsible for supervising and supporting research students*;
    - Academic staff at an early-career stage with teaching responsibility;
    - A group of undergraduate and postgraduate students at different stages of their studies, drawn from across the School's programmes. Each year cohort should be represented. If the department offers any joint programmes, these should also be represented;
    - Doctoral students at different stages of their research;
    - If distance learning programmes are offered, a range of distance learning students (where attendance is not possible feedback will be sought via other means, including questionnaires, organised by the Review Secretary).

    *Within these categories, the Panel would expect to interview the Director of Education for the School (or equivalent), the Director of Taught Postgraduate provision (or equivalent), the Director of Distance Learning (if appropriate), and the Postgraduate Research Tutor (or equivalent).

39. It is not necessary for all members of staff and students to be present at all review meetings. The Review Secretary and Review Chair will decide which members of staff and students are best suited to attend which meetings. Students must be involved in a majority of the review meetings. Student opinions are essential to the review process.

The Review Process

40. The Review Secretary and the Head of School will arrange a schedule of meetings to take place over an appropriate period. This will typically be over the course of 4-6 weeks in order to ensure sufficient currency within the process. The minimum number of meetings should be three, but Schools are encouraged to use this time fully to explore any issues facing the School or opportunities for enhancement.

41. This schedule should be circulated to all members of the Review Panel at the start of the Review Process.

42. In addition to the Review meetings, the Review Panel should observe a teaching session where prompted by issues outlined in the Self-Evaluation Document or identified in the teaching quality metrics or other review mechanisms.

43. Students must be involved in the majority of the meetings. Student opinions are essential to the review process.

Feedback and Reporting

44. At the end of the Review Process the Chair and Secretary will provide feedback to the School on key issues which have arisen through the review. This will include likely areas for commendation, possible enhancements and significant risks requiring action on the part of the School, College, or University.

45. A written summary of these conclusions will be agreed by the Chair and circulated to the School within a week of the end of the Review Process. The full report will be agreed by all members of the Panel and issued to the School within 6 weeks. If required, the report can be supplemented by a meeting between the Chair of the Review Panel, Secretary and Head of School.

Departmental Response

46. The PDER report should be considered by the College Education Committee (or equivalent) and the School Education Committee. It is also good practice for the School to share the report and, where appropriate, the departmental response with their students via the Student/Staff Committee.

47. The School will be required to provide an initial response to the Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee addressing any issues raised in the report, normally within two months of its publication.

48. One year after the publication of the report the School will be required to provide a full report to the Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee detailing the actions taken in response to the review.

49. An annual report of the operation of the PDER process will be submitted to the Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee, with a summary submitted to the Education Committee and Senate.

Section C

Out-of-Cycle Education Quality Review

Introduction

1. Education Quality Reviews can also occur out of the periodic cycle, where issues or risks to provision are identified.
2. Identification of areas where the School is at-risk of falling outside normal University procedures, or where provision is at-risk of falling below minimum standards can be done through one of three means:
   a. Self-identification by the School through the Annual Programme Review process of a known issue where the School requests a review by the University to assist in identifying solutions;
   b. Falling below threshold standards on as identified through the Teaching Quality Metrics.
   c. Identification by Education Services of a risk or issue through normal review processes, including Annual Programme Review, or through associated processes including appeals, student complaints, or student survey responses.
3. Out-of-cycle reviews are informed by Annual Programme Review reports and other regular reviews of academic provision undertaken by departments.
4. Out-of-cycle reviews are an additional means by which the University meets the recommendation of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education that an institution should monitor and evaluate the continuing validity and relevance of its programmes of study.

Out-of-Cycle Education Quality Review Process

5. The Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee undertakes out-of-cycle Education Quality Reviews of academic schools through the establishment of Education Quality Review Panels.
6. These Panels will be established after areas of risk are identified as noted in point 2 above.
7. An Education Quality Review can be triggered at any meeting of the CQSC or exceptionally by the Chair of CQSC where required. A School due for review will be given notification that there is a potential for review as soon as possible, and ideally at least one month in advance of the review being triggered.
8. Once approved by CQSC, a Review Secretary will be assigned to project-manage the review process. The Review Secretary will be a member of staff of the Education Quality and Enhancement Development team.
9. Arrangements for the production of the required documentation and the focus of the review will be agreed between the Review Secretary and the Head of the relevant School.
10. Support for the review process is provided by the Review Secretary and guidance is published to provide the information required for departments to undertake the process.
11. The Review will focus solely on the area identified as being at-risk, taking into account related processes or procedures if necessary. Reviews will typically fall into one of the following broad thematic areas, but may incorporate more than one where the evidence indicates wider support needs:
    a. Teaching and Learning
    b. Assessment and Feedback
    c. Student Outcomes and Support
    d. Skills and Employability

12. The Review will incorporate:
    - The drafting by the School of a themed Self-Evaluation Document (SED) and the preparation of a range of documentation with support from EQED;
    - A series of review meetings where the Review Panel will meet the Head of School and a range of staff and students drawn from across the School to explore the issue(s) identified;
    - Review by the Panel of documentary evidence following the meetings to propose solutions and confirm a plan of action by the School.
13. The Review Panel shall be composed as identified in Section B, point 14 above.
14. The nomination of staff and students to attend meetings with the Review Panel shall be composed as identified in Section B, point 39 above.

Preparation of Review Documentation

15. The Secretary to the Review Panel will liaise with the Head of School and their nominated representatives to agree a schedule for the production of documentation relating to the review.
16. With the exception of the themed Self-Evaluation Document, it should not be necessary to produce new documentation for the review and Schools are encouraged to use existing documentation. It is recognised, however, that due to the focused nature of the out-of-cycle review process there may be a requirement to provide additional data or narrative in some areas.
17. EQED and other sections of Student and Academic Services will assist with the identification of certain documentation which is available at University level, for example, data from the Student Records System (SITS).
18. A list of the typical documentation required for a review is given in the Guidance for Schools.
19. Documentation should be provided by one of the following means:
    - Via a secure OneDrive folder;
    - Via a Blackboard site to which access can be arranged for all Panel members.

Themed Self-Evaluation Document (SED)

20. One of the main aims of the Education Quality Review process is for the School under review to undertake an evaluation of, and reflect upon, the provision and processes under review. To this end, departments are required to produce a themed Self-Evaluation Document (SED). Advice on the production of this SED is provided to departments in the Guidance for Schools.
21. Through the preparation of the themed Self-Evaluation Document (SED), the School is given the opportunity to explore the issue under review and identify areas for possible growth, development, or enhancement.
22. The SED should conclude with a summary of the plan of action that the School will follow to address the issue under review for the Panel to consider.
23. The Panel will review the SED and use it to identify areas it wishes to explore in detail with particular staff or students at review meetings.

Schedule for the Review Process

24. The Review Secretary and the Head of School will arrange a schedule of meetings to take place over a 4 week period. There is no minimum number of meetings, but it is expected that Schools will use this time to fully explore the issue(s) identified.

25. This schedule should be circulated to all members of the Review Panel at the start of the Review Process.
26. Students must be involved in the majority of the meetings. Student opinions are essential to the review process.

Feedback and Reporting

27. At the end of the Review Process the Chair and Secretary will provide feedback to the School through the School Education Committee on key issues which have arisen through the review. This will include likely areas for commendation, consideration and action.
28. A written summary of these conclusions will be agreed by the Chair and circulated to the School within a week of the end of the Review Process. The full report will be agreed by all members of the Panel and issued to the School within 3 weeks. If required, the report can be supplemented by a meeting between the Chair of the Review Panel, Secretary and Head of School. This report will include a plan for actions to be completed by the School throughout the following academic year.

Departmental Response

29. The out-of-cycle EQR report should be considered by the Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee. It is also good practice for the School to share the report with the staff of the School and, where appropriate, the departmental response with their students via the Student/Staff Committee.
30. The School will be required to provide an initial response to the Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee addressing any issues raised in the report, normally within one month of its publication.
31. The School will be required to provide a full report to the Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee detailing the actions taken in response to the review three months following the Review, six months following the review, and one year following the review.
32. An annual report detailing any out-of-cycle reviews that took place within that academic year will be submitted to the Curriculum and Quality Sub-Committee, with a summary submitted to the Education Committee.