



## Periodic Review Procedure

<b>Document Control Box</b>	
<b>Document title</b> (include version number if amended within same year as approved)	<b>Periodic Review Procedure</b>
<b>Reference Number</b>	056/21
<b>Approval category (Please indicate)</b>	
Governance/Governor	X
MPRIG Executive/Other Committee (insert name)	
Senior Staff (insert name)	
<b>Date document approved</b>	18/11/21
<b>Supersedes</b> (insert previous title and/or version date)	
<b>Date document last reviewed and/or updated</b>	
<b>Date next due for review</b>	Feb 2025
<b>Related statutes or regulations</b>	
<b>Related policies/procedures/guidance/forms</b>	Validation and Revalidation Procedure
<b>Staff member responsible for update</b>	Academic Director

### Amendment History

Version	Revision Summary	Date Approved	Author



## Periodic Review Procedure

### Contents

Introduction.....	3
Principles.....	3
Aims .....	4
Scope .....	4
Responsibilities.....	4
Relationship with Annual Programme Review, Continuous Monitoring and Financial Viability Review .....	5
Relationship with Professional, Regulatory or Statutory Bodies .....	6
Relationship with re-validation .....	6
Procedure.....	7
Appendix 1: Role of Panel Members.....	13
Appendix 2: Guidance on producing a Self-Evaluation Document .....	15
Appendix 3: Indicative agenda for the review meeting .....	21
Appendix 4: Questions for meeting with Students.....	22
Appendix 5: Areas for scrutiny and questions for meetings with Staff .....	25
Appendix 6: Report Template .....	30

## **Introduction**

1. Periodic Review is intended to provide an opportunity for reflection on the quality, standards and enhancement of the College's academic provision over a period of time. Periodic Review will enable the College to reflect on a programme's strengths and areas for improvement in order to improve the experience of the students. It is developmental and based on a dialogue between peers. It should be forward-looking but also take account of the current situation and any relevant previous issues.
2. Periodic Review takes place on a six-yearly cycle. It enables the College to verify over a particular timeframe, academic standards, the quality of the student learning experience, the continuing relevance of programmes to both internal/external needs, alignment with external reference points, as well as the identification of good practice and innovation.
3. The review will be based on a Self-Evaluation Document (SED) and supporting evidence produced by the Department.
4. This policy has been written in accordance with the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

## **Principles**

5. The principles of Periodic Review are that it will:
  - a) Critically review the academic portfolio of a department or programme area and the suite of awards within that area;
  - b) Ensure there is an enhanced student experience;
  - c) Be a peer review process; drawing on the expertise of internal colleagues and external experts;
  - d) Promote constructive and challenging discussion of matters related to academic provision;
  - e) Have significant staff and student input;
  - f) Assess the effectiveness of the departments'/programmes' implementation of quality management processes in reflecting on and evaluating the performance of the department/programme area (e.g. Annual Programme Review and Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies Reviews);
  - g) Be an evidence-based process and will draw on a wide range of available information;
  - h) Help to facilitate the development of:
    - new, amended or enhanced provision (agreed as part of the review);
    - innovative approaches to delivering programme content;

- student support and increased levels of satisfaction;
  - links to and/or joint provision with other departments or partners;
- i) Result in an achievable Action Plan that is supportive of the aims of the Department/programme area and the Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Framework.

## **Aims**

6. The aims of the periodic review process are:

- a) To establish whether there are effective and appropriate mechanisms to ensure that intended learning outcomes are being attained by students, standards are being achieved and the programme specification is being delivered;
- b) To establish whether the programme(s) remain current and valid in the light of developments in the discipline and in teaching and learning;
- c) To verify that the Colleges' procedures are working effectively to assure the standard of awards and the quality of the learning opportunities;
- d) To review the quality and consistency of the information provided to students and applicants;
- e) To consider how the College is implementing its Learning, Teaching, and Assessment Framework;
- f) To identify good practice within particular programmes or areas that can be disseminated both within and outside the College.

## **Scope**

7. This policy applies to:

- All taught undergraduate and postgraduate and non-higher education programmes leading to a Spurgeon's College award;
- Those programmes validated by other institutions but where the validation arrangement allows for the College to undertake its own reviews;

## **Responsibilities**

8. The responsibility for the periodic review of programmes rests with Spurgeon's College Academic Board, operating under the delegated authority of the Governors and reporting to the Governors.
9. The Programme Approval Revalidation and Review Committee (PARRC) is responsible for overseeing the periodic review process is undertaken in accordance with this procedure.

10. The Programme Revalidation and Review Working Group (PRRWG) is convened by the PARRC and will generate the detailed work and documentation to enable a formal review of an existing programme ready for submission to the Review Panel. The PARRC will sign off any documentation produced by its working groups before it is submitted to the Review Panel.
11. The Secretary of the PARRC will act as secretary to the Periodic Review Panel. They will assist the working group in assembling the documentation needed for the review.
12. Student participation is a key element of periodic programme review. The PARRC should ensure an opportunity to meet with current and if possible former students to input and comments at the evaluation stage. Membership of the Programme Revalidation and Review Working Group includes student representatives, as does the Periodic Review Panel.

### **Relationship with Annual Programme Review, Continuous Monitoring and Financial Viability Review**

13. Annual Programme Review and continuous monitoring together form a major component of the College's quality framework. They are ongoing processes of reflection and action planning undertaken by the Programme Committees and the Academic Quality Assurance Committee (AQAC). For the avoidance of confusion, a brief description of the Annual Programme Review process is given here.
14. Annual Programme Review gives departments the opportunity to reflect upon the teaching, learning and operation of a programme in the previous academic year through the production of an evaluative report, identifying particular achievements and to:
  - a) Review the appropriateness and effectiveness of the learning outcomes, teaching methods and assessment strategies of a programme and consider the planning of any consequent changes to units and/or programmes;
  - b) Ensure that any problems arising in a particular programme are reported, along with the steps taken to resolve them;
  - c) Monitor and review the student experience, through various feedback and evaluations and that appropriate action is taken as required;
  - d) Consider any relevant external comments on the wider aspects of the programme(s), including those of External Examiners and, where appropriate, Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) and employers;
  - e) Identify any trends in student recruitment, progression and achievement, particularly with respect to identifying if more could be done to support

certain groups of students in meeting the learning outcomes of their programme(s);

- f) Report on any new developments/enhancements in learning and teaching that might be disseminated within and outside the department.

15. Continuous monitoring is captured primarily through end of unit evaluation and considered by the AQAC.
16. The output of all this is captured in the minutes of the relevant committee meeting(s) and the Academic Action Plan that indicates what actions need to be taken, by whom, and in what timescale.
17. The output from the five or six years of annual review and continuous monitoring in the period under review should form the basis of much of the supplementary evidence required for Periodic Review.
18. When a periodic review is undertaken, a financial viability review will also be undertaken for that programme by the Finance Department and Chief Operating Officer. This is a separate process, however the Academic Board and Senior Management Team will consider these findings, alongside the findings of the periodic review, when making any decisions regarding the future direction of a programme.

### **Relationship with Professional, Regulatory or Statutory Bodies**

19. The Periodic Review schedule and documentation requirements are aligned with the accreditation schedule and documentation requirements of professional, regulatory or statutory bodies (PRSBs) wherever possible. Documentation from accreditation visits that have taken place up to a year before the date of the Periodic Review event may be used as part or all of the submission for it.
20. Periodic Reviews can be organised as joint events with PRSBs where practical, and/or the submission for a PRSB visit may be used as, or form the basis of, the submission for a Periodic Review.

### **Relationship with re-validation**

21. Where the re-validation of a programme is scheduled in the same year as a periodic review, the periodic review should be undertaken at least three months prior to the start of the validation process. This will allow enough time for the outcomes of the periodic review to inform the validation. Relevant elements of the periodic review may also be used within the validation process to avoid unnecessary duplication (e.g., student consultation).

## **Procedure**

### Setting the date

22. The Quality Manager maintains a schedule of review events. A date for a review event should be set well in advance (6 months or more) and within the agreed six-year period from the date of the last review.
23. At least three months before the event, the Quality Manager will consult with the PARRC to agree the scope of the review, the review procedure, the preparation required for the Self Evaluation Document (SED) and evidence base, and membership of the Review Panel.

### Identifying the Panel Members

24. As a minimum, the panel for a periodic review comprises the following:
- Chair (External member of the AQAC, Academic Board or Governor)
  - External subject specialist(s)
  - Representative of the validating institution (if relevant)
  - Representative of PRSB or Employers (if relevant)
  - At least two students, representative of the programmes being reviewed
  - Secretary (Secretary of the PARRC)
25. The exact composition of a panel should reflect the nature of the provision under review, and membership may be increased, for all or part(s) of the meeting, subject to the approval of the Chair. For example, the scope of the review may require more than one external subject specialist to be involved to ensure that the academic breadth of the provision under review is given appropriate consideration.
26. The role of a panel member is three-fold:
- Initial review of documentation and submission of comments before the event
  - Participation in discussion with the Panel, staff and students during the event
  - Consideration of and comment on the review report after the event.
27. The specific role of each panel member and additional information can be found in Appendix 1.

### Criteria for the appointment of external panel members

28. External panel members are appointed through the office of the Academic Director. They should be able to demonstrate:
- a) Appropriate competence and experience and continuing active involvement in the relevant subject discipline(s)
  - b) Relevant academic and/or professional qualifications
  - c) Knowledge and understanding of relevant external reference points for the maintenance of academic standards and assurance and enhancement of quality
  - d) Preferably some previous experience of reviewing programmes.
29. Employer representatives on the panel are appointed through the office of the Academic Director, and should:
- a) Be an employer or professional representative of the sector in which graduates might be expected to work.
  - b) Be of an appropriate level of seniority or have significant recent professional experience within the relevant field.
  - c) Possess sufficient experience within the sector to be able to comment on the relevance of the programme for those wishing to gain employment in the sector.
30. Where relevant, external panel members may also need to satisfy additional criteria set by PSRBs.
31. Terms of appointment for all external panel members should be confirmed in writing.
32. The appointment as an external panel member of anyone in the following categories or circumstances is not permissible:
- a) Anyone who is involved in the delivery of the programme being reviewed.
  - b) A current employee or member of the governing body of the College.
  - c) A current or former external examiner appointed to a programme at the College unless a period of five years has elapsed since the appointment ended.
  - d) Former staff or students of the College, unless a period of five years has elapsed since their employment ended or they completed their studies.

### Planning and producing the Self Evaluation Document

33. About three months before the event, the PARRC will convene a review working group to produce the SED and gather the evidence that will form the basis of discussions.
34. The Secretary will meet with the working group to discuss the content of the



SED, timescales and the additional information that needs to be gathered for the review event. Guidance on producing the SED and the supporting documentation is provided in Appendix 2, although the headings are for guidance and are not prescriptive.

35. The SED should be self-critical and evaluative. Rather than being a 'snapshot' of the department at the time of the review, the SED should discuss how the provision under review and the department have developed since the previous review, identifying any challenges overcome and current challenges. The SED should make extensive use of cross referencing to relevant supporting documentation and make use of concrete examples.
36. The SED and associated documentation should be received by the Secretary 4-6 weeks before the review, having been agreed by the PARRC.
37. At least 4 weeks prior to the event, the Secretary will forward all the evidence to the panel members for consideration. Usually, this will be made available electronically, either via Moodle, or other cloud-based storage.
38. Panel members will be encouraged to submit initial comments to the secretary at least two weeks in advance of the event to allow inform the agenda and initial lines of questioning to be drawn up.
39. This request should be accompanied by a reminder to panel members of the areas under discussion, and in particular the one(s) that they have been asked to lead on in the meeting itself, and which they therefore need to have covered fully. Panel members should be informed that, particularly when there is a large evidence base, it is not necessary to read every piece of supporting documentation that is submitted if it is not relevant to the area that they have been asked to review.
40. All panel members can comment on all aspects of the programme being reviewed; however, there may be areas of particular focus for each panel member. For example, Student representatives may wish to closely scrutinise evidence on student engagement, support and experience. External members may wish to focus on the subject specific evidence in the context of external reference points with particular reference to academic standards and/or employability.
41. The written documentation submitted for the event, when triangulated with discussions in the student and staff meetings, will normally provide sufficient evidence to allow the panel to reach decisions on the outcomes. A panel member may request further evidence via the Secretary if there is a good reason for doing so.

42. Panel members are required to scrutinise the documentation and provide a brief paper on their findings of initial strengths and comments on areas for further investigation at the review
43. All comments should be brief, highlight key areas for discussion, and reflect strengths and possible areas for further development.
44. The request should also give panel members the opportunity to request further information, for consideration either before or at the meeting, such as samples of assessed work with feedback, together with relevant examination papers, and/or unit specifications, if not included in handbooks.

#### Staff and Student attendees for the review event

45. The Secretary will meet with the Chair of the panel soon after their appointment (at least 8 weeks prior to the event) to agree which staff and the composition of the student group that will meet with the panel.
46. The Chair may wish to ask people to attend for some parts of the meeting but not others, depending on the items under discussion and colleagues' expertise. Subject to their availability, it is common for all colleagues to attend for the feedback session at the end. It is expected that the Academic Director and the Programme Director will attend for at least the feedback session.
47. A representative group of students from the programmes under review, and covering all areas and years of study, should be sought. They may, but do not have to be, elected representatives. A group of eight to ten students is optimum, and the panel may wish to split and convene more than one simultaneous meeting if the number of students attending on the day is significantly more than this. It is also helpful, if not always practical, to ask somebody who has just completed a programme of study that is under review to attend and give their views.

#### Pre-meeting of the Panel

48. One or two days before the event, or on the day itself (depending on the nature and scope of the review), the panel should meet to consider the comments that have come forward, agree a final agenda and agree which panel members should ask which questions and when. An indicative agenda can be found in Appendix 3.

#### Review event

49. The panel will convene for one or more days to consider the SED and meet

with staff and students as appropriate. All review events will include an initial meeting with the Senior Management Team. The agenda will also include the opportunity for the Panel to meet with programme teams and with students. The agenda will also include private panel meetings for the Panel to discuss lines of questioning and formulate conclusions. Suggested lines of questioning can be found in Appendices 4 (for Students) and 5 (General).

50. Initial feedback will be given at the feedback session at the end of the day.

51. Discussion and decisions should be fully recorded.

### Review Report and College Response

52. One or two days after the event, the secretary will circulate headlines from the panel meeting to the panel, relevant staff and the PARRC. These are normally based on the feedback session given by the Chair at the conclusion of the review event and should be labelled as 'subject to change' to allow them to be superseded by the conclusions and recommendations of the final report.

53. The Secretary will produce a first draft of the report, and this will be circulated to panel members for comments no later than 8 weeks following the review event. A template for the Periodic Review Report can be found in Appendix 6. The report will identify areas of good practice and make recommendations to the College as discussed by the Panel. Panel members should return comments on the draft report to the Secretary within two weeks (10 weeks after the event).

54. Once comments from Panel members have been incorporated the Secretary will circulate the report to the PARRC, Academic Director and other relevant staff for a factual accuracy check. No later than thirteen weeks after the event, staff should return comments on factual accuracy to the Secretary.

55. The Chair will approve a final report no later than fourteen weeks after the event, and this will be circulated to all panel members, relevant staff and a copy put on Moodle for students.

56. No later than 20 weeks after the event, the PARRC will produce a response to the report. This should include or make reference to how recommendations and commendations will be reflected in an action plan, and how work on taking them forward will be reflected more generally in the planning cycle.

57. The Academic Board will consider the report and progress on any recommendations or actions arising from the report will be monitored internally.



## **Appendix 1: Role of Panel Members**

### Chair

1. The role of the Chair is to manage and direct the review process. The Chair will chair all meetings held during the course of the review, will provide oral feedback to the review team at the conclusion of the review and will approve the draft report. It is the role of the Chair to ensure each panel member has an opportunity to explore issues with the staff and students.

### Internal Panel Members

2. The role is designed to provide information about the values, strategies and policies of Spurgeon's College. The purpose of the role is to evaluate the evidence provided within the particular context of Spurgeon's and bring experience to the panel of the operation, management and delivery of programmes within the College.

### Secretary to the Panel

3. To provide support to the Chair during the review, confirm arrangements with all panel members, distribute documentation to panel members, book rooms and organise catering, attend and minute all meetings, and prepare the draft report, recommendations and areas of good practice for immediate circulation to the Chair and Panel. The Secretary will also circulate the report to staff and students and provide advice on the preparation of an action plan.

### External Panel Members

4. The role should allow for appropriate subject expertise to be provided to the review team, within the wider context of Higher Education, and business or employment. External members should evaluate the subject specific evidence in the context of external reference points with particular reference to academic standards, quality of learning opportunities and employability. This role should provide a broad focus on quality assurance and enhancement. External panel members should specifically consider:
  - Whether the unit descriptors appear appropriate for the Award and Title of the relevant programme(s)?
  - If the learning outcomes appear to be in line with the relevant level descriptors?
  - If relevant Subject Benchmark Statement(s) are reflected appropriately?

### Student Panel Members

5. It is expected that student members will be current students of Spurgeon's College and of good academic standing. They will be full members of the team and be expected to comment on the documentation, inform the agenda setting and pursue lines of questioning during the meetings with the review

team. Student members play a key role by bringing the student perspective to the work of periodic review panels and ensuring the student experience is central to the review process. It would be particularly useful to focus on student areas such as assessment, feedback and support.

## **Appendix 2: Guidance on producing a Self-Evaluation Document**

1. A Self Evaluation Document (SED) is an evidence-based reflection of what you believe to be working well and what you believe to be working less well. It should be full and frank, not attempting to hide problems; it should be balanced, not forgetting to cover strengths; and it should be developmental, offering thoughts on how to improve what you do.
2. You are not required to provide a detailed description of what you do. Some background information may be necessary to set the scene but the emphasis should instead be on your evaluation of how effective and successful you believe the various aspects to be.
3. The following guidelines should be used to structure your SED. Prompts are provided to aid your evaluation and cover all areas that should be included in the document. Please highlight strengths and areas of good practice but also highlight those areas that you are working to improve; state the issue and the actions that you are taking to resolve or improve the situation. You should provide examples within the text and refer to documentary evidence, via footnotes, to support statements made in the SED. You need not reproduce in the SED detailed information available in another existing document; instead, you can either append that document or summarise the contents of the document and explain its relevance.
4. The SED should not be a lengthy document. Keep it succinct and remember that the SED acts as the basis for a dialogue between you and the review panel. You may wish to use Strength/Weakness/Opportunity/Threat (SWOT) analyses to introduce and summarise each section and highlight areas where discussion would be most useful.

### **Section 1: Introduction**

- List the UG and PGT programmes within the scope of the review including:
  - the award (including intermediate or exit awards e.g. PGCert, PGDip, CertHE, DipHE);
  - programme titles;
  - mode of study (for example full-time, part-time, distance learning);
- The number of students on each programme and the total number of students (undergraduate and postgraduate).
- Programme specifications or handbook extracts covering all relevant programmes should be attached to provide the panel members with detailed information on the programmes.
- State any partners involved in the delivery or management of a programme and

any actual or pending recognition by or affiliation to a professional, statutory or regulatory body.

- Provide the Academic Governance Framework.

## **Section 2: Aims and Context**

- Outline the context in which the programmes are offered and how they relate to the Strategic Objectives of the College.
- The context might include reference to:
  - enabling students to develop their capacity to learn;
  - how the provision meets international, national, regional or local needs, including widening access to education and employment;
  - how the provision meets student needs in relation to preparing them for employment, further study, or the first stage of professional practice;
  - how good practice is shared.
- Attach any action plans, and a record of the outcomes of the actions taken from the last 5 or 6 years' Annual Monitoring.
- Tell us how you use the statistical indicators and management information available to you for the evaluation of quality and standards. How is this used to enhance provision?
- What is your strategy for growth (where relevant)?

## **Section 3: Intended learning outcomes and their achievement**

- How do you know that intended learning outcomes (ILOs) for programmes are designed and developed appropriately and effectively, and that the standards achieved by successful students meet or exceed the minimum expectations of the award? You should refer to:
  - the context and strengths outlined in Section 2;
  - external reference points, such as relevant subject benchmarks, external review output, and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications;
  - feedback from External Examiners;
  - where appropriate, professional, statutory and regulatory requirements and the interests of external stakeholders.
- How are staff, students and External Examiners made aware of the ILOs?
- At what stages are students encouraged to reflect on their ILOs? (e.g. Is reference made to ILOs throughout the delivery of the programme/student experience?)
- In what format are the ILOs provided for students (e.g. in course unit outlines)?

## **Section 4: Curricula**

How do you know that the structure and content of your programmes are designed



and developed appropriately? You may want to refer to:

- providing students with opportunities to achieve the intended learning outcomes;
- providing students with appropriate opportunities for academic and intellectual progression;
- providing students with skills and knowledge to enhance their employability;
- developments/good practice in teaching and learning;
- current research and scholarship in the discipline;
- encouragement of self-reflective lifelong learning
- the levels and modes of study;
- coherence, flexibility and the extent of student choice;
- where appropriate, placement availability;
- feedback from External Examiners;
- subject benchmark statements;
- where appropriate, the role and requirements of a professional body;
- reflective practice within the curricula;
- outcomes of any market research activity.

## **Section 5: Assessment**

How do you make sure that the design and development of assessment methods is appropriate for the intended learning outcomes and the level of study? You should refer to:

- criteria that enable internal and External Examiners to distinguish between different categories of student achievement;
- assessment loads on students, particularly across programmes, and the cumulative impact, i.e. potential 'over-assessment';
- opportunities for formative assessment to develop students' abilities and skills;
- the security, integrity and consistency of assessment methods;
- the setting, marking and moderation of work;
- the return of work with feedback and the level of student satisfaction with this;
- the different methods of assessment, including formative assessment.

## **Section 6: Teaching and Learning**

- Evaluate how you design and develop teaching and learning, and how you know whether the underlying methods are effective. You should refer to:
  - the relationship to intended learning outcomes and the level of study;
  - aims and content of programmes;
  - the research, scholarship, practice and professional activity of staff;
  - opportunities for engagement and participation by students;
  - the integration of eLearning / blended learning within the curricula and how this enhances teaching and learning;
  - how students are encouraged to reflect on their own development?
  - obtaining and using feedback from students, staff, External Examiners and

- other stakeholders to enhance and improve programmes, and closing feedback loops;
- the use of efficiencies in teaching to maximise available resources;
- Tell us how you maintain and enhance the quality of teaching and learning. You should refer to:
  - results of unit feedback, National Student Survey/Postgraduate Survey, and any other forms of feedback from students;
  - External Examiner reports and previous internal and external review activity;
  - links with any relevant professional, regulatory and statutory body.

### **Section 7: Recruitment, retention, progression and achievement by students**

- Does the College have a strategy for recruitment? How is that strategy developed and informed?
- If not discussed under Context, please comment on any significant trends highlighted in the application and entry statistical data. Any further actions required to be taken?
- How effective is the application process and how is this measured?
- How effective is the promotional material for the programmes? Is online and hard copy consistent?
- Tell us about any issues that arise from your evaluation of data relating to student retention and withdrawal. Where appropriate, tell us about the effectiveness of any strategies that you adopt to reduce or limit the latter. Are any further actions required?
- Tell us about any issues that arise from your evaluation of the statistics regarding student achievement and where you believe action or support may be required.
- What measures are in place to monitor graduate destinations and maintain links with alumni?
- Tell us about any significant trends in data resulting from graduate destination.

### **Section 8: Student support and experience**

- How do you know whether arrangements for student admission and induction, including welcome week, are appropriate and effective and generally understood by staff and applicants/students?
- Please comment on the effectiveness of student support initiatives and schemes. Also consider how aware the students are of these services and facilities.
- How do you know whether support for students (including written guidance [e.g. handbooks], academic advising, tutorial support, feedback to students, and supervisory arrangements) is effective? How do you make sure that these support arrangements are consistent with the student profile, context of

provision and any special learning needs?

- How do you know whether students and staff have a clear understanding of their respective responsibilities?
- How do you know that students have a sense of belonging and identity within the College?
- How do you know that mechanisms for student representation and feedback are functioning effectively?
- How do you know that mechanisms are in place to allow students to comment on the use of eLearning?

### **Section 9: Learning resources including staff support**

- How do you know that the collective expertise of the academic staff in your area is suitable and available for the delivery of the programmes? Please make appropriate reference to accommodating the needs of part-time staff, the use of team teaching, etc.
- Please evaluate the training and support that is provided for members of academic staff, both new and existing, with reference to any induction, ongoing development, and mentoring activity.
- Are Staff:Student Ratios manageable, appropriate and resourced effectively?
- Please evaluate local engagement with, and effectiveness of, peer review of teaching and any formal recognition of excellent teaching that takes place.
- If you make use of staff from outside the College, please provide details of how this is done and what training and support is provided for them.
- Please evaluate the appropriateness and availability of equipment and IT facilities for staff and students.
- Please evaluate the appropriateness and availability of learning and teaching accommodation available to you. To what extent are the environments in which learning occurs conducive to effective learning?
- Please evaluate the appropriateness and accessibility of resources provided by the Library.
- Please evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of technical and administrative support available to you.
- How effectively overall do you feel that students use the learning resources available to them?

### **Additional Evidence to be provided**

- Programme Specifications/Handbooks
- Unit Specifications/Descriptors
- External Examiner Reports and responses (*previous 5 years*)
- Annual Programme Reviews for the last 5 years

- Minutes of staff-student liaison meetings for the last 5 years
- Unit evaluation reports
- Record of staff development/CVs
- An overview of staff publications/research outputs/research informed teaching;
- Information on staff:student ratios;
- Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy and Action Plan
- Reports from accrediting or other bodies where relevant
- College strategic aims and objectives
- Relevant procedures
- Internal review reports where available
- Statistical data for the previous 5 years including:
  - Admissions data; entry criteria/qualifications
  - Progression, retention and completion rates
  - Degree classifications
  - Employment destinations
- Examples of assessed student work or exam papers can be provided if required.
- Comparability with other HEIs/external benchmarks i.e. FHEQ and Subject Benchmark Statements.
- Mapping to Professional, Statutory, and Regulatory Body requirements, where relevant.

### Appendix 3: Indicative agenda for the review meeting

#### AGENDA

9.00 Private meeting of the panel

9.30 Meeting with relevant staff to discuss:

- Aims and context of the programme and intended learning outcomes
- Curricula – content and design
- Assessment and achievement of intended learning outcomes by students

11.00 Break

11.15 Meeting with relevant staff to discuss

- Teaching and Learning
- Student recruitment retention and progression
- Learning resources

12.45 Break for Lunch with Students

14.00 Meeting with staff to discuss:

- Quality management and enhancements systems
- Student information, experience and support
- Staff resources and staff development

15.30 Private panel meeting to agree feedback, commendation and recommendations

16.00 Feedback by the Chair

16.30 Close

Panel Members:

Name & Role

---

## **Appendix 4: Questions for meeting with Students**

The meeting with students enables reviewers to establish student views on the issues being considered. These meetings provide an opportunity not only to hear the direct views of those present, but also to establish more generally whether there are effective arrangements for student feedback and representation.

It may be helpful to establish on what basis the students were selected to attend the meeting, and how effective the College has been generally in securing student involvement in the review process.

The questions from the review team can be related to the main themes of the Periodic Review. The following provide a 'menu' of questions which could be asked to students. It is unlikely you will need to (or have time to) ask each of these questions. The issues raised in the first private meeting of the Panel on the review day will help you to focus on areas to explore in more depth. Throughout the meeting, students should be given opportunities to raise points not covered by the questions raised by the review team.

### **Quality and the student experience**

- How did they find out more about us prior to enrolling? Open Days? Web?
- Why did they choose Spurgeon's College?
- How are student views sought? (Induction feedback? Unit/course feedback?)
- Are students represented on committees? If so, what is their role?
- Are student views influential? Can they provide examples of any changes made?
- How do students know what the College has done in response to their views/issues they have raised?
- Did students make a contribution to the self-evaluation document?

### **The curriculum**

- Are students made aware of the intended learning outcomes by programme specifications or other means?
- Is the course what they expected it to be? What is the match between the expectations of students, the intended learning outcomes and the curricular content?
- Does the curricular content encourage the development of knowledge and skills?
- Are students aware of progression in the course they are doing – is it getting more challenging as they move through the levels?
- What is its relevance to further study and prospective employment?

- Are timetables and workloads appropriate?
- What opportunities are there for practical and vocational experience (if relevant)?
- How are students engaged in curriculum development and approval?

### **Assessment and achievement**

- In assessment, are students clear about what they have to do? Are they given the calendar for assessment submission dates at the start of the semester?
- Is there an appropriate amount and type of assessment?
- Is assessment formative as well as summative?
- Do students receive marking criteria explaining how they can achieve the best grades?
- What feedback is there? How is it given and is it prompt, effective and helpful?
- In their experience, have the intended learning outcomes been achieved?
- Do staff discuss student achievement with students?
- Are further study and career aspirations likely to be satisfied?

### **Teaching and learning**

- How do students find the teaching and learning methods? Are they appropriate (to level and subject matter?) Is there a variety?
- How do students perceive the quality of the teaching?
- Is there effective support and guidance for independent study?
- Is there effective technical support and guidance?
- Do students have confidence in the security of the online classrooms and discussion fora (if online)?
- How do placements complement the curriculum? What skills are acquired during placement? Do they enhance employability?
- Are the arrangements for placements well managed? (where relevant)

### **Student support**

- How did students find the admission and induction process?
- Do students know who to go to if they need help? With academic work? With other matters?
- Do students have a personal tutor? Do they meet with him/her regularly? At scheduled times? (check all years)
- Do students receive effective support on placement?
- Are students able to access Programme Specifications, External Examiner reports and Student Feedback information via Moodle?

## **Learning resources**

- How good are the library services in terms of opening hours, access, user support, availability of books and journals?
- What IT support is there? Are opening hours, access, user support and availability of workstations and software appropriate?
- Are there suitable programme-specific materials?
- Are the rooms and equipment adequate?

## **General**

- If you could improve one thing, what would it be?
- What would you single out to praise about the course, or studying at Spurgeon's College?



## **Appendix 5: Areas for scrutiny and questions for meetings with Staff**

This appendix suggests questions and prompts to assist members of the Periodic Review Team. It may be used in:

- analysis of the self-evaluation prior to the review;
- collection of evidence during the review;
- preparation and compilation of the report of the review.

It covers the main features of the review process, but it is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive. The provider's self-evaluation, the statement of aims, and the intended outcomes of programmes may all raise issues peculiar to the provision under scrutiny.

Under the headings below there are general statements about the aim of each review topic together with specific prompts for reviewers.

### **The Curricula**

The periodic review team should consider the effectiveness of the content, design and organisation of the curricula in enabling the intended outcomes of programmes to be achieved. Specific issues that are likely to be pursued by reviewers include:

- academic and intellectual progression within the curriculum;
- appropriateness of content in relation to the level of the award;
- alignment of the aims and learning outcomes with the College's key strategies;
- inclusion of recent developments in the subject;
- reflection of best practice in pedagogy.

There should also be consideration of the following:

- learning and study skills in the curricula;
- employability and work placements;
- the curricula and portfolio in relation to market requirements

Questions that could be considered are:

- Do the design and content of the curricula encourage achievement of the intended learning outcomes in terms of knowledge and understanding, cognitive skills, subject specific skills (including practical/professional skills), transferable skills, learning and study skills, research skills, progression to employment and/or further study, and personal development?

- Is there evidence that curricular content and design is informed by recent developments in techniques of teaching and learning, by current research and scholarship, and by any changes in relevant occupational or professional requirements?
- How does the subject team ensure that the curricula and its portfolio of provision is relevant to and meets market demand? What evidence is used to support this and how effective is it?
- Are the aims and intended learning outcomes for a programme clear and coherent, and how well do they, and the curriculum, relate to external reference points such as subject benchmark statements and professional body requirements?
- How does the subject team ensure that the design and organisation of the curriculum is effective in promoting student learning and achievement of the intended learning outcomes?
- Is there the right balance between breadth and depth of study?
- Are the admissions requirements appropriate both to the target intake and to the curriculum and outcomes of the programmes?
- Are the programmes appealing and likely to engage students?
- Is there appropriate division between core and option units and appropriate flexibility in the course structure?
- In respect of all curricula matters generally, what is the student feedback? What are the sources of student feedback, and how does the subject team respond to it?
- How do students know what is expected of them?

### **Assessment and Achievement**

The panel should evaluate the effectiveness and appropriateness of the assessment strategy in providing students with the opportunity to achieve the aims and learning outcomes of the individual programmes.

Questions that could be considered are:

- What is the variety and range of assessment methods used, and how effective are they in enabling learners to demonstrate achievement of the intended learning outcomes?
- Do the current assessment methods have an adequate formative function in developing students' abilities?
- Are there assessment criteria that enable internal and external examiners to distinguish between different categories of achievement?

- How do assessment strategies and processes ensure the security and integrity of assessments?
- What innovations in assessment methods are under consideration or have recently been introduced?
- Is the range of assessment methods across the programmes appropriate?
- Is the assessment load appropriate?
- Is the assessment strategy adequately responsive to the varying needs and backgrounds of students (i.e. in terms of nationality and disability)?
- What evidence is there that the standards achieved by learners meet the minimum expectations for the award, as measured against relevant subject benchmark statements and the qualifications framework?
- What trends are noticeable in retention and achievement statistics; how are strengths built on and problems addressed?

### **Learning and Teaching**

The periodic review team should evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of the learning and teaching arrangements.

Questions that could be considered are:

- Are there appropriate methods of learning and teaching in place to enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes?
- How effective is the learning and teaching strategy in relation to curriculum content and programme aims?
- Is there an appropriate mix of activities e.g. lectures, tutorials, practicals?
- How and to what extent is the use of technology enhanced learning used to deliver the curriculum of programmes? Is there a strategy in place to develop this further?
- How have the possible requirements of students with disabilities been anticipated in order to enable them to achieve the intended learning outcomes?
- How effectively do staff draw upon their research, scholarship or professional activity to inform their teaching?
- How good are the materials provided to support learning?
- Is there effective engagement with and participation by students?
- How effectively is learning facilitated in terms of student workloads?

### **The Learning Environment**

The periodic review team should assess the adequacy of the learning environment, its effectiveness, and how the subject team manages this.

Questions that could be considered are:

- Is the collective expertise of the academic staff suitable and available for effective delivery of the curricula, for the overall teaching, learning and assessment strategy, and for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes?
- Is the quality of teaching maintained and enhanced through effective staff development, peer review of teaching, integration of part-time and visiting staff, effective team teaching and induction and mentoring of new staff?
- Is appropriate technical and administrative support available?
- Is there an overall strategy for the deployment of learning resources?
- How effectively is learning facilitated in terms of the provision of resources?
- Is suitable teaching and learning accommodation available?
- Are the subject book and periodical stocks appropriate and accessible?
- Are suitable equipment and appropriate IT facilities available to learners?

### **Student Support**

The periodic review team should evaluate the student support systems in place for the student journey. Areas that could be considered include:

- recruitment and induction of students;
- identification of and action on any special learning needs;
- feedback to students on their progress;
- overall academic guidance and supervision;
- tutorial support;

Questions that could be considered include:

- Is there an appropriate overall strategy for academic support, including written guidance, which is consistent with the student profile and the overall aims of the provision?
- Are there effective arrangements for admission and induction which are generally understood by staff and applicants?
- How effectively is learning facilitated by academic guidance, feedback and supervisory arrangements?

- Are the arrangements for academic tutorial support clear and generally understood by staff and students?

### **Quality and Enhancement Management**

The periodic review team should evaluate the effectiveness of the measures taken to enhance the quality and standards of provision, assessing the following in particular:

- how the subject team seizes developmental opportunities in a systematic and strategic manner;
- how the subject team enhances the quality of learning opportunities by systematically building upon information or feedback that may come from:
  - external examiners;
  - external bodies, such as professional, statutory or regulatory bodies;
  - students and graduates;
  - employers;
  - the annual programme monitoring process;
  - the College’s Strategic Plans;
  - College policies
- how the subject team identifies and disseminates good practice.

The main question for consideration is:

How does the subject team review and seek to enhance standards and quality and how effective are their methods or strategies?

## Appendix 6: Report Template



## Report of the Periodic Review of

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

### Section 1: Event Details

**Date of Meeting:**

**Location:**

**Programmes Reviewed:**

**Review Panel:**

**In Attendance:**

**Evidence provided for scrutiny:**

### Section 2: Aims and Context

### Section 3: Conclusions

**3.1 Commendations**

**3.2 Recommendations**

### Section 4: Summary Record of Discussion

Draft headings:

- Curriculum content and design
- Learning Outcomes
- Assessment
- Teaching and Learning
- Staff Development and Expertise

- Learning Resources
- Governance, Strategy and Quality Enhancement
- Student Recruitment, Retention, Progression and Achievement
- Student Support and Involvement

### **Section 5: Report Sign Off**

<b>Name of Panel Chair</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	
<b>Date</b>	