

## Guidance for the Periodic Review of Taught Provision

### Contents

|           |  |    |
|-----------|--|----|
| <b>1.</b> | <b>Introduction</b>  |    |
| 1.1       | Definition   | 2  |
| 1.2       | Purpose  | 2  |
| 1.3       | Process  | 3  |
| 1.4       | Relationship with Continuous Monitoring                        | 3  |
| 1.5       | Relationship with Professional, Regulatory or Statutory Bodies | 4  |
| <br>      |  |    |
| <b>2.</b> | <b>Timeline</b>  |    |
| A.        | Setting the date for the review event                          | 5  |
| B.        | Identifying the Secretary and other panel members              | 5  |
| C.        | Planning and producing the written material for the event      | 8  |
| D.        | Agreeing the logistics of the event                            | 9  |
| E.        | Completing and distributing the written material               | 10 |
| F.        | Making final preparations and holding the event                | 11 |
| G.        | Producing and acting upon the output from the event            | 11 |
| <br>      |  |    |
|           | <b>Appendices</b>  |    |
| A.        | Guidelines for producing a Self Evaluation Document            | 13 |
| B.        | eLearning summary report                                       | 20 |
| C.        | Indicative agenda for review meeting                           | 21 |
| D.        | Report template  | 22 |

# Guidance for the Periodic Review of Taught Provision

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Definition

Periodic Review is review of a portfolio of programmes, normally at School level, that assesses its health and facilitates planning for future provision. 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. Periodic Reviews must be held every five or six years (or every five years in the case of collaborative provision that is undergoing a Periodic Review immediately before the associated Institutional Review).

### 1.2 Purpose

Periodic Review:

- provides the University with a system by which a School's management of its programmes and discipline areas may be monitored;
- provides the University with a system by which the standards and quality of taught Undergraduate and Postgraduate awards may be monitored;
- reviews teaching, learning, methods of assessment and the quality of the student experience;
- reviews the continuing validity and relevance of programme aims and intended learning outcomes, including adherence to external reference points such as the 'Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland' (FHEQ) (<http://www.gaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Framework-Higher-Education-Qualifications-08.pdf>) where appropriate;
- identifies areas of good practice for wider dissemination;
- enables Schools, collaborative partners and disciplines to review and evaluate:
  - their portfolio of programmes, assess their suitability, success, development and possible improvement, and to plan for future provision;
  - their taught programme provision, and in particular students' achievement of the appropriate academic standards and the learning opportunities offered to them to support their achievements;
- enables an independent panel to review this self-evaluation through the consideration of documentation that covers the entire period under review,

and discussions with staff and students.

### 1.3 *Process*

Periodic Review is normally carried out at the discipline, School or collaborative partner level, rather than by individual programme or groups of cognate programmes. A Periodic Review event is organised by the Faculty, who at the end of the process produce a report for consideration by the School, Faculty and Vice President (Teaching, Learning and Students).

For larger Schools it may be necessary to adapt this guidance to allow the disaggregation of the event into a number of smaller discipline-specific meetings culminating in a School overview meeting. Any such variations to this process must be approved by the Faculty.

The University is also responsible for periodically reviewing collaborative taught programmes and validated PhDs. As part of this process, the University's Teaching and Learning Support Office will review the continuing validity and relevance of programme aims and intended learning outcomes and a partner's management of its programmes, as well as the overall management of the link.

### 1.4 *Relationship with Continuous Monitoring*

Periodic Review and Continuous Monitoring together form a major component of the University's quality framework. For the avoidance of confusion, a brief description of the Continuous Monitoring process is given here.

Continuous Monitoring is an ongoing process of reflection and action planning. It should be driven by the staff delivering the programme or group of cognate programmes. Programme teams are asked to reflect on the effectiveness of programmes as delivered during the year, identifying:

- particular achievements;
- issues beyond their control that have affected their work;
- aspects that need to be addressed in the short term and recorded in an action plan;
- current or possible future developments within the academic or professional community and the market environment.

The output of Continuous Monitoring is captured in the minutes of programme committee meeting(s) and an action plan. These are considered at School level, and the School then reports to the Faculty on the conduct and outcomes of its Continuous Monitoring activity. As part of this process, every Schools is required to produce a Student Experience Action Plan (SEAP) which is informed by Continuous Monitoring activity, and which must indicate what actions need to be taken, by whom, and in what timescale. In turn, the Faculty reports on the conduct and outcomes of Continuous Monitoring to the University-level Teaching and Learning Group as part of the Annual Review of Teaching and Learning (ARTL). The ARTL meeting also considers all the School SEAPs.

The output from the five or six years of Continuous Monitoring in the period under review should form the basis of much of the supplementary evidence required for Periodic Review.

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

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, for example by minor adjustments to the University's schedule. 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, subject to the agreement of the relevant Faculty.

If, in preparing for a Periodic Review or for a visit by a PRSB during a given academic year, a School feels that it has met the aims of Continuous Monitoring for that academic year, then a Faculty may agree to accept the School's response to the Periodic Review or PRSB report as the whole or partial output of Continuous Monitoring for that particular year. However, there is no automatic exemption from Continuous Monitoring since this should be taking place as part of 'business as usual' throughout the year.

Periodic Reviews can be organised as joint events with PRSBs where practical, and/or a Faculty may agree that the submission for a PRSB visit can be used as, or form the basis of, the submission for a Periodic Review.

## 2. Timeline

An indicative timeline for the Periodic Review process is provided here:

### ***At least a year before the event:***

#### **A: Setting the date of the review event**

Periodic Reviews at the University are organised by, and are the responsibility of, the Faculty in which the School under review is based.

Periodic Reviews at collaborative partners are organised by the University's Teaching and Learning Support Office (TLSO) in liaison with the partner, the relevant Faculty and the School. Wherever possible, Periodic Reviews at a partner run concurrently with the associated Institutional Review.

The TLSO maintains a schedule of Periodic Review events. Once an event has taken place the Faculty should agree the date of the next event with the School and confirm it with the TLSO. Subject to the agreement of all parties, the date of a Periodic Review event can be moved to accommodate unforeseen events, as long as the revised date falls within the agreed five or six year period from the date of the last review.

### ***At least three months before the event:***

#### **B: Identifying the Secretary and other panel members**

As a minimum, the panel for a Periodic Review comprises the following:

- Chair
- External Subject Specialist(s)
- representative of the University of Manchester Students' Union
- representative from a Faculty other than the one hosting the review
- representative from the home Faculty
- eLearning technologist
- representative from the TLSO
- Secretary

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. Similarly, additional Faculty representatives may be sought if the amount of material submitted for review warrants it.

**Faculty identifies the Secretary of the review panel.** This is normally a Faculty PSS colleague with responsibility for teaching, learning and the student experience.

**Secretary identifies the Chair of the review panel.** This is normally the relevant Associate Dean of the Faculty whose provision is under review, or their nominee.

**Secretary liaises with the School or collaborative partner to assign the External Specialist(s) on the panel.** In most cases the School or collaborative partner will be best placed to identify the person/people with appropriate status, expertise, experience, and specialist knowledge to serve as external specialist(s) on the panel. Informally, and with the input of a Teaching and Learning PSS colleague in the School, the School or collaborative partner should seek the potential agreement of up to three appropriate people who would be willing to serve in this capacity. The nominees should have credibility within their subject area, experience of internal reviews within their own institution, and have no conflicts of interest (for example, they should not be External Examiners at the University, either current or those who have held an appointment within three years of the date of the review). The School/collaborative partner should then forward the nominees' names and CVs to the panel Secretary so that they can brief the Chair and seek the approval of the appointment(s). Following this discussion, and if the Chair is happy that the nominee(s) is/are suitable, the Chair should approve the appointment/s.

**Secretary writes to External Specialist(s) to confirm their appointment.**

Following approval by the Chair, the Secretary writes formally to the External Specialist/s to confirm their appointment, their fee, and their role. The role of the external specialist is to return comments before the meeting on all aspects of the SED and supporting documentation, paying particular attention to all sections that require an external perspective, such as aims, context, intended learning outcomes, curricula, and the coherency and appropriateness of the programme portfolio. The external specialist then attends the meeting and should be prepared to lead the discussions in those areas. The Faculty should also ensure that any necessary travel, subsistence and accommodation expenses incurred by the external specialist(s) are reimbursed.

**Secretary assigns the internal Faculty representative(s) to the panel.** These representatives should not be part of the School undergoing review. Normally this colleague is asked to lead on one or more of: learning resources/staff

support, student support, recruitment and retention, teaching and learning, and assessment.

**Secretary liaises with the TLSO to assign the external Faculty representative on the panel.** TLSO will liaise with the Faculties that are not hosting the event to identify the external Faculty representative.

**Secretary liaises with Faculty eLearning manager to assign the eLearning technologist to the panel.** This is normally a colleague from the home Faculty's eLearning team who will also produce an eLearning summary report for consideration at the review. This person will consider the use of eLearning in the area under review and how it meets and exceeds minimum requirements, and will suggest enhancements.

**Secretary liaises with the TLSO to assign the TLSO representative.** The TLSO representative has two roles. Firstly, they will look at processes underpinning student support and experience such as peer support, student representation, induction and welcome week, with a focus on whether processes and procedures are fit for purpose and are being implemented to the maximum benefit of the student experience. Secondly, they will ensure that all quality assurance and linked processes and output are explored appropriately at some point during the meeting (such as unit surveys, National Student Survey/Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey, External Examiner reports, and output from previous internal and external review activity). The TLSO member is by definition a generalist and mainly concerned with processes (which could be discussed under any agenda item). However, the broad nature of the roles and activities within the TLSO mean that the Faculty may wish the TLSO to select a representative based on overarching themes or emphases in the SED (such as student satisfaction, academic malpractice, degree regulations etc.). The TLSO representative is normally assigned a lead role on procedural matters relating to Student Support and Experience and Teaching and Learning.

**Secretary liaises with UMSU Education Officer to assign student representative on the panel.** The student representative on the panel is normally a member of the UMSU Executive and/or a student with specific responsibility for the Faculty that is hosting the review. Like the TLSO representative, this person is asked to pay particular attention to practical issues associated with Student Support and Experience. No UMSU representative is required for Periodic Reviews at collaborative partners but should the partner themselves wish to nominate one of their students for panel membership they are welcome to do so.

## **C: Planning and producing the written material for the event**

**Secretary holds an initial meeting with the School/programme team to outline the Periodic Review process and timescales and to advise on the drafting of the Self Evaluation Document.** This is an important part of getting the process underway and helps the School to think about how, when and by whom the preparatory work needs to be undertaken. The Periodic Review panel uses a Self-Evaluation Document (SED) that is produced by the School, collaborative partner or discipline as the basis for its discussions. The SED should be the only document that is drafted specifically for the event. This discussion should include the how any related documentation will be collated in order to support the SED, and the organisation of the review process itself.

The ownership and responsibility for the production of the SED lies with the Head of School and Head of School Administration although its drafting and preparation will normally be carried out by others. It should be a team effort with a single voice, and should include the input of PSS colleagues as well as academic staff.

Collaborative partners are strongly encouraged to discuss the drafting of their SED with their Collaborative Academic Advisor<sup>1</sup> and the Collaborations Adviser in the TLSO.

**Team under review begin writing the Self Evaluation Document and collating the supporting evidence.** Guidance on drafting a SED and preparing the supporting documentation is provided in Appendix A. When a review is conducted at School level it may be necessary for the SED to include statements that address separate disciplines or groups of programmes. This will assist the panel to form a view of the adequacy of provision in those distinct areas as well as of the provision overall.

**eLearning technologist begins to prepare summary eLearning report** in a format that is appropriate to the context and needs of the event. It should be completed in a constructive manner and should allow the eLearning team to interact with Schools. The minimum expectation here is a summary report on the School's eLearning activity, resulting in a list of recommendations focused specifically on the development of eLearning. For further information please see Appendix B.

---

<sup>1</sup> A Collaborative Academic Advisor (CAA) is allocated to each collaborative programme or group of programmes. The CAA is appointed by and reports to the relevant Head of School and is the main point of contact for partner staff involved in the delivery of the programme. The CAA helps the University ensure the maintenance of quality and standards, deals with relevant queries, and advises on the development of programmes.

## **D: Agreeing the logistics for the event**

**School informs the Secretary who from the School/programme team will be attending for which parts of the agenda.** The School 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 Head of School and Head of Administration will attend for at least the feedback session, for information and because they may be best placed to respond to queries relating to strategic issues.

**Secretary liaises with the School and UMSU to identify the student group who will meet with the panel.** 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. When a review is conducted at School level it may be necessary for the panel to meet with students pursuing programmes in different fields of study. This will assist the panel to form a view of the adequacy of provision in those distinct areas as well as overall.

**Secretary briefs the Chair on the event and its scope and agrees the composition of the panel.** As with all meetings, a good Chair keeps discussions focussed and to time. This is especially important with a Periodic Review since the nature of the event is intended to be open, discursive and collegial. This makes it all the more challenging to cover the ground effectively and comprehensively within any timing constraints.

It is therefore valuable for the Secretary to plan out the expected timings of the agenda items with the Chair in advance. This discussion can be refined at the pre-meeting of the panel, by which time it will have become clearer what questions and issues are likely to be discussed. The Chair and Secretary should also discuss with the Chair whether any additional panel members will be required to ensure that all aspects of the provision under review are covered appropriately.

**Secretary ensures the Self Evaluation Document and supporting evidence is forwarded by the School by the agreed deadline.** Normally this can be achieved by ongoing communication, but there may be a need for the Faculty to hold interim meetings with the School to check progress, answer questions, and ensure that work is on track.

***4 to 6 weeks before the review event:***

**E: Completing and distributing the written material**

**School submits to the Faculty a copy of the SED and supporting documentation for each panel member.** Electronic submission (e.g. by optical media or an online media storage system) is strongly encouraged. Supporting documentation may include longitudinal data by which the standards and quality of taught awards may be monitored.

For collaborative partners, a meeting between the Chair of the panel, the Secretary, the relevant Head of School (or nominee) and the Collaborative Academic Adviser should be held following the submission of the SED to discuss the context of the link within the School. At this meeting it will be made clear to the School that, if the review is successful, the panel will recommend that the partnership be extended for a further five years.

**eLearning technologist submits to the Faculty a copy of the summary eLearning report and recommendations.**

**Secretary circulates SED and supporting evidence to the panel members with a request for their comments/questions to inform the agenda and any pre-meeting.** 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. However, panel members should be encouraged to comment on any area of the documentation, but to indicate in such cases under which area they would like their comment(s) to be considered. All comments should be brief, highlight key areas for discussion, and reflect strengths and possible areas for further development. 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. 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.

***Approximately 3 weeks before the event:***

**Panel members return comments to the Secretary,** who uses them to inform the agenda for the event and discussions of a pre-meeting of a panel.

**Faculty collates comments received from panel members** and circulates agenda for pre-meeting to panel members, the School for information and, if time permits, an initial response.

## **F: Making final preparations and holding the event**

***One or two days before, or on the day of the event itself (depending on nature and scope of work under review):***

**Faculty convenes pre-meeting of panel, inviting School representative to give details of context if appropriate.** The Chair and Secretary should use this meeting to consider the comments that have come forward and agree the agenda for the meeting itself. This is also a good opportunity to agree which panel member will ask which questions, and when.

***On the day:***

The event takes place. An indicative agenda can be found at Appendix C.

## **G: Producing and acting upon the output from the event**

***One or two days after the event:***

**Faculty circulates headlines from the panel meeting to the School.** 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. The headlines should also be considered by the relevant Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee.

***No later than eight weeks after the event:***

**Faculty produces first draft of report and circulates it to panel members for comments.** Subject to approval by the Chair and panel members, and taking account of any amendments that may be considered necessary in the light of discussions at the meeting, the recommendations made by the eLearning technologist as part of the preparatory work for the meeting should be included with the recommendations of the report as a whole. A template for a Periodic Review report can be found at Appendix D.

***No later than ten weeks after the event:***

**Panel members return comments on draft report to Faculty.** Faculty should chase Panel members for their comments and make it clear to them that it might not be possible to act upon any that are received late.

***No later than eleven weeks after the event:***

**Faculty incorporates comments from panel members and circulates report to School for factual accuracy check.**

***No later than thirteen weeks after the event:***

**School returns comments on factual accuracy to Secretary.**

***No later than fourteen weeks after the event:***

**Faculty considers comments on factual accuracy and circulates final report to School, panel members and Vice-President (Teaching, Learning and Students).**

***No later than eighteen weeks after the event:***

**School produces response to report for consideration by Faculty committee/group.** This response 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. The Faculty will consider the report and any response at the relevant Teaching and Learning group, and will monitor progress through Continuous Monitoring.

***November/December following the event:***

**Summary report of high-level issues and trends from all Periodic Reviews is taken to University Teaching and Learning Group** to inform the Annual Review of Teaching and Learning.

## **Appendix A: Guidelines for writing a Self Evaluation Document (SED)**

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.

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.

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.

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.

Further advice and guidance is available from the relevant Faculty quality administrator and the Teaching and Learning Support Office. Collaborative partners are advised to seek further advice and guidance from their Collaborative Academic Adviser when drafting the Self Evaluation Document.

### **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 (for example Mathematical Finance);
  - 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 a diagram showing the School or collaborative partner's committee structure for teaching and learning.

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

- Outline the context in which the programmes are offered noting how they relate to the mission and Strategic Plan of the University (and where relevant, the collaborative partner), the Manchester Matrix - the Purposes of a Manchester Undergraduate Education and the Teaching, Learning and Assessment Strategy of the Faculty.
- Reflect on the appropriateness of your aims in relation to the strategic aims of the University (and where relevant the collaborative partner), Faculty and School.
- Comment on the particular strengths and characteristics that define the School, collaborative partner or discipline.
- 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 provides students with the opportunity to engage in interdisciplinary learning, for example, by offering UCIL units as choices within programmes;
  - how the provision meets student needs in relation to preparing them for employment, further study, or the first stage of professional practice;
  - how the provision meets UG student needs in terms of developing the graduate attributes, as set out in the Manchester Matrix;
  - how good practice is shared.
- Attach your action plans, and a record of the outcomes of the actions taken from the last 5 or 6 years' Continual Monitoring exercises.
- 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)?
- How are any arrangements for collaborative activity managed within the School?

## **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;
  - the Manchester 2020 document;
  - 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, etc)?

#### **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;
  - consider other relevant topics relating to curricular planning, stemming from the University's strategic plan, and University consultations and reviews such as the Review of Undergraduate Education (including the attributes of a Manchester graduate).

#### **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 in order to develop students' abilities and skills;
  - the security, integrity and consistency of assessment methods;
  - the setting, marking and moderation of work;
  - the return of student work with feedback and the level of student satisfaction with this;
  - the different methods of assessment, including formative assessment;
  - compliance with the University's Assessment Framework (e.g. do units include some form of peer assessment, School policies on marking, submission of work, re-assessment, online submission, etc).

#### **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;
- Personal Development Planning (PDP); how are students 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;
- other relevant topics relating to teaching and learning stemming from the University's strategic plan, and University consultations and reviews such as the Review of Undergraduate Education (including the attributes of a Manchester graduate);
- an overview of how eLearning is used to enhance teaching and learning;
- Tell us how you maintain and enhance the quality of teaching and learning. You should refer to:
  - results of unit surveys, including the National Student Survey/Postgraduate Taught Experience 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 School or collaborative partner have a strategy for recruitment? How is that strategy developed and informed?
  - You may wish to refer to the section on Context. 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 at School, Faculty and/or University level.
- 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 surveys (DLHE).

(A brief explanation of what the DLHE survey is can be found at: <http://www.careers.manchester.ac.uk/graduates/dlhe/>)

### **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, such as PASS, peer mentoring, academic skills development, careers and the Academic Advisor

role. 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 School / University?
- How do you know that the management of any joint provision under review, either within the School or cross-School, is functioning effectively?
- Please comment on your use with students of personal development planning, with discussion around the effectiveness of your chosen model or approach.
- 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 your school or University, please provide details of how this is done and what training and support is provided for them.
- If you make use of teaching assistants, please provide details of this including 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, and include any supporting statements from PSS colleagues on their roles if this is considered helpful.
- How effectively overall do you feel that students use the learning resources available to them?

**Appendices to the Self Evaluation Document** (these help evaluate provision and should be circulated electronically wherever possible).

**General (much of the information below will have been compiled and reviewed as part of the Continuous Monitoring process)**

- Programme specifications or handbook extracts for all programmes within the scope of the review;
- Continual Monitoring action plans for the programme / School or both plus a record of the outcomes of the actions taken for the previous five or six years;
- Previous professional body report/s plus response/s (where relevant);
- Statistical data for the past five or six years as follows:
  - entry qualifications;
  - progression, retention and completion rates;
  - degree classifications
  - first employment destinations (where appropriate, e.g. vocational programmes)
  - unit evaluation questionnaire feedback analysis results
  - NSS/PTES scores and league table performance
- External Examiner reports plus responses or Faculty summary of comments and responses;
- Student Experience Action Plans (SEAPs);
- Any School-level policy or guidance that varies from the institutional norm.

**Qualitative data** (Please provide records for the last 5/6 years, unless already provided by Continuous Monitoring)

- student feedback, such as from unit evaluation questionnaires, NSS/PTES;
- results, minutes of staff- student liaison committees;
- staff feedback, such as from programme committees;
- accreditation and monitoring reports of professional, regulatory and statutory bodies;
- reports of previous internal reviews.

**Programme information** (Seek guidance from your Quality Administrator about how much information is needed)

- prospectuses and other publicity materials such as flyers;
- a selection of student programme handbooks.

**School or collaborative partner information**

- Committee minutes relating to Continual Monitoring or academic panel minutes;
- Existing School policies which supplement the University's Quality Framework.

**Faculty information**

- For example, Faculty operational priorities;
- the eLearning technologist's summary report (see Appendix B) may either form part of, or be appended to, the SED or be submitted as a standalone document.

### University information

- 'Strategic Vision 2020' (<http://www.manchester.ac.uk/discover/vision/>);
- TLSO [Teaching and Learning policies and procedures](#) and [Assessment policies and procedures](#);
- The Manchester Matrix – The Purposes of a Manchester Undergraduate Education (<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=9804>).

### Other sources of information

- your Faculty quality administrator;
- The University's Teaching and Learning Support Office (<http://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/tlso/>);
- Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality/the-quality-code/qualifications>);
- Subject benchmark statements (<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality/the-quality-code/subject-benchmark-statements>);
- QAA Code of Practice for the Assurance of Academic Quality and Standards in Higher Education (<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/AssuringStandardsAndQuality/code-of-practice/Pages/default.aspx>);
- Higher Education Academy (<http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/>).

If requested by panel members, examples of student work should be made available to the panel on the day of the review. Panel members can also request copies of particular documents that you have referred to in the text of the Self Evaluation Document.

## **Appendix B: eLearning Summary Report**

The Faculty eLearning technologist will lead on pre-work prior to the review, which will evaluate the use of eLearning within the programme/School. The purpose of the pre-work will be to monitor how eLearning meets and exceeds the minimum requirements, but also for the eLearning team to work with the unit leaders with a view to making enhancements.

A summary report should be provided to the review panel, the School and Programme Directors, prior to the periodic review. These should identify strengths and areas for enhancement over the next year/five or six years. The aims and objectives of the review and subsequent summary report, is to encourage and promote good practice and consistency in eLearning across a programme of courses. It should:

- engage with academic staff and help develop ongoing relationships with the eLearning team;
- raise awareness of the support offered by the eLearning team;
- provide an baseline for what is expected from a course in relation to eLearning in the short term;
- engage academics to develop and enhance their online teaching and learning provision in the medium/long term.

The recommendations contained within the summary report will be considered at the Periodic Review or may be used as supporting documentation as part of the SED.

## Appendix C: Indicative agenda for the review meeting

### AGENDA

- 1 Private meeting of the panel
- 2 Private meeting of the panel with students<sup>2</sup>
- 3 Meeting with staff to discuss:<sup>3</sup>
  - 3.1 Aims and context
  - 3.2 Intended learning outcomes
  - 3.3 Curricula – content and design
  - 3.4 Assessment
  - 3.5 Teaching and Learning
- 4 Meeting with staff to discuss:
  - 4.1 Achievement of intended learning outcomes by students
  - 4.2 Recruitment, retention, progression and achievement by students
  - 4.3 Student support
  - 4.4 Learning resources including staff support
  - 4.5 eLearning Summary Report
- 5 Brief private meeting of the panel to agree feedback
- 6 Feedback by the Chair on strengths and recommendations on areas for further development.

---

<sup>2</sup> *The timing of the student meeting may be problematic if the main event is scheduled outside teaching time. In such cases it might be helpful to convene a separate student meeting when availability is better.*

<sup>3</sup> *If appropriate, the School/programme team may wish to begin this part of the event by presenting a short (5-10 minute) overview of the provision under review and any underlying contextual matters. The discussion areas in sections 3 and 4 must be covered but the order can be altered to reflect the timings of the particular day (e.g. the arrival of the external subject specialist, and the availability of staff and students).*

## Appendix D: Report template

### Report of the Periodic Review Panel meeting for [insert name of the partner/provision under review] Date of meeting

**Present:** [Insert other names in alphabetical order]

**Apologies:** [Insert names in alphabetical order]

**In attendance:** [Insert names in alphabetical order]

*(Discussion as a result of each section of the SED should be written up under the following headings, with particular attention paid to issues requiring follow up and areas of good practice. Paragraphs should be numbered)*

#### **Aims and context**

#### **Intended learning outcomes and their achievement**

#### **Curricula: content and design**

#### **Assessment**

#### **Teaching and learning**

#### **Recruitment, retention, progression and achievement by students**

#### **Student support**

#### **Learning resources**

#### **eLearning Summary Report**

#### **Conditions/ Recommendations**

#### **Areas of Good Practice and Commendations**

---

| <b>Document control box</b>                       |   |
|---|---|
| Policy / Procedure title:                         | Guidance for the Periodic Review of taught provision  |
| Date approved:                                    | November 2015 (revised January 2016 to correct minor formatting issues and revise indicative agenda footnote 3, and March 2018 to update web links)   |
| Approving body:                                   | TLMG  |
| Implementation date:                              | November 2015 (to avoid disruption, events in the advanced planning stage at November 2015 may, with agreement from Faculty, continue to use the guidelines introduced in August 2012)  |
| Version:  | 3.1   |
| Supersedes:                                       | Guidelines for the Periodic Review process August 2012  |
| Previous review dates:                            | August 2012, September 2010, November 2009  |
| Next review date:                                 | tbc   |
| Related Statutes, Ordinances, General Regulations | n/a   |
| Related Policies, Procedures and Guidance:        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TLSO <a href="#">Teaching and Learning policies and procedures</a> and <a href="#">Assessment policies and procedures</a></li> <li>• Periodic Review of Collaborative Programmes – see the <a href="#">Guidance and Procedures for the Quality Assurance of Collaborative Provision</a></li> </ul> |
| Policy owner:                                     | Emma Hilton Wood, Head of Academic Policy, Teaching and Learning Support Office   |
| Lead contact:                                     | Jo Hicks, Teaching and Learning Manager, Teaching and Learning Support Office   |