

## **INTERNAL REVIEW SCHEME**

### **1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 A scheme of Departmental Review was approved for use in the merged University in 1996, building on the use of a similar scheme in the former University since 1987. Schemes for annual course review and for quinquennial course review were also in place in the University. However, on the recommendation of the QAA Continuation Audit Report (May 1999), these processes were revised and rationalised into an integrated Internal Review Scheme. Some changes have subsequently been made, based on experience of the Scheme's operation and to ensure alignment with the requirements of the QAA's Institutional Audit.
- 1.2 The Internal Review Scheme brings together Annual Programme Review, Periodic Programme Review and Re-approval, School Review, Research Institute Review and Faculty Review. The procedures for each are given as Parts 1-5. The Periodic Programme Review and Re-approval procedure (formerly Periodic Programme Review) was revised during the academic year 2005/06 and its procedures aligned with those for programme design, approval and amendment (Senate, June 2006).

### **2. INTRODUCTION**

- 2.1 The central purpose of each review is to maintain and, where possible, enhance quality through the evaluation of activities and the identification of priorities.
- 2.2 Each stage informs others, with Annual Programme Review contributing to Periodic Programme Review and Re-approval and School Review, and School Review and Research Institute Review contributing to Faculty Review. (Whilst Academic Enterprise is recognised as the third strand of University activity, alongside teaching and research, it is believed to be best reviewed within a School and Faculty context rather than as a discrete unit or activity.)
- 2.3 The Review Cycle is five years, with School and Research Institute Reviews taking place in the first four years and Faculty Reviews in the fifth. Periodic Programme Review and Re-approval takes place at intervals of not more than five years, in accordance with a schedule agreed between the School and their Faculty, and makes appropriate recommendations for the future of each programme.
- 2.4 In line with the University's policy of action/approval at the first level and monitoring at the second, Periodic Programme Review and Re-approval and School Review are conducted by the Faculty, which reports to the University Teaching and Learning Committee and Research Committee, as appropriate. Similarly, the Faculty Review is conducted at University level with the report going to the Senate, with cross-reference to the Teaching and Learning Committee and the Research Committee.
- 2.5 Externality is an important part of the Scheme. For example, external subject specialists are asked to comment on the School's Periodic Programme Review and Re-approval reports; there are external (to the University) members of the panels for School, Research Institute and Faculty Reviews. The remaining (University) members of the panels are all external to the unit being reviewed. In addition to this being a means of ensuring the objectivity of the review, it is seen as a valuable means of disseminating good practice across the University. Internal externality is now a key feature of the Periodic Programme Review and Re-approval procedure with the Chair as an independent person from another Faculty appointed by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) from a panel of suitably experienced and trained individuals.
- 2.6 The University has in place procedures and processes that are designed to assure the academic standards of its awards and the quality of the programmes leading to these awards. It expects Schools and Faculties to follow these procedures and processes and, where the requirement exists, to have their own, which are complementary to

those of the University. Thus, all Schools should, at any time, be reasonably well prepared for an audit or review by the QAA or a PSRB. Whilst the Scheme is not designed to be a rehearsal for the elements of Institutional audit, evidence of many of the University's activities can, and will, be used for both purposes. For example, Schools are required to maintain an ongoing 'baseroom' collection of important up-to-date documents which will be readily accessible to staff and to others, such as internal or external reviewers.

- 2.7 A mid-term review for each Research Institute, School and Faculty takes place mid way through the five-year cycle.

### **3. ELEMENTS OF THE SCHEME**

- Part 1 Annual Programme Review
- Part 2 Periodic Programme Review and Re-approval
- Part 3 School Review
- Part 4 Research Institute Review
- Part 5 Faculty Review

## INTERNAL REVIEW SCHEME

### PART 1 - ANNUAL PROGRAMME REVIEW

#### 1. Purpose

To maintain and where appropriate improve the quality of programmes; specifically:

- a) to enable Faculties and, through them, the Senate to carry out their responsibilities for the quality, organisation and conduct of programmes of study;
- b) to identify and disseminate more widely good practice in teaching, learning and assessment;
- c) to ensure that problems arising in a particular programme are identified at an early stage and appropriate steps taken to resolve them;
- d) to identify any general issues which the Faculty, or the University more widely, should address;
- e) to build up information needed for the periodic review of individual Programmes, for School Review and for external reviews;
- f) to assist in demonstrating to appropriate external bodies that the University has effective means of monitoring the quality of its programmes.

#### 2. Features

- 2.1 Schools are required to monitor programme operation on an ongoing basis throughout the year; to take prompt action where appropriate, with feedback; and to document fully matters raised, with their outcomes. It is expected that this monitoring activity is channeled through the School Staff-Student Committee, or Joint Boards of Study in the case of collaborative programmes (e.g. 2+2 and foundation years).
- 2.2 At the end of the session each programme will be reviewed and evaluated with regard to its operation that year. A formal report on each programme will be prepared. In the case of "X with...." or clustered programmes, a composite report which highlights any matters related to each specific programme can be submitted.
- 2.3 The annual programme review report is intended to be an overview and commentary. It is expected that Schools will collect and retain full information even though these are not presented in full in the report. The report will normally be of no more than 6 sides A4 in length.
- 2.4 There are separate pro formas for undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. These can be amended, as appropriate, to meet the requirements of different programmes, but any such variation requires the approval of the Associate Dean (Teaching).

#### 3. Process

##### Programme

- 3.1 The Programme Leader/Programme Team is responsible for producing the Annual Programme Review report and submitting it to the School Council (normally via the Staff-Student Committee) for consideration. When the report has been considered and approved the Programme Leader/Programme Team is responsible for implementing the action plan and giving feedback on it to students.

- 3.2 Copies of reports on postgraduate programmes should also be sent by the School to the Director of Graduate Studies. Information gathered from them will be used when reporting to the Research Committee on strategic postgraduate issues.
- 3.3 Reports on programmes which have external links (e.g. franchises) must be copied to the Chair of the Partnerships and Collaboration sub- Committee.

[Note: the purpose of receipt of copies of the APR reports by these committees is for them to deal with issues related to postgraduate and collaborative provision.]

#### School

- 3.4 The School Council will receive all APR reports and will seek to identify cross-programme matters (whether shared problems or good practice which ought to be disseminated more widely). Cross representation on School Councils will give an 'external' viewpoint as well as helping to disseminate good practice.
- 3.5 The School Council will use the checklist annexed to assist in its consideration of APR reports. If the School Council finds a report to be poor in quality, for example having an inadequate action plan, then it will refer it back to the Programme Team for amendment and re-submission.
- 3.6 The Associate Dean (Teaching) will request a sample of reports for monitoring purposes. (All reports may be requested if so wished).
- 3.7 The Head of School/Associate Head (Teaching) will prepare a summary report for the Faculty Council containing:
- a) the number of reports considered (with a list of the programmes concerned as an appendix) noting the number which had been referred back;
  - b) issues to be addressed by the School (i.e. School action plan);
  - c) issues to be referred to the Faculty;
  - d) issues to be referred to the University;
  - e) examples of good practice;
  - f) any suggestions for improving programme monitoring procedures generally.
- 3.8 The Head of School has responsibility for monitoring APR action plans and for ensuring that there is feedback to students. The Head of School will report at the end of the session to the School Council and to the Faculty Council on progress made in addressing School issues.

#### Faculty

- 3.9 The Faculty Council will consider the Schools' summary reports and will seek to identify cross-Faculty matters (whether shared problems or good practice which ought to be disseminated more widely).
- 3.10 The Dean/Associate Dean (Teaching) will prepare a report for the Teaching and Learning Committee containing:
- a) the list of School summary reports considered;
  - b) the report prepared by the Associate Dean (Teaching) on the sample of APRs which has been scrutinised (see 2.3 above);

- c) issues to be addressed by the Faculty (action plan);
- d) issues to be referred to the University;
- e) examples of good practice;
- f) any suggestions for improving monitoring procedures generally.

3.11 The Dean of Faculty has responsibility for monitoring School action plans and at the end of the session will report back to Faculty Council on progress made in addressing School and Faculty issues.

#### University

3.12 The University Teaching and Learning Committee will consider a consolidated report from the Faculty containing both its summary report and the report on the APR sample (see 3.2 and 3.3 above).

3.13 The University Teaching and Learning Committee will act on University issues and report back to Senate on both issues and the action. It will also report back to Schools and Faculties.

3.14 The Pro-Vice Chancellor (Teaching) has responsibility for monitoring Faculty action plans and at the end of the session will report to the University Teaching and Learning Committee on progress made in addressing Faculty issues.

#### **4. Timing**

Autumn term following year under review: Programme Leader/Programme Team prepare APR report; APR reports are considered by School Staff-Student Committee(s) and by School Council (Steps 1.1 – 2.4 above).

December: Faculties receive summary report from each School and prepare Faculty report.

February: Faculty Council considers School and Faculty summary reports.

March: Teaching and Learning Committee considers Faculty summary reports and takes up University issues.

Summer term: Schools, Faculties and University report on progress in addressing issues identified.

## 5. Annex

Check-list for consideration of Annual Programme review reports by School Council:

1. Has the correct template been used?
2. (re Q5): Is there sufficient evidence of a review of the programme, rather than just the production of a report?
3. (re Q7): Are all actions from the previous year identified? If only partially completed, or not completed, do they appear on the coming year's action list?
4. (re Q9): Have the statistics been commented on appropriately?
5. (re Q16): Is the action identified appropriate?
6. (re Q17): Have all weaknesses identified in response to Qs 9-15 been picked up here? Are the actions identified appropriate? Is the timescale for completion realistic?

**UNIVERSITY OF SALFORD**  
**ANNUAL PROGRAMME REVIEW REPORT 2005/06 - POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES**

Completed report to be maximum six sides in length – Download a copy of this form from :  
[www.academic.salford.ac.uk/aqa/forms/apr\\_report\\_pg.doc](http://www.academic.salford.ac.uk/aqa/forms/apr_report_pg.doc)

1. Programme title and award.....
  2. School.....
  3. Name of Programme Leader.....
  4. Name of person completing this form.....
  5. Summarise how the programme team was involved in producing this report .....
- .....
- .....

**6. Background information**

*E.g. duration of programme, mode of attendance, how long it has been running, any special features:*

**7. Review of previous year's action plan**

Action	Achieved	Person responsible	Comments

**8. Programme Statistics**

Note: for definitions of categories see:

[www.academic.salford.ac.uk/aqa/apr\\_definition\\_cats\\_pg.pdf](http://www.academic.salford.ac.uk/aqa/apr_definition_cats_pg.pdf)

Student Profile	2003/2004	2004/2005	2005/2006
% Female			
%APL/APEL			
% Declared disability			
% International			
Progression	2003/2004	2004/2005	2005/2006
N <sup>o</sup> Applicants			
N <sup>o</sup> Offers			
N <sup>o</sup> Registrations			
N <sup>o</sup> Withdrawn (%)			
Leaving with PG Cert. (%)			
Leaving with PG Dip. (%)			
Referred on taught elements (%)			
Progression to Masters (%)			
Submitting dissertation (%)			
Awarded Masters (%)			
Source of Funding	2003/2004	2004/2005	2005/2006
Self-funding (%)			
Employer funded (%)			
ESF (%)			
Other (%)			

*Note: In sections 9-15 strengths and weaknesses should be highlighted.*

**9. Comments on statistics**

*What were the patterns in recruitment, entry profile, progression and completion rates? Any changes from previous years? Destinations of students? Stability of funding sources? How do these figures relate to appropriate national or subject benchmark indicators?*

**10. Student Feedback**

*What were the results of evaluative questionnaires and of any other feedback methods used? What were the main issues raised by students? Action taken.*

**11. Staff Feedback**

*What substantive comments have been made by staff on the way the programme has operated this year?*

**12. External Examiners' Comments/Reports**

*What comments were made by External Examiners? What action was taken or not taken in response? Reasons should be given for any action not taken.*

**13. Collaborative Arrangements**

*Programmes which have external links, e.g., a franchise, must comment on the operation of the collaborative arrangement.*

**14. Changes to the Programme**

*Summarise any changes made to the programme during the year and give the rationale behind them.*

**15. Any other information**

*Anything else relevant to the Review – for example, external accreditation and review (PSRB/QAA), ways in which the programme has responded to equality and diversity requirements including issues of accessibility. Also any lessons drawn from outcomes of Boards of Appeal, induction activities, subject updating, links with research, developments in work-based learning, employer liaison and opinion, international dimension, programme delivery, staffing, physical resources and facilities, staff development, alumni feedback.*

**16. Summary of strengths (good practice which goes beyond the University's minimum requirements)**

Strength	Evidence	Action to maintain strength/good practice

**17. Weaknesses and Action Plan for next academic year**

Weakness	Action	Person responsible within programme team	Target date for completion

**18. Issues to be referred to a) the School b) the Faculty c) the University.**

**UNIVERSITY OF SALFORD****ANNUAL PROGRAMME REVIEW REPORT 05/06 - UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES**

Download a copy of this form: [www.academic.salford.ac.uk/aqa/forms/apr\\_report\\_ug.doc](http://www.academic.salford.ac.uk/aqa/forms/apr_report_ug.doc)

Programme award and title	<b>BA (Hons) Witchcraft</b>
School	<b>Magic and Wizardry</b>
Name of Programme Leader	<b>Tabitha Tintwistle</b>
Name of person completing this form	<b>Tabitha Tintwistle</b>
Basic information <b>Duration, mode(s) of attendance</b>	<b>3 years full time/6 years part time or 4 years full time with placement year</b>
Date of initial programme approval	<b>February 1997</b>
Date last re-approval	<b>May 2002</b>
Date periodic review and re-approval due	<b>2006/07</b>

The main purpose of annual monitoring of programmes is as a vehicle to:

- act as a check on the academic standards set and achieved by students
- assist reflection on the quality of the learning opportunities being provided
- identify and share good and innovative practice
- ensure any issues have been identified and carried forward into the action plan
- inform School planning both in terms of its overall plans for enhancement and in monitoring the viability of its academic portfolio

**1. Summarise how the programme team was involved in producing this report**

**2. Review of previous year's action plan**

*All actions identified in previous year should be included and reported upon*

Action	Achieved	Person responsible	Comments

**3. Programme Statistics**

Programme statistics should cover the reporting year and the two previous academic sessions. Statistics for the academic session of the report will be available from the Student Information System (SIS) following the input of re-assessment information in September.

Additional information and category definitions can be accessed on the APR website at: <http://www.academic.salford.ac.uk/aqa/apr/> It is important that all statistics are produced against these category definitions.

Destinations data is sent to Schools in April by the Careers Service. These data relate to the graduates from the previous July.

**4. Comments on statistics**

*What were the patterns in recruitment, is demand for the programme buoyant? What do the entry profile, progression and completion rates and awards profile indicate about academic standards and the learning opportunities provided? How do these compare with overall School figures or similar programmes in the School? What changes have*

*there been from previous years? Destinations of students? How do these figures relate to national or subject benchmark indicators? Where are actions needed?*

Statistical information will help the programme team and School make judgments about:

- The demand for and viability of the programme (looking at applications trends, entry, achievement and destinations)
- The academic standards being set and achieved by the students (progression and achievement data)
- Issues surrounding retention (match of entrants to the programme; match between initial expectations and experience of the programme; whether the curriculum, teaching, learning and assessment strategies and academic support are enabling students to meet the intended learning outcomes etc.)

## **5. Student evaluation and views**

*What were the outcomes from the NSS for the subject area, from the University's biennial student experience survey, any programme or level evaluation and from module questionnaires? What were the main issues raised by students via staff/student meetings and other means? What action has been taken? Where are actions needed?*

Student evaluation of the programme will help the programme team to assess the quality of the learning opportunities provided. Information from staff/student meetings will help the team to know how effectively they are working with the students as partners in the management of the quality of the learning opportunities provided. This section is likely to note in-year actions and identify planned enhancements for future delivery of the programme.

## **6. Staff Feedback**

*What substantive comments have been made by staff on the way the programme has operated this year and the learning opportunities provided?*

This section will tend to draw on discussions in programme team meetings as well as reflect upon the effectiveness of any recent changes or initiatives. It should also look forward to any known external factors (revised subject benchmarks, changing employer needs or PSRB requirements, changes to the 14-19 curriculum etc.) Actual changes are summarised in section 9.

## **7. External Examiners' Comments/Reports**

*What comments were made by External Examiners? What action has been taken in response? Were any comments not acted upon, if so, what were the reasons for this? Has a response been sent to the External Examiners?*

External examiners are likely to comment on academic standards, on the administration and conduct of final assessment and Boards of Examiners as well as on the quality of the learning opportunities provided. Any negative comments about academic standards should be discussed with the Associate Head of School for Teaching and may be raised by Faculty or University.

## **8. Collaborative Arrangements**

*Programmes which have external links, e.g., a franchise, must comment on the operation of the collaborative arrangement. Include feedback from staff in collaborative partners, student views, any specific comments by the External Examiners and the effectiveness of*

*management and support arrangements (visits, Joint Boards of Study, staff development etc.). Planned actions arising?*

The University is responsible for the academic standards of all its awards and it is important that these are monitored effectively with programmes delivered in whole or part by our collaborative partners. Similarly the University is responsible for the ensuring that the quality of the learning opportunities provided by a partner are appropriate. This section will help to illustrate how the University and partner are working together to ensure quality and standards.

### 9. Changes to the Programme

*Summarise any changes made to the programme during the year and give the rationale behind them. Summarise proposed changes to be introduced in the coming academic session.*

### 10. Any other information

*Anything else relevant to monitoring? For example, external accreditation and review (PSRB/QAA), ways in which the programme has responded to equality and diversity requirements including issues of accessibility. Also any lessons or noteworthy practice drawn from: induction activities, subject updating, links with research, developments in work-based learning, employer liaison and opinion, international dimension, programme delivery, staffing, physical resources and facilities, staff development, alumni feedback.*

### 11. Summary of strengths (good practice which goes beyond the University's minimum requirements)

Strength	Evidence	Action to maintain strength/good practice
<i>Example: Students from L2 are involved with induction at L1 and mentor new students</i>	<i>Scheme introduced in 2004, staff note that L1 students settle into their studies more quickly, early withdrawals have reduced from 8% to 6%</i>	<i>Continue scheme; present at School away day to other programme leaders; ensure student mentors reflect their skills within PDP</i>

### 12. Action Plan for next academic year

Area for improvement	Planned action	Person responsible within programme team	Target date for completion

**13. Issues to be referred to**

**a) the School**

ie those strengths and issues where the School needs to take action to improve the learning opportunities for students (resource issues should be raised as part of School planning processes)

**b) the Faculty**

ie: issues residing at Faculty level such as cross-School programmes or co-ordination of learning technologies

**c) the University**

ie: larger more strategic issues that cannot be addressed directly with eg service providers or at School or Faculty levels

## INTERNAL REVIEW SCHEME

### PART 2 PERIODIC PROGRAMME REVIEW AND RE-APPROVAL

#### 1 CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION

- 1.1 The University is responsible for the academic standards of its awards and the quality of its programmes. The periodic review and re-approval of programmes is a key mechanism to assure the University, external stakeholders and our students about academic standards and quality. The University links the processes of periodic review and re-approval ie: review results in the updating of the full Programme Specification and a decision on whether or not a programme should be re-approved is a key outcome.
- 1.2 Academic authority rests with the Senate. This policy delegates the responsibility for approval, review and re-approval of programmes to Programme Approval and Review Sub-committees (PARSC). Senate receives an annual report on the operation of periodic programme review prepared by the Academic Quality & Standards Unit. In addition, all academic policies are reviewed systematically according to an agreed schedule in order to ensure that they remain effective and fit for purpose.
- 1.3 Independence and objectivity are central to both programme approval and programme review and are “essential to provide confidence that the standards and quality of the programmes are appropriate” (Draft QAA 2006 *Code of Practice: section 7*). The University ensures independence and objectivity in the periodic review and re-approval of its programmes by the participation of academic advisors of high calibre and standing external to the institution and by representatives of PSRBs (where agreed by the Professional Body) and through the constitution of the review panel which includes persons, including the Chair, independent of the ‘home’ Faculty.
- 1.4 Periodic programme review and re-approval as an institutional process draws on the annual monitoring of programmes within Schools. The outcomes of periodic programme review inform and are informed by the ways in which the University seeks to develop its academic portfolio and the quality of the educational experience offered. Summaries of periodic programme reviews are published and made available to the public, prospective students and other stakeholders via the TQi website.
- 1.5 Thus periodic programme review and re-approval reflects the guiding principles of **responsibility** for quality and standards; **externality** to provide objectivity and confidence; **enhancement** in the ways periodic review leads to planned improvement at both local and institutional levels and **equity** in that it monitors both quality and standards over time, is rigorous and provides reliable information on quality and standards.

#### 2 PURPOSES

- 2.1 To assure the University and external stakeholders of the continuing relevance and validity of the academic quality and standards of our awards.
- 2.2 To contribute to the identification and spread of good practice.
- 2.3 To identify and implement those positive steps which may be taken to enhance a programme at a local and an institutional level.
- 2.4 To consider re-approval of a programme of studies or otherwise.

### **3 TIMING AND SCOPE**

- 3.1 The periodic review and re-approval of a programme will take place at intervals of not more than five years in accordance with a schedule agreed between the School and their Faculty.
- 3.2 The process applies to all taught programmes leading to an award of the University.

### **4 SUMMARY PROCESS**

- 4.1 Periodic programme review involves:
- reflection by the programme team and School;
  - consultations with current and former students, employers, professional bodies and any other key stakeholders;
  - scrutiny of documentation since the previous review (or initial approval) including external examiners' reports and statistical information; and
  - the formal updating of the programme specification in light of reflection on evidence gathered, advances in discipline knowledge, external benchmarks, legislative and similar requirements, advances in pedagogy and the University's goals and priorities.
- 4.2 The outcome is the re-approval of the programme (potentially with conditions or recommendations) or a decision to withdraw.

### **5 PROCESS**

#### School

- 5.1 The process is initiated by the Secretary to PARSC of the 'home' Faculty who will meet the Head of School/Associate Head (Teaching) to agree a schedule identifying which of the School's programmes will be reviewed and seek re-approval in each year. Programmes must be reviewed and seek re-approval within five years of first approval or last re-approval.
- 5.2 At the start of each year, the Secretary to PARSC will meet the Head of School/ Associate Head (Teaching) to agree the timing of the review of each of the programmes scheduled for review in that year. In agreeing this timing, due regard will be given to the distribution through the year of load on the Faculty PARSC and the need for prior consultation with students.
- 5.3 As student opinion on the quality of a programme is one of the key ways in which programme(s) may be enhanced and developed, the Head of School will be requested by the Secretary to PARSC to initiate a process through which opinion of current students on the programme(s) of study may be obtained. This may be achieved via a student consultation meeting, the report of which will go to the Chair of PARSC, an open invitation for comments or other such methods which may be agreed – for example, written comments provided as a result of a questionnaire. The Faculty and School are requested to determine at an early stage, in consultation with students from the programme, the most suitable means of obtaining such input from students in order to allow time for consultation to take place and feed into the review
- 5.4 Those Schools and Faculties whose programmes are subject to validation by an external body may combine the consideration of periodic review and re-approval with the external re-validation meeting, provided that the function of the Faculty PARSC is fully achieved. This will ensure adequate independent externality, whilst ensuring constructive alignment and avoiding duplication of effort.

- 5.5 The Head of School will be asked by the Secretary to PARSC for the names of appropriate External Advisors whose expertise is relevant to the programme(s) under review and re-approval. Wherever possible these persons should not have been involved in the programme(s) nor have acted as External Examiner for any of the School's programmes during the current or preceding three years. The External Advisor will be nominated by the PVC (Teaching & Learning) on the recommendation of the Faculty (See section 8.).
- 5.6 The Head of School/Associate Head (Teaching) will consult the relevant Programme Team(s) and charge them with undertaking a review, producing a reflective analysis, revising and updating the Programme Specification and Module Specifications. The Programme Team(s) will draw upon available documentation provided by the School, most particularly, Annual Programme Review reports, External Examiners' reports, student statistics and reports from professional and other accreditation bodies where appropriate (See section 7 which details the evidence base for periodic programme review).
- 5.7 The Programme Team will prepare a reflective analysis of the performance of each individual programme (or cognate group of programmes, using the same groupings as used by the School in Annual Programme Reviews) since the previous review or initial approval, compiled as a reflective analysis using the template given in Annex A. In the completion of Annex A, it is important to include how the programme team was involved in undertaking the review and producing the reflective analysis and how it was considered within the School. Programmes involving collaborative provision should fully involve the partners in the process of review.
- 5.8 The reflective analysis should evaluate the following aspects of each programme:
- academic standards
  - quality of learning opportunities
  - enhancements
  - viability and market demand
- And make a recommendation on the future of programme.
- A template for the reflective analysis is provided as Annex A. The nature of the evidence base that the programme team will draw upon is outlined in section 7 (Evidence base for periodic programme review). The headings reflect the judgements that the PARSC is required to make and the report it has to produce (see Annex B); programme teams may also find it useful to refer to section 6 (Judgements).
- 5.9 The reflective analysis must be accompanied by the full Programme Specification(s) including all Module Specifications, updated or modified as appropriate. Also forwarded are the report from the Student Consultation Meeting (or agreed alternative), copies of External Examiners' reports for the previous three years and of any reports by PSRBs or other external agencies; programme statistics are included as part of the reflective analysis.
- 5.10 Following consideration within the School the reflective analysis, together with revised Programme and Module Specifications, and other documentation listed, must be signed off by the Head of School/Associate Head (Teaching) for all the programmes under review confirming the recommendations found in the evaluative analysis provided by the Programme Team. The documentation must then be forwarded to the Secretary to PARSC according to the agreed timing.

#### Faculty

- 5.11 On receipt of these documents at the Faculty Office, the Secretary to PARSC checks that the paperwork is complete and, if necessary refers it back to the School for correction and/or amendment. When it is found to be satisfactory, the Secretary to PARSC will forward all the documents to the Faculty PARSC, including its

External Advisor, for detailed consideration. The updated Programme and Module Specifications and reflective analysis should be accompanied by External Examiners' reports (most recent three years), any reports by PSRBs or external agencies and the report from the Student Consultation Meeting (or agreed equivalent); student statistics which date back either to the original programme approval or the previous periodic programme review will be included as part of the reflective analysis.

- 5.12 Where a programme is drawn from a single Faculty it will be considered by that Faculty PARSC. Where a programme is from more than one Faculty it will be considered by a sub-committee with members from each Faculty involved. Where a programme is offered collaboratively with another HEI it should be considered by a sub-committee with representatives from all participating HEIs involved. In the case where programmes are offered either cross-Faculty or collaboratively with another institution, the Chair and the membership of the sub-committee(s) must be appointed in such a way as to ensure both adequate representation and independence and objectivity.
- 5.13 An external expert will be appointed an External Advisor. The Faculty recommends appointment of the External Advisor on behalf of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning). He/she should not have been involved in the programme, nor have acted as External Examiner for the School during the current or preceding three years. The External Advisor is normally an academic of high calibre and credibility; where external participants are drawn from the professional world they must be able to comment with authority on the place of the programme within the FHEQ, the response to relevant subject benchmark statements and any PSRB requirements. Where appropriate two externals may be appointed, one from academia and one from industry. Section 8 details requirements and criteria more fully.
- 5.14 The External Advisor for a periodic programme review and re-approval will normally attend the meeting of the Faculty PARSC. If, however, for circumstances beyond his/her control the External Advisor is unable to attend the meeting, written comments will be required which will be circulated prior to the meeting for consideration at the same and the Chair will speak directly with the External Advisor prior to the meeting. However, the External Advisor should attend if (s)he, or the Chair, believes there are concerns with the programme(s) under review and the meeting re-scheduled as necessary.
- 5.15 The Faculty PARSC will consider the Programme and Module Specifications, the School's reflective analysis and supporting documentation and will discuss it with representatives of the Programme Team. It is the responsibility of the PARSC to make a formal decision on the re-approval of the programme, to agree any conditions and recommendations and identify good practice. Re-approval is only formally given once any conditions have been met. The Faculty PARSC must ensure that amendments which require approval by the University Teaching and Learning Committee must be forwarded for approval accordingly.
- 5.16 The PARSC will be concerned to assure itself that the academic standard of the programme, as described in the Programme Specification and Module Specifications, remains satisfactory in relation to the QAA's Academic Infrastructure. It will make judgements under the following headings:
- academic standards
  - quality of learning opportunities
  - enhancements
  - viability and market demand

as well as a formal decision on the future of the programme(s) under review choosing from one of the following options:

- i. that the programme should be re-approved and continue for the next five years or;
  - ii. that the programme(s) should continue for a specified period, of no more than five years, subject to specified conditions and recommendations; conditions normally being implemented by the start of the following academic session. Re-approval can only be confirmed when all conditions have been fulfilled or;
  - iii. that it should be discontinued from a date to be specified, subject to safeguards for students already on the programme.
- 5.17 The PARSC must be satisfied that the programme continues to meet the requirements of any relevant professional, statutory or regulatory body and that students who undertake the programme are able to satisfy the qualifications descriptors in the FHEQ. Where approval is for less than five years the reasons for this should be made clear.
- 5.18 The Secretary to PARSC will write to the Head of School whose programmes have been reviewed:
- a) confirming that the Periodic Review of the programmes (to be listed) from the (named School) has been completed:
  - b) provide a copy of the report of the review Panel which details the decision, any strengths and features of good practice, as well as any conditions and recommendations.
  - c) Indicate the date by which the School must supply responses with regard to any conditions or recommendations.
- 5.19 The Chair of the PARSC should sign off any conditions noted in (ii) above when they have been satisfactorily met (consulting the External Advisor and other panel members as necessary). The outcome of the report will be reported to the Faculty Board and the University Teaching and Learning Committee for information and the full report sent as soon as possible to the Academic and Quality Standards Unit which in turn is responsible for summarising the information for publication on the TQi website and reporting on the procedure to Senate. A copy of the full report will be sent by the Faculty to all external and student members of the panel.

## 6 JUDGEMENTS

- 6.1 In coming to a decision about the future of a programme and to identify any conditions or recommendations periodic programme review panels make judgements in four areas:
- academic standards
  - the quality of the learning opportunities
  - intentions for enhancement
  - viability and market demand
- 6.2 Panels are asked to confirm that the **academic standards** set by the programme are appropriate, reflect current knowledge and developments in the discipline and any requirements in the field (eg: from PSRBs) and are being attained by the students.
- 6.3 In coming to a judgement here, and in formulating any conditions or recommendations, the panel will confirm that the standards reflect the position of the award within the framework for higher education qualifications, PSRB requirements and have taken due cognisance of relevant subject benchmark

statements. Panels will draw on evidence from external examiners' reports and longitudinal data on student entry qualifications, progression and achievement.

- 6.4 Panels are asked to confirm that the **quality of the learning opportunities** are appropriate ie: that the curriculum, the teaching, learning and assessment methods used, the information, guidance and support offered and the learning resources available together provide learning opportunities of high quality that should facilitate the attainment of the intended learning outcomes by students.
- 6.5 In coming to a judgement here, and in formulating any conditions or recommendations, the panel will examine, with the programme team, the match between the intended learning outcomes, the curriculum, teaching, learning and assessment methods etc and the experience of students on the programme.
- 6.6 In forming a judgement about the **intentions for enhancement** the review panel will consider the changes made to the programme since approval/ the previous review and the ways in which the programme team has sought to ensure the currency of the programme, to incorporate advances in pedagogy, to develop graduate employability and to integrate external and internal initiatives and new developments (such as PDP or enterprise in the curriculum). However, the primary source of evidence will be the forward plan of the programme team and the ways in which it seeks to respond to the views of students and involve them in the management of the quality of the learning opportunities provided. Areas of good, interesting and innovative practice should be highlighted.
- 6.7 Panels are also asked to form a view on the **demand** for and **viability** of the programme. This is primarily an assessment of the extent to which the programme team is mindful of, and responds to, any shifts in demand from prospective students for the discipline in general and the programme at Salford in particular. Similarly, changes in demand for graduates in the discipline and in employer needs and expectations. Recommendations here will inform planning within the School.

## 7 EVIDENCE BASE FOR PERIODIC PROGRAMME REVIEW

- 7.1 The areas of academic standards, quality of the learning opportunities, intentions for enhancement and demand and viability are interlinked, however the indicative lists below highlight the main sources of evidence.
- 7.2 **Academic standards set and achieved**
- External examiner reports (from programme approval or previous review, and any which indicated 'NO' to one of the three key TQI questions since approval/previous review)
  - Data (since programme approval or previous review) on entry qualifications, progression/continuation and final award to include any comparators/ benchmarks available
  - Intended learning outcomes in relation to the FHEQ, PSRB requirements and any relevant subject benchmark statements
- 7.3 **Quality of learning/educational opportunities**
- Programme and module specifications (the curriculum)
  - Teaching, learning and assessment methods
  - Student achievement across the curriculum (i.e. in different modules/pathways) and of the intended learning outcomes
  - Consideration of the impact of following different modes of study (namely full-time, part-time and distance learning)
  - Programme handbooks (the information and guidance for students to support them in their learning)
  - Availability and deployment of learning resources (ICT, library services, use of learning technologies, discipline specific resources, generally teaching and learning accommodation, teaching and support staff etc)

- How developments in knowledge and thinking in the discipline and individual research and scholarship, are fed into the curriculum
- Evidence of how the programme has addressed the University's strategic goals and engaged with key initiatives eg: PDP, enterprise in the curriculum, etc)
- Evidence of how effective the programme is in developing the wider transferable skills of students
- How students are involved in the management of the quality of their learning opportunities
- How the programme takes account of the views of students, graduates and employers
- Staff-student minutes

#### 7.4 **Intentions for Enhancement**

- 7.4.1 This grows out of the above evidence as it draws on this evidence base in order to plan intended improvements to the quality of the student experience eg: the use made of APRs, student views, the way in which initiatives are being built upon, practice placement environment etc.
- 7.4.2 Programmes should also highlight local initiatives, TLQIS projects, externally funded projects, areas of innovation, interesting and good practice and indicate how these have been evaluated and used to enhance the student experience.

#### 7.5 **Market demand and viability**

- Trends regarding entry qualifications profile
  - Trends regarding applications profile (numbers of applications, offers, acceptances, enrolments)
  - Trends regarding student destinations profile (First Destinations and Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education)
  - Sector trends re applications and provision in the discipline
  - Graduate feedback
  - Consultation with employers and employer organisations
  - Other available information on stakeholder views, employer needs and industry trends
- 7.6 If information is not forthcoming from the relevant support section on any of the above, this should not be seen as a reason for not completing the relevant sections in Annex A and Annex B.

### 8 **APPOINTMENT OF EXTERNAL ADVISORS**

- 8.1 External Advisors should be individuals of high calibre and credibility. They are normally drawn from academia as the External Advisor must be able to comment with authority on academic standards within HE and be familiar with the QAA's academic infrastructure (especially the FHEQ, Subject Benchmark Statements and Programme Specifications). Where an External Advisor is drawn from industry or is the nominated representative of a PSRB this would normally be in addition to an academic External Advisor.
- 8.2 The function of the External Advisors is both to comment with authority on the programme and subject under review and to provide an independent and objective view to give the University itself, students and external stakeholders confidence in the judgement made.

- 8.3 Wherever possible External Advisors should not have had previous involvement in the programme or School. For example,
- External Advisors should not have acted as an External Examiner for any of the programmes in the School over the previous three years
  - External Advisors should not be used by the School as a 'critical friend' during the process of reflection and review or concurrently in the development of other programmes in the School
  - Reciprocal arrangements and similar conflicts of interest should be avoided (eg: no member of the School should be a serving External Examiner in the External Advisor's own Department)
- 8.4 External Advisors should be able to comment with authority on the programme under review and should be familiar with
- relevant subject benchmark statements
  - any PSRB requirements
  - the FHEQ
- 8.5 In general the University favours External Advisors who are academics within UK HE because of the nature of the specific judgment being made. The valued input of employers, professionals and practitioners in the field is best fitted to the review stage within the School. Programme teams and Schools are strongly encouraged actively to seek the views of and to involve external persons in the process of review in order to help ensure the currency and relevance of the curriculum and to explore how effectively the programme prepares its graduates for employment. This involvement is distinct from the formal involvement of an External Advisor appointed by the University for the purposes coming to a judgment as to whether or not a programme should be re-approved.

## **ANNEX A: TEMPLATE FOR PERIODIC PROGRAMME REVIEW AND RE-APPROVAL REFLECTIVE ANALYSIS (Programme Team)**

Download a copy of this form:

[www.academic.salford.ac.uk/aqa/forms/temp\\_ppr\\_reapproval\\_progteam.doc](http://www.academic.salford.ac.uk/aqa/forms/temp_ppr_reapproval_progteam.doc)

### **UNIVERSITY OF SALFORD**

**PERIODIC PROGRAMME REVIEW [period of review eg: 2000/01 to 2005/06]**

**SCHOOL OF .....**

### **PART A: INTRODUCTION**

- 1. Programme title(s) and award**
- 2. School(s) responsible for the programme**  
Also indicate any collaborative partners
- 3. Name of Programme Leader**
- 4. Summary of how the programme team undertook this review and produced the reflective analysis and its consideration within the School**
- 5. A brief history of the programme**  
e.g. when it commenced, how it links to other programmes, summarise any major changes or important factors, especially over the last five years.
- 6. Programme statistics for the past five years**  
i.e. tables showing applications, admissions, retention, progression and achievement information drawn from Annual Programme Review reports, statistics on the PESU site and those circulated by the Academic Quality and Standards Unit; destinations of graduates. These may be appended to the report if this is more convenient.

### **PART B: PROGRAMME REVIEW**

#### **ACADEMIC STANDARDS**

- 7. The educational aims of the programme**  
This should include a commentary on the fit of the programme with the FHEQ
- 8. The intended learning outcomes of the programme and the extent to which these are being realised;**  
i.e. what the student should be, and is, capable of in terms of knowledge and understanding, skills and other attributes; the extent to which the intended learning outcomes are being realised by students on the programme; how the programme has responded to relevant subject benchmark statement(s) and any PSRB requirements
- 9. Comments on statistics with respect to Academic Standards**  
Commentary on identifiable trends in retention, achievement or graduate destinations? How do these figures compare with targets and/or appropriate national or subject performance indicators, where available? How is any significant divergence from national or subject performance indicators accounted for? What actions have been taken in response to any trends which you have identified? How effective do you think these actions have been?

**10. Comments from the External Examiners**

What have been the External Examiners significant comments over the past five years? What actions have been taken, in response to the comments, to develop the curriculum or teaching, learning and assessment strategies or processes? Have any recommendations not been acted upon, if so, what are these and what were the reasons why recommendations have not been acted upon?

**11. Comments from external/accreditation bodies (where applicable) and action taken in response to these comments**

e.g. report(s) of an accreditation visit by a professional or statutory body

**QUALITY OF LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES PROVIDED****12. Reflection on the programme and learning opportunities provided for students**

How do the curriculum, the teaching, learning and assessment methods, the range and availability of learning resources and the academic support provided for students work together to offer an appropriate and high quality learning environment that facilitates the attainment of the intended learning outcomes by students on the programme? How does the programme seek to fulfil University strategic goals through the learning experience provided?

**13. Issues raised by students in their feedback on their learning experience and actions taken in response**

Consideration of and responses to the student consultation meeting by the programme team. What have been the most significant points raised by students over the past five years? What actions have you taken in response? Have there been any issues which you have been unable to resolve?

**14. Feedback from graduates and employers and other stakeholders**

Consideration of any feedback from graduates from the programme and from employers and from any other key stakeholders.

**15. Significant changes to the programme**

Evaluate any significant changes to the programme over the last five years, explaining the rationale for these changes, using the headings below. Evaluate how these have enhanced the learning experience for students and the currency of the curriculum.

- Programme structure
- Content
- Teaching, learning and assessment strategies
- Student support and guidance
- Learning resources
- Arising from key external requirements (e.g. PSRB, QAA, HEFCE, SENDA/DDA, RRAA) and University goals and initiatives (eg: internationalisation, enterprise, employability, PDP) if not covered above.

**ENHANCEMENT****16. Currency and relevance**

Reflections on how the programme team have sought to ensure the currency of the curriculum, responded to advances in the discipline and in pedagogy and fit with the University strategy and mission

**17. Plans for enhancement**

Detail, preferably in the form of an action plan with milestones, the plans of the programme team and School for the enhancement of the student learning experience over the next two to three years, including any initiatives or particular projects

**18. Proposed changes to the programme**

Describe proposed changes to the programme which you wish to be approved as part of the periodic programme review

**19. Strengths and good practice associated with the programme**

Features which make the programme distinctive and practice which has been or is considered worth disseminating more broadly throughout the University

**VIABILITY AND MARKET DEMAND****20. Applications and admission**

Evaluation of information on applications and admission over the past five years and an assessment of the demand for the programme and for the discipline nationally

**21. Career opportunities and employer needs**

Assessment of the career opportunities for graduates and of employer expectations and needs with respect to the programme and discipline area

**22. Your view of the future of the programme**

How do you expect the programme to develop over the next few years? What do you anticipate as being the most significant changes to the programme? What will be the major drivers for these changes?

**PART C: PROGRAMME REAPPROVAL****23. Formal recommendation**

The School is required to make a formal recommendation on the future of the programme. The range of options is as follows:

- a) that the programme, revised as proposed in any modified programme specification, should be re-approved and continue; or
- b) that it should be discontinued from a date to be specified, subject to safeguards for students already on the programme.

The Reflective Analysis, including the programme statistics, should be forwarded to the Secretary to PARSC together with:

- An updated Programme Specification and all Module Specifications
- Copies of External Examiners' Reports (previous three years only)
- Report from the student consultation meeting (or equivalent direct representation of student views)
- Copies of any reports by PSRBs or other external agencies (previous three years only)

**ANNEX B: TEMPLATE FOR PERIODIC PROGRAMME REVIEW AND RE-APPROVAL  
PANEL REPORT**

Download a copy of this form:

[www.academic.salford.ac.uk/aqa/forms/temp\\_ppr\\_reapproval\\_panelreport.doc](http://www.academic.salford.ac.uk/aqa/forms/temp_ppr_reapproval_panelreport.doc)

**UNIVERSITY OF SALFORD**

**PERIODIC PROGRAMME REVIEW [Year eg: 2001/02 to 2006/07]**

**PROGRAMME DETAILS**

Programme title(s) and award:

School(s) responsible for the programme and any collaborative partners involved:

Name of Programme Leader:

Overview of the main characteristics of the programmes covered by the review:

**PANEL DETAILS**

Chair:

External Advisor(s): [name and institution]

Date of meeting:

**Date of Programme confirmed as re-approved**

[Programme title] is re-approved for a period [number] years; any conditions set by the panel have been met.

Signed ..... [Chair of Panel] ..... [date]

**ACADEMIC STANDARDS**

Does the Review Panel consider that:

- the academic standards reflect the position of the award within the framework for higher education qualifications, PSRB requirements and the subject benchmark statement?
- the programme reflects current knowledge and developments in the discipline?
- the standards set and intended learning outcomes being attained by students on the programme are appropriate

Strengths and good practice:

Conditions and recommendations:

**QUALITY OF LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES**

Does the Review Panel consider that:

- the curriculum, the teaching, learning and assessment methods, the range and availability of learning resources and the academic support provided for students work together to offer an appropriate and high quality learning environment that facilitates the attainment of the intended learning outcomes by students?
- students have been supported and monitored from intake to completion?
- learning resources have been effectively deployed to support the learning of students?
- employability and career development are considered in the programme delivery?

Strengths and good practice:

Conditions and recommendations:

**ENHANCEMENT**

Does the Review Panel consider that:

- the programme team has kept abreast of developments in knowledge in the discipline?
- the team has responded to advances in pedagogy?
- the programme has continued to reflect University strategic goals appropriately?
- the team has responded appropriately to internal and external initiatives (eg: PDP, enterprise in the curriculum)?
- students are involved appropriately in the management of the quality of their learning experience, their views considered and responded to?
- the team identify and seek to disseminate examples of interesting, innovative and effective practice?
- the future plans for the further development of the programme and learning opportunities are appropriate?

Strengths and good practice:

Conditions and recommendations:

**VIABILITY AND MARKET DEMAND**

Does the Review Panel consider that:

- there is current and likely future demand for the programme(s) of study from prospective students and that the programme team assess viability effectively?
- there is current and likely future demand for graduates from the programme and that the programme team are responsive to shifts in employer needs and expectations?

Strengths and good practice:

Conditions and recommendations:

**FORMAL DECISION REGARDING RE-APPROVAL**

The Review Panel is required to make a formal recommendation on the future of the programme. The range of options is as follows:

- i. that the programme should be re-approved and continue for the next five years;
- ii. that the programme(s) should continue for a specified period, of no more than five years, subject to specified conditions and recommendations; conditions normally being implemented by the start of the following academic session. Re-approval can only be confirmed when all conditions have been fulfilled; or
- iii. that it should be discontinued from a date to be specified, subject to safeguards for students already on the programme.

**DECISION**

*Please insert. The date by which programme teams are expected to meet any conditions should be indicated.*

Signed ..... [Chair] ..... [date]

Signed ..... [External Advisor]..... [date]

### **Note re conditions, recommendation and re-approval for less than five years:**

#### **Conditions**

These are regarded as items which should be acted upon as a matter of urgency as they put either academic standards or the quality of students' learning experience at risk, resulting actions should normally be implemented before the start of the following academic session, where this is not appropriate or possible a date should be indicated. Actions on conditions should be reported to the Chair of the panel who will make a judgment as to whether the condition(s) have been adequately fulfilled and formally sign them off when they have been. The Chair may consult the external advisor or other panel members before agreeing to sign off conditions. The follow up and signing off of conditions are reported to the Academic Quality & Standards Unit.

#### **Recommendations**

These are advisory to the School and programme team. They are items which should be considered and responded to normally within 12 months of the review. Responses to recommendations should be reported to the Faculty which is responsible for ensuring that recommendations have been followed up appropriately. Recommendations may be about the dissemination or development of strengths/features of good practice as well as about areas of concern which are important but not essential to a decision to re-approve.

#### **Re-approval for less than five years**

There could be a range of reasons why approval is for less than five years. For example, there may be a range of concerns or requirements for complex actions that go beyond what can be reasonably dealt with by conditions or there could be a concern about viability and market demand. Although new areas of activity or of higher risk would normally be considered at programme approval, there may also be reasons (such as the expansion or the extension of a programme to new partners or new forms of delivery) that might lead to a recommendation for a period less than five years. Re-approval for less than five years can trigger a full periodic programme review but may require only the re-approval of the programme (if, for example concerns were mainly about the currency of the curriculum) and, conversely, may only require review (for example, if an established programme was about to be delivered with a series of collaborative partners there might only be a review of the student experience with those partners).

## ANNEX C

### CONSTITUTION OF FACULTY PROGRAMME APPROVAL AND REVIEW SUB-COMMITTEES (PARSCs)

#### 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Each Faculty has a Programme Approval and Review Sub-committee (PARSC) which plays a key role in the approval, amendment and periodic review and re-approval of programmes. It is responsible for: recommending Outline Approval and granting Detailed Approval of new programmes, conducting the periodic review and re-approval of programmes, approving PARSC Amendments and recommending approval of TLC Amendments.
- 1.2 The PARSC plays a valuable role in maintaining consistency of standards across the University and in disseminating good practice. The sub-committee will receive all documentation and will consider the proposed curriculum from a broader experience of curriculum design.

#### 2 CONSTITUTION

- 2.1 The minimum membership provisions of PARSC shall be as follows:

- i) Chair, an independent person from another Faculty appointed by the PVC (Teaching and Learning) from a panel of suitably experienced and trained individuals<sup>1</sup>
- ii) An independent institutional nominee, i.e. not from the home Faculty
- iii) Associate Dean (Teaching) (*ex officio*)
- iv) the Associate Heads Teaching of Schools from the home Faculty on the understanding that they not be involved in the decision making process for approval or review of programmes from their respective Schools (although support may be provided for programme team leaders from their School invited to the meeting)
- v) One external advisor, chosen to have academic expertise appropriate to the programme under consideration<sup>2</sup>
- vi) One representative of EDU
- vii) One representative of ISD<sup>3</sup>
- viii) A student representative, selected by the students from a programme being reviewed<sup>4</sup>

- 2.2 Additional members may be appointed to PARSC as follows:

- i) A representative of a Professional Statutory or Regulatory Body where approval or review is being conducted as a joint/shared process
- ii) A representative from industry, the community or other external stakeholders
- iii) A student liaison representative from the School
- iv) An independent person with appropriate experience and/or expertise in flexible and distributed learning when such a mode of delivery is being considered
- v) Additional external advisors to provide the necessary range of subject expertise when joint/complex programmes are under consideration.

<sup>1</sup> e.g. designated individuals drawn from current/recent Associate Deans (Teaching), Director of Quality and Standards, current/recent chairs of relevant sub-committees of Teaching and Learning Committee, current/recent members of Teaching and Learning Committee

<sup>2</sup> in attendance primarily for consideration of the Detailed Scheme and Periodic Review / Re-approval of a programme

<sup>3</sup> normally the person responsible for Faculty liaison

<sup>4</sup> for Periodic Programme Review and Re-approval only

## **INTERNAL REVIEW SCHEME**

### **PART 3 SCHOOL REVIEW**

#### **1. PURPOSE**

- 1.1 To review overall School performance and management in teaching, research and academic enterprise in the context of the University's and Faculty's aims and objectives.
- 1.2 To provide evidence of this performance for the University and other *stakeholders*.

#### **2. FOCUS**

- 2.1 School Review will principally consider:
  - a) the School's strategy and plans;
  - b) the School's scheme of management and its appropriateness for achieving the School's strategy;
  - c) the School's image and standing within the internal and external communities and its links with those communities;
  - d) support for learning within all the School's programmes, including the School's arrangements for engagement with support units, such as ISD;
  - e) arrangements for academic and pastoral support for students within the School, including the Personal Tutor Scheme;
  - f) the level of research activity within the School, how this informs teaching, and the School's relationship with cognate Research Institutes;
  - g) the School's implementation of the University's commitment to minimum standards of provision for post-graduate research students;
  - h) the level of academic enterprise activity, both that integrated with existing teaching and research and that mounted as separate commercial activity;
  - i) the deployment of School resources including staff, accommodation, facilities and equipment;
  - j) the quality and extent of the information available to the School's staff and students;
  - k) the School's compliance with Faculty and University requirements.

#### **3. NATURE OF SCHOOL REVIEW**

- 3.1 The review of a School is held in a five-year cycle which is agreed in advance and reported to the Senate.
- 3.2 A School Review is undertaken by a panel whose members are all external to the School. There are members from other Schools in the 'home' Faculty, from other Faculties and external to the University. The membership is intended to assist in the dissemination of good practice throughout the University.

- 3.3 The key input to the School Review process is the considered self-evaluative input by the School staff, not only in the formal School self-evaluation document but also in the engagement of staff in the debate prompted by the School Review process.
- 3.4 The self-evaluation should be based on a retrospective assessment of the School's effectiveness, on how this currently impacts on the evolution of the School, and how this will shape the School's agenda and strategy in measurable terms for the future. A recurrent theme in that self-evaluation will be the prioritisation between, but also the synergy between, the Teaching, Research and Academic Enterprise strands within the School.
- 3.5 The Panel members will be sent some of the School's key documents, including the self-evaluation, and two Panel members will review the School's 'baseroom' document collection.
- 3.6 The Panel will visit the School for 2 days when it will meet the School's staff and a cross section of its students; observe the School's accommodation and facilities; and have an opportunity for further consultation of the 'baseroom' documents.
- 3.7 The Panel will produce a report which will be considered by the Board of Faculty<sup>5</sup>, along with the School's response. The Board of Faculty will agree an action plan, intended to reinforce strengths and deal with areas that need attention.

#### **4. MEMBERSHIP**

- 4.1 The membership of the Review Panel shall be as follows:
- Dean from another Faculty (Chair)
  - Associate Dean not from the School but from the 'home' Faculty
  - Head of School not from the School but from the 'home' Faculty
  - Associate Dean or Head of School from a third Faculty
  - Two (or exceptionally three) external members from cognate disciplines

A member of staff from Chair's Faculty Office will act as Review Secretary

- 4.2 In the unlikely event that it is not possible to establish a Panel with membership precisely as defined above, advice should be sought from the Teaching and Learning section of the Academic Division.

#### **5. PROCESS**

##### Preparation

- 5.1 Approximately six months before the planned date of the visit to the School the Review Chair will contact the Head of School to discuss the requirements of the process, including the need to produce a self-evaluation document.
- 5.2 A visit to the 'baseroom', established to house Core Documentation and Supporting Material (see below), will take place at least six weeks before the visit to the School and will be undertaken by two members of the Review Panel, namely, the Head of School not from the School itself but from the 'home' Faculty and the Review Secretary.

---

<sup>5</sup> Throughout this document the term 'Board of Faculty' refers to the Board of the 'home' Faculty, i.e. the one of which the School is part.

- 5.3 The purpose of this visit is to assess the completeness of the collection of key documents and, through sampling, to assess the quality of these documents.

Visit to School

- 5.4 The duration of the visit is 2 days.
- 5.5 The itinerary for the visit will include a tour of School's facilities, meetings with the School's management group, other staff and students and an opportunity to sample baseroom documentation.
- 5.6 At the end of the visit, the Review Panel will provide oral feedback on its preliminary conclusions and recommendations to the School's management group. The Dean will be invited to this meeting.

**6. STANDARD DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED FOR SCHOOL REVIEW**

List A : Core Documentation

- 6.1 The School will be asked to supply the required documents to the Review Secretary approximately four weeks before the visit to the School, and s/he will amalgamate the contributions from various sources into a set of spiral-bound documentation. These documents should be circulated to all members of the Review Panel.
- A list of all staff, giving their categories and principal roles in the School.
  - A summary CV for each member of academic staff.
  - the School strategic plan, together with the current academic and business plan(s).
  - School's Scheme of Management.
  - School self-evaluation document.
  - The most recent School Annual Programme Review summary report.
  - Research report. A brief report on the role of research within the School (evidenced, for example, by the number of staff who are full members of a Research Institute and the proportion of staff who were returned in the RAE); linkage with the RI. [The Research Institute Review process will look in full at research activity; this section is intended to give a picture of the significance of research in relation to the School's range of activities]
  - Academic Enterprise report. A brief report on the scope and scale of Academic Enterprise activity within the School (evidenced by, for example, the number of staff involved, the level of income to the School and the nature of the activities).
  - Current School budget statement.
  - The report of the visit by two Panel members to review the 'baseroom' document collection.

and, after the first round of School Review:

- The report of the previous review, together with the School's response, the follow-up report and the mid-term review report.

List B: Supporting Material

6.2 All documents listed in ' Information held in Schools - School Documentation' should be available in the 'baseroom' to the Panel.

6.3 Any other documents referred to in the self-evaluation.

**7. REPORTING PROCESS**

7.1 The Review Panel will prepare a written report on the review which:

- describes in outline the process undertaken;
- draws conclusions on those areas in which the School is to be commended and those to which the School is asked to give consideration;
- makes appropriate recommendations.

7.2 The Review Panel Report will be forwarded to the School for factual correction. The (revised) Report and School response, including proposed actions and recommendations, will then be submitted to the Board of Faculty. The Board of Faculty will prepare a report, which will indicate the proposed actions and recommendations, to Teaching and Learning Committee, Research Committee and any equivalent body for Academic Enterprise.

**8. FOLLOW UP**

8.1 The Faculty will monitor the agreed action plan.

8.2 In those cases **where serious concerns were identified**, the School will submit an initial progress report to the Faculty three months after the plan's agreement by the Board of Faculty. The Faculty will decide whether further interim progress reports are required and, if so, when.

8.3 In all cases, the School will submit a progress report to the Faculty a year after the visit.

8.4 The Chair of School Review (or her/his successor as Dean) will:

- a) meet the Dean of the 'home' Faculty and Head of School at mid-cycle, to discuss progress since the Review, and
- b) produce a written report which will be submitted to the Board of Faculty.

## INTERNAL REVIEW SCHEME

### PART 4 - RESEARCH INSTITUTE REVIEW (updated 4 Jan 2005)

#### 1 MEMBERSHIP

1.1 A Review Panel comprising:

- Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) (Chair)
- Director of Graduate Studies
- Dean or Associate Dean (Teaching) from another Faculty
- Research Institute Director/Associate Dean (Research) from a third Faculty
- Two external members

1.2 An officer of the Research and Graduate College staff will act as Secretary

#### 2 MAIN PURPOSES

- a) To consider the Research Institute's strategy and in particular how the Strategy relates to the University's overall strategy for research and the Faculty's strategies for research, within both the longer term and the next Research Assessment Exercise.
- b) To consider the Research Institute's discharge of its responsibilities towards its members and its postgraduate research students.

#### 3 PURPOSES AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

A Review will consider principally the following matters:

##### Research Profile

- a) The Research Institute's standing and profile within the University's, the regional, the national and the international academic communities.
- b) The Research Institute's achievement of a high collective output. A primary source of evidence in this consideration will be the quality and quantity of papers and presentations or other relative deliverables.
- c) The Research Institute's marketing and promotion of its research activity to achieve maximum presence in its research community and amongst potential users of the work of members.
- d) The Research Institute's engagement with external parties including Research Councils, commercial sponsors and other institutions both at home and abroad. A primary source of evidence in this consideration will be the value and nature of research grants and contracts.
- e) The Research Institute's reaction to the previous RAE gradings and its planned preparation for the next RAE.

##### Postgraduate Research Students

- f) The student experience within the Research Institute, including the use of Learning Agreements, Annual Progress Reports (completed by the

Supervisor) and Postgraduate Researcher Annual Self-Evaluation Reports, to assure a satisfactory level of supervision and support. A primary source of evidence in the consideration will be research student recruitment, retention and completion/submission rates.

- g) The fostering of a supportive research environment for postgraduate research students and particularly the relevant research training opportunities offered.

#### Research Management and Administration

- h) Whether the administrative and resourcing arrangements for Research facilitate the provision of a research ethos within the Research Institute and the provision of sufficient opportunity for Research Institute members to engage in research. To this end the Review will look at:
- the operation of the resource allocation model and its effect on the Research Institute in terms of the provision of equipment and consumables.
  - the allocation of duties, in negotiation with Heads of School, via appraisal and workload allocation, between research, academic enterprise, teaching and administration.
  - the Research Institute's engagement, in tandem with the Faculties and Schools, with the University's academic and business planning process.
- i) the operation of the Research Institute Executive and Board including the arrangements for membership of the Research Institute. In this regard the Review would look particularly at
- the mechanisms for the appointment to and subsequent review of membership and the setting of individual performance targets. The Review will not however seek to evaluate individual staff performance.
  - the mechanisms for the admission of postgraduate research students to the Research Institute
  - the mechanisms for the quality assurance of individual postgraduate research students' progression, Annual Progress Reports, Interim/Transfer Assessments and Internal Evaluations, and final assessment and for consideration of the overall good standing of the University's research awards.
  - the consideration given to academic appeals by the Research Institute since the last Research Institute Review
- the aim would be to determine how the Research Institute collects and responds to issues raised by postgraduate research students and to allow the Research Institute to demonstrate how it is administering procedures and processes relating to postgraduate research students in accord with University Regulations.
- j) the position of contract researchers within the Research Institute.
- k) the support to the Research Institute from the central services provided by the Research and Graduate College and University Support Units and the Research Institute's call upon central pump-priming funds such as those for Research Investment.
- l) support provided by related Faculties and Schools.

#### **4 PRELIMINARY STAGE**

4.1 Internal members of the Review Panel to hold open, agenda-setting meetings with

- a) Research Institute members and staff
- b) Postgraduate research students

Electronic circulation of invitation to

- a) Research Institute members and staff
- b) Postgraduate research students

to attend open, agenda-setting meetings and/or to make prior written comment to the Review.

4.2 The Research Institute Director, in consultation with the relevant Associate Dean (Research) and senior members of the Research Institute, provides a self-reflective analysis as a covering report for the Review Panel to assist their understanding of other documentation submitted to evidence the Research Institute's strategy, current position and discharge of its responsibilities.

#### **5 DURATION**

To be determined in the context of information received at the Preliminary Stage but in no instance to be less than 1 day.

#### **6 INPUTS**

Research Institute Director's analysis  
Other documentation either existing or produced by Research and Graduate College officers.

#### **7 REPORTING PROCESS**

7.1 The Review Panel's report, with Externals' reports appended, will be forwarded to the Research Institute for factual correction. The (revised) report will then be submitted to the Research Institute and to relevant Faculties for response. The Research Institute and the relevant Faculties (those Faculties with members in the Research Institute reviewed) will wish to liaise on their responses so as to avoid duplication or contradiction. The report and responses will be submitted to Research Committee.

7.2 Research Committee will forward the report and responses, identifying proposed actions and recommendations as necessary, to Senate.

#### **8 FOLLOW UP**

Interim, mid-cycle, Research Institute reports will be made to the Research Committee.

#### Footnote:

A similar process, adapted as necessary, will also be applied to cross-University Research Centres.

## **INTERNAL REVIEW SCHEME**

### **PART 5 FACULTY REVIEW**

#### **1 PURPOSE**

- 1.1 To review overall Faculty performance and, in particular its management of teaching, research and academic enterprise in the context of the Faculty's strategy and the University's aims and objectives.
- 1.2 To provide evidence of this performance for the University and its stakeholders.

#### **2 FOCUS**

- 2.1 Faculty Review will principally consider:
- a) the Faculty's strategy and plans;
  - b) the Faculty's scheme of management and its appropriateness for achieving the Faculty's strategy;
  - c) the implementation of the University's policies and strategies for Teaching and Learning, Research and Academic Enterprise;
  - d) the discharge by the Faculty of its quality assurance and enhancement remit, as delegated by Senate, and, in particular, the proper conduct of its responsibilities for:
    - approving new taught programmes and amendments of existing programmes;
    - monitoring the academic standards of the Faculty's programmes;
    - monitoring the operation of the Annual Programme Reviews by Schools;
    - conducting the Periodic Programme Review of the Faculty's programmes;
    - responding in a satisfactory manner to reports of the Review of its Schools and Research Institute(s);
  - e) the effective management and deployment by the Faculty of its resources including staff, accommodation, facilities and equipment;
  - f) the Faculty's overview of the promotion of Research within its Research Institute(s);
  - g) the Faculty's overview of the promotion of academic enterprise within its Schools and Research Institute(s);
  - h) the Faculty's role in effecting the transfer of good practice between its Schools and between the Faculty and other parts of the University;
  - i) the Faculty's collaboration with other parts of the University, as appropriate;
  - j) the Faculty's success as a vehicle by which a range of associated disciplines is fostered and its role in enhancing its image and standing and those of its Schools within the internal and external communities and its links with those communities

- k) the quality and extent of the information available in the Faculty;
- l) the Faculty's compliance with University requirements.

### 3 NATURE OF FACULTY REVIEW

- 3.1 The review of a Faculty is held in the fifth year of a five-year cycle, its Schools and Research Institutes having been reviewed in the first four, according to an agreed schedule.
- 3.2 A Faculty Review, which draws on the output of the review of its Schools and Research Institutes, is undertaken by a panel whose members are all external to the Faculty and one of whom is external to the University.
- 3.3 The key input to the Faculty Review process is the formal Faculty self-evaluation document. This self-evaluation should be based on a retrospective assessment of the Faculty's effectiveness, on how this currently impacts on the evolution of the Faculty, and how this will shape the Faculty's strategy for the future.
- 3.4 The Panel members will be sent some of the Faculty's key documents, including the self-evaluation.
- 3.5 The Panel will visit the Faculty for one day when it will meet the Faculty Executive, additional members of the Faculty Board and Faculty support staff; observe the Faculty's accommodation and facilities; and have an opportunity for further consultation of the Faculty's key documents.
- 3.6 The Panel will produce a report which will be considered by the Senate, along with the Faculty's response. The Senate will agree an action plan, intended to reinforce strengths and deal with areas that need attention.

### 4 MEMBERSHIP

- 4.1 The membership of the Review Panel shall be as follows:
  - Pro Vice-Chancellor (Chair)
  - Dean from another Faculty
  - Lay member of University Council
  - External member (senior member of staff e.g. Pro-Vice-Chancellor or Dean from a cognate discipline in another University)
- 4.2 A member of Academic Division staff will act as Secretary
- 4.3 In the unlikely event that it is not possible to establish a Panel with membership precisely as defined above, advice should be sought from the Teaching and Learning section of the Academic Division.

### 5 PROCESS

#### Preparation

- 5.1 Approximately **six months** before the planned date of the visit to the Faculty the Review Chair will contact the Dean to discuss the requirements of, and arrangements for, the process

Visit to Faculty

- 5.2 The duration of the visit is one day.
- 5.3 The itinerary for the visit will include a sight of the Faculty's accommodation and facilities, meetings with the Faculty's Executive, members of the Faculty Board, other Faculty staff and an opportunity to sample 'background' documentation.
- 5.4 At the end of the visit, the Review Panel will provide oral feedback on its preliminary conclusions and recommendations to the Faculty Executive.

**6 STANDARD DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED FOR FACULTY REVIEW**List A: Core Documentation

- 6.1 The Faculty will be asked to supply the required documents to the Review Secretary approximately four weeks before the Panel's visit to the Faculty, and s/he will amalgamate the contributions from various sources into a set of spiral-bound documentation. These documents should be circulated to all members of the Review Panel.
- A list of all Faculty Office staff, giving their categories and principal roles in the Faculty.
  - A summary CV for the Dean and Associate Deans.
  - Faculty strategic plan, together with the current academic and business plan(s).
  - Faculty's Scheme of Management.
  - Faculty self-evaluation document.
  - Current Faculty budget statement.
  - Reports on the reviews of each of its Schools, together with the School's response, the resulting agreed action plans and progress reports.
  - Mid-cycle, interim reports on School Reviews.
  - Reports on the reviews of each of its associated Research Institutes, together with the Institute's response, the resulting agreed action plans and progress reports.

and, after the first round of Faculty Review:

- The report of the previous review, together with the Faculty's response.

List B: Supporting Material

- 6.2 These documents should be available to the Panel during their visit, in a convenient location and an environment in which they can be easily consulted by the Panel members.

- The following sets of reports and minutes for the last three years:
  - Minutes of the Board and Council of Faculty.
  - Minutes of the Faculty Executive
  - Reports of the Programme Approval sub-committee
  - Reports of the Faculty Teaching Development Committee.
  - Reports of the Faculty Promotions Committee
  - Faculty Reports on the Annual Programme Review process
- All other documents referred to in the self-evaluation.

## 7 REPORTING PROCESS

7.1 The Review Panel will prepare a report on the review which:

- describes in outline the process undertaken;
- draws conclusions on those areas in which the Faculty is to be commended and those to which the Faculty is asked to give consideration;
- makes appropriate recommendations.

7.2 The Review Panel's report will be forwarded to the Dean of Faculty for factual correction. The (revised) report will then be considered by the Board of Faculty and a Faculty response prepared. The report and Faculty response, including proposed actions and recommendations, will be submitted to the Senate with cross-referrals as necessary to Teaching and Learning Committee and Research Committee.

## 8 FOLLOW UP

8.1 The Senate will monitor the agreed action plan.

- a) In those cases where serious concerns were identified, the Faculty will submit an initial progress report to the Senate **three months** after the plan's agreement by the Senate. The Senate will decide whether further interim progress reports are required and, if so, when.
- b) In all cases, the Faculty will submit a progress report **a year** after the visit.

8.2 The Chair of Faculty Review (or her/his successor as Pro Vice Chancellor) will:

- a) meet the Dean at **mid-cycle**, to discuss progress since the Review, and
- b) produce a report which will be submitted to the Senate.

## UNIVERSITY OF SALFORD

REVIEW of the Faculty of [.....Name of Faculty.....] - Dates of Visit

## SCHEDULE OF REVIEW VISIT

Venue: [.....Name of Building.....]

TIME	ACTIVITY	RELEVANT PARTICIPANTS
8.30 a.m.	Assemble in Dean's Office	Review Panel
8.30 - 9.00 a.m.	Visit to Faculty Office (and any other relevant facilities)	Review Panel / Faculty Administrator / Dean
9.00 – 9.55 a.m.	Initial Private Meeting	Review Panel
10.00 – 11.10 a.m.	Meeting with Faculty Executive	Review Panel / Faculty Executive
11.15 - 11.40 a.m.	Private Meeting	Review Panel
11.45 - 12.40 p.m.	Meeting with Key Faculty Academic Members of Staff *	Review Panel Associate Deans / Head of School / Associate Heads of School / RI Directors
12.45 – 1.40 p.m.	Working Lunch	Review Panel
1.45 - 2.25 p.m.	Meeting with Faculty/School Administrative Staff *	Review Panel Faculty Administrator / Administrative Assistant / School Administrator
2.30 – 4.10 p.m.	Panel members study "background", supporting documents. Agree outcome and recommendations.	Review Panel
4.15 - 4.30 p.m.	Feedback meeting with Faculty Executive	Review Panel / Faculty Executive
4.30 p.m.	Formal business ends. External member prepares notes for incorporation into document before leaving.	
* Not all Faculty/School staff will be present in meeting, but all to be on "standby".		