

**Report of the Periodic Review of *[Department name and School]* on *[date]* at *[location],* University of Worcester**

**Panel Members**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Name and panel role*  | *Job title and School/Institution/Organisation* |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

1. **Objectives of Periodic Review**

Periodic Review is a key process in the University’s quality assurance and enhancement management framework. It is one of the principal means by which the University assures itself of the current and future health of its taught degree courses. The process focuses on the management of academic standards and quality at academic department level against a set of University expectations.

All Departments are required to undertake a periodic review every six years. The review is conducted by an independent Review Panel and covers a Department’s management of academic standards and quality in relation to the portfolio of taught undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. The Evaluation and Development Document (EDD) forms the focus of discussions between the Department and the Review Panel, whose report and recommendations are intended to assure the University of the effectiveness of the Department’s arrangements for managing quality and standards in relation to learning and teaching, to identify good practice and make recommendations for actions to improve the quality of provision.

1. **Department Overview**

*Overview of the Department and main characteristics of the programmes covered by the review; this will draw on the overview by the Department in its commentary*

*Table listing all of the Courses*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course** | **Abbreviation** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Context for Judgements, Action(s), Commendation(s) and Affirmation(s)**

1. **Conduct of Review**

*Summary statement of how the review was carried out, to include reference to key documentation and meetings held, how the Panel agreed the report (amend as appropriate)*

Documentation including the EDD was made available to the Panel, 3 weeks ahead of the first panel meeting. Documentation provided is listed in Appendix 1.

The review meetings were in two stages. The first panel meeting was held on the xxx2018 and consisted of a meeting with students and stakeholders and identified lines of enquiry for the second meeting. Additional information was requested following the first panel meeting. Documentation provided is listed in Appendix 2.

The second meeting was held on the xxx2019 and the Panel met with key members of the Department under review, including the Senior Management Team, Head of Academic Department, course leaders for major courses and/or courses identified by the Panel, and the relevant academic librarian.

1. **Tour of Specialist Resources**

*[Where appropriate, brief details of subject resources and associated facilities viewed by the Panel using bullet points/list]*

1. **Meeting with Students and Graduates**

The Panel met with x first year students, x second year students and x graduates from the courses under review:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course** | **Level** |
|  |  |

Students were asked a range of questions to determine what “worked” and “did not work” within their student academic experience. Key points arising from the meeting with students were as follows: *[Use bullet points]*

*This section of the report may be completed following Meeting 1 and agreed ahead of Meeting 2.*

1. **Meeting with Employers/Mentors/Stakeholders**

The Panel met with the following employer/mentor representatives:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Organisation** | **Role** |
| Name of organisation*(stakeholder/ placement relationship)* |  |

*This section of the report may be completed following Meeting 1 and agreed ahead of Meeting 2 (& section 10 to record additional information)*

1. **Meeting with Departmental Managers**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Role** |
|  |  |

Key points arising from the meeting with Departmental Managers were as follows:

*Name and role of those present*

*Section to be completed in bullet points of the significant conversation*

1. **Meeting with Course Leaders**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Role** |
|  | Head of Department |
|  |  |

Key points arising from the meeting with Departmental Managers were as follows:

*Section to be completed in bullet points of the significant conversation*

1. **Review Outcomes**

On the basis of the evidence presented the Panel has reached a conclusion of ***confidence/limited confidence*** in relation to the Department’s management of standards and quality.

*[NB. These statements should be used as an aide memoire in the final meeting of the event and should be amended to accurately reflect the outcomes.]*

*The six statements should be a matter of formal explicit confirmation with the whole Panel at the end of the Periodic Review meeting, with the final wording agreed by the Chair.  If a Panel is not able to fully confirm one or more of the bullets, then the bullet should be omitted and a more narrative statement should be developed about what needs to be done to ensure confidence.  If there are any reservations about the first two bullet points, then AQU Officers are advised to refer back to the Head of Academic Quality to draft appropriate statements.*

*NOTE: any course(s) within the Periodic Review Group which do NOT fulfil the criteria must be identified here with reasons for the lack of confidence and related actions.*

The Panel was able to confirm that:

* the academic standards of the course under review are set and maintained at the appropriate level
* courses remain current, relevant and valid in the light of student demand, developing knowledge in the discipline and practice in its applications
* appropriate opportunities and support for learning are being made available to students
* there is a well-managed and deliberate approach to quality enhancement and continuous improvement
* the Programme Specifications, Course Handbooks and associated programme documentation are accurate and fit for publication. *[or amend as appropriate, see example below]*

**OR**

The Panel advised that some amendments to the Programme Specification and/or the Course Handbook and/or other programme documentation were required before it/they are fit for publication **(See Action x)**.

*If one of the courses needs re-approval (eg curricula development) before it can run again. This would be captured in an Action & should be noted under UE2.*

~~The Panel therefore recommended re-approval of the following courses to Academic Standards and Quality Enhancement Committee (ASQEC), (acting on behalf of Academic Board), for a period of up to 6 years or until the next Periodic Review:~~

~~(insert list)~~

~~The Panel recommended reapproval of the following courses subject to specified~~ **~~Actions (see below):~~**

~~(insert list)~~

1. **Review Judgements**

The Review Panel considered the evidence provided through documentation and meetings with students, employers/mentors, and departmental managers and course leaders against the University expectations as set out below.

*Record Additional Information & lines of enquiry for Stage 1 report (Evidence for Stage 2 report)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **University Expectation** | **Judgement** |
| **UE1:** There are sustainable markets for the Department’s courses, they recruit suitably qualified students from diverse backgrounds, and retention is strong |  |
| **Additional information: *(stage 1 report)*****Lines of enquiry: *(stage 1 report)*****Evidence: *(final report)*** |
| **University Expectation** | **Judgement** |
| **UE2:** Courses are well designed, meeting the University’s design principles, ensuring threshold standards are secure and allowing students to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes |  |
| **Evidence:** |
| **University Expectation** | **Judgement** |
| **UE3:** Teaching and learning strategies are well designed, informed by institutional policies relating to inclusive practice and research inspired teaching and result in strong student engagement, satisfaction and effective challenge |  |
| **Evidence:** |
| **University Expectation** | **Judgement** |
| **UE4:** There is effective use of technology enhanced learning, including use of the VLE, implementation of electronic management of assessment and a strategic approach to developing staff and student digital capabilities |  |
| **Evidence:** |
| **University Expectation** | **Judgement** |
| **UE5:** There are effective arrangements for academic support, including for personal academic tutoring, induction, supporting student module choice and monitoring student engagement/attendance |  |
| **Evidence:** |
| **University Expectation** | **Judgement** |
| **UE6:** Sufficient and appropriate resources, such as staff and learning resources, are available to underpin the curriculum and permit all students to achieve learning outcomes. |
| **Evidence:** |
| **University Expectation** | **Judgement** |
| **UE7:** Assessment outcomes for all students are strong (or issues are being addressed) and underpinned by effective assessment, feedback, standardisation and moderation processes |  |
| **Evidence:** |
| **University Expectation** | **Judgement** |
| **UE8:** Graduate employment outcomes are strong and underpinned by clear approaches at course level to developing student employability and the provision of careers education, information, advice and guidance |  |
| **Evidence:** |
| **University Expectation** | **Judgement** |
| **UE9:** Courses have well managed work-based learning or placement opportunities and there is good take up of opportunities which provide excellent learning for students |  |
| **Evidence:** |
| **University Expectation** | **Judgement** |
| **UE10:** There is a clear commitment to staff professional development and recognition through achievement of HEA Fellowship, and engagement with University teaching development schemes and other professional development opportunities |  |
| **Evidence:** |
| **University Expectation** | **Judgement** |
| **UE11:** Management of risk and quality assurance processes, including module and annual evaluation processes, are effective and there is planned continuous improvement and enhancement |  |
| **Evidence:** |
| **University Expectation** | **Judgement** |
| **UE12:** Students are genuinely involved in quality management and enhancement, courses are responsive to student feedback and work in partnership with Course Representatives  |  |
| **Evidence:** |
| **University Expectation** | **Judgement** |
| **UE13:** Published information, including programme and module specifications, course handbooks and module outlines, are fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy |  |
| **Evidence:** |
| **University Expectation** | **Judgement** |
| **UE14:** Students have a high degree of satisfaction with their courses and measures of student engagement are strong |  |
| **Evidence:** |
| **University Expectation** | **Judgement** |
| **UE15:** The management of collaborative partnerships and courses is effective with appropriate attention to risk |  |
| **Evidence:** |

**Actions and recommendations**

The Panel made the following **Commendations** describing practice considered exemplary and/or innovative:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Commendations** |
| **1.** |  |
| **2.** |  |
| **3.** |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

The Panel noted the following **Affirmations**, acknowledging developments already in place or planned to address previously identified issues:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Affirmations** |
| **1.** |  |
| **2.** |  |
| **3.** |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

The Panel identified the following actions to secure improvements and recommendations to enable enhancements

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Actions** | **By when**  |
| **1.** |  |  |
| **2.** |  |  |
| **3.** |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Recommendations** | **By when**  |
| **1.** |  |  |
| **2.** |  |  |
| **3.** |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Once approved by ASQEC, the Actions and Response should be appended to the School or Course Enhancement Plan (as appropriate) and monitored by the College Learning, Teaching and Quality Enhancement Committee, to ensure that the outcomes are acted upon. A progress report and update of actions will be requested by during summer 20XX for approval in September 20XX.

An initial response to the Actions/Recommendations, should be provided by the Head of Department, then approved by the College Director of Learning, Teaching and Quality Enhancement/Head of School and sent to the AQU Officer by **xxx** for the June ASQEC, (attached as Appendix 3).

AQU Officer:

*Draft Outcomes:*

*Outcomes approved by Chair:*

*Report approved by Chair:*

**Appendix 1: List of all the documents provided to the panel**

**Appendix 2: List of additional documents requested and provided to the panel: second panel meeting**

**Appendix 3: Departmental Response to Draft Periodic Review for XXX**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Action** | **By when**  | **By whom** | **Comments/Progress** |
| **1.** |  |  |  |  |
| **2.** |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Recommendation** | **By when**  | **By whom** | **Comments/Progress** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

The Panel noted the following **Affirmations**, acknowledging developments already in place or planned to address previously identified issues:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Action/Recommendation** | **By whom** | **Comments/Progress** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |