ANNEX F: Periodic Review

1. Schools are subject to periodic review every five¹ years.

2. Scope of the Review

   The review covers all taught and research programmes of study offered to undergraduate and postgraduate students in a School including programmes delivered in partnership with other institutions. Periodic reviews, however, of programmes of study delivered by Validated Institutions are undertaken separately from the review of their host School at the University.

3. Schedule of Reviews

   The Quality Assurance Office (QAO) will publish a schedule of reviews. Faculty Boards may agree that there should be a single periodic review for a School or several reviews each covering a specified subject area. Such arrangements should be advised to QAO.

4. Appointment of Review Panels

   4.1 The appointment of Review Panels will be approved by the relevant Faculty Dean.

   4.2 Each Review Panel will comprise:

   a) a chairperson who will normally be an academic member of staff from within the Faculty, but not the School whose educational provision is under review. If the periodic review is of a Collaborative Partner the chairperson should not be a member of the cognate School at the University;

   b) another academic member of staff, who is not a member of the Faculty;

   c) two members who are persons external to the University and of sufficient status and academic expertise to command authority in the educational provision under consideration. External Examiners currently employed by the University may not be appointed as external members of the Panel. Former External Examiners or former members of staff may not be appointed as external members of the Panel if they were employed by the University during the period of time since the School’s previous periodic review. The School should provide the relevant Faculty with the CVs of three or more potential external reviewers from which the Dean will select two appropriate appointments;

   d) a student member (appointed by the Quality Assurance Office) who is not a member of the School under review;

   e) a secretary (nominated by the Head of Quality Assurance) who will be an administrator with a working knowledge of the expectations of the University's Code of Practice (e.g. a Faculty, School or QAO administrator).

   a) to e) above are all full Review Panel members. Panels may have additional members. Faculties should ensure that between the Panel members, there is appropriate training and/or expertise to review both taught and research programmes of study. Examples of appropriate training and expertise would include a QAA HER Auditor, an Associate Dean (Education) or Associate Dean (Graduate Studies), or a School Director of Education or School Director of Graduate Studies. All Panel members must be sufficiently independent from the educational provision under review to be able to provide an impartial view on it.

   4.3 Where a School manages higher education in partnership with other institutions that contribute to the School’s programmes of study (i.e. under the following arrangements: Partner Colleges, Dual/Joint awards, Academic Centres, programmes entered by articulation, the delivery of modules by a partner organisation for specific credit either as standalone modules or as part of a

¹ To commence in academic year 2019-20.
5. **Purpose of the Review**

Periodic review is an external process which provides an opportunity for in depth scrutiny and quality enhancement of all aspects of a School's educational provision. This includes addressing whether UK threshold academic standards are achieved and whether Kent's academic standards are being maintained.

The terms of reference of a Review Panel are:

a) to advise on how the quality of the educational provision and student learning experience under review might be further enhanced;

b) to identify any aspects of the provision that are particularly innovative or represent good practice;

c) to ascertain whether the programmes remain current and valid in the light of:
   o developing knowledge in the discipline and developments in teaching, learning and research (including technological advances);
   o changes in student demand, employer expectations and employer opportunities (as appropriate).

d) to identify whether the programme specifications are being delivered, learning outcomes achieved and quality and standards maintained (in light of external reference point such as the FHEQ, subject benchmark statements and PSRB requirements);

e) to evaluate whether there are effective links between student learning and discipline-based research in the School.

f) to investigate whether the School is properly undertaking its responsibilities as set out in the Codes of Practice for Research and Taught Programmes of Study;

g) to recommend actions to remedy any shortcomings;

h) to report its findings on the above to the University;

i) to recommend to the University whether the research programmes of study under review should continue, continue subject to certain conditions or be discontinued;

j) to recommend to the University whether the taught programmes of study under review should continue, continue subject to certain conditions or be discontinued;

k) to ensure that any partners involved in programmes of study remain of sound quality and reputation;

l) to address any quality issues with provision by partners;

m) in the case of periodic reviews of Validated Institutions, to recommend to the University whether the partnership arrangement should continue and the Validated Institution be permitted to continue to deliver the programmes under scrutiny.

6. **Review Focus**

The Review Panel will fulfil its terms of reference as stated above by exploring the following five key areas (with specific reference to how the School addresses the needs of international students and students with disabilities, where appropriate):

**Section A: Taught Programme Design and Delivery**
The Panel will explore the curriculum, methods of delivery and assessment of u/g and p/g taught programmes in order:

- to make recommendations for further enhancement of the curriculum, teaching and assessment practices in the School.
- to ascertain whether the programmes remain current and valid in the light of (i) developing knowledge in the discipline and developments in teaching, learning and research, and (ii) changes in student demand, employer expectations and employment opportunities (as appropriate);
- to evaluate whether there are effective links between student learning and discipline-based research in the School.
- to identify whether the programme specifications are being delivered, learning outcomes being achieved and quality and standards being maintained (making reference to external reference points such as subject benchmark statements, the FHEQ and PSRB requirements);
- To ascertain that all undergraduate degree specifications conform to the requirement that they include at least 90 credits at level 6 or above at Stage 3.
- where the School offers versions of a module at more than one level (e.g. level 5 and 6 versions), to investigate and report on whether the stated learning outcomes are i) sufficiently differentiated between versions, and ii) pitched at an appropriate level for the specific version; and to determine whether the assessment is appropriate for testing the achievement of the learning outcomes at the intended level;
- to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of a School's teaching, learning and assessment strategies (and how these are aligned with relevant institutional strategies);
- to identify any aspects of the School's approach to curriculum, teaching, learning and assessment, which are particularly innovative or represent good practice;
- to recommend actions to remedy any shortcomings.

Section B: Postgraduate Research Provision
The Panel will explore the design and delivery of research programmes of study in order:

- to make recommendations for further enhancement of the postgraduate research student experience in the School;
- to identify whether the programme specifications are being delivered and confirm that quality and standards are being maintained (making reference to external reference points such as the FHEQ);
- to evaluate the appropriateness of the research supervision provided by the School and its supervisory staff;
- to identify any aspects of the School's approach to its delivery of research programmes of study which are particularly innovative or represent good practice;
- to recommend actions to remedy any shortcomings.

Section C: Student Support and Guidance
The Panel will explore the student support and guidance offered to students within a School in order:

- to make recommendations for further enhancement of the support and guidance provided to students by the School;
- to ascertain the effectiveness of the Personal Academic Support System (PASS) for taught students (including the use made of Personal Development Planning);
to ascertain the effectiveness of the Academic Advisers for taught students;

- to consider the general support offered to research students and opportunities provided to them to develop transferable skills in accordance with the Researcher Development Framework;

- To evaluate the training and support provided to postgraduate students who teach within the School;

- to identify any aspects of the School’s approach to student support and guidance which are particularly innovative or represent good practice;

- to recommend actions to remedy any shortcomings.

**Section D: Learning Opportunities**

The Panel will consider the student learning environments and resources for taught and research programmes in order:

- to make recommendations for further enhancement of the resources and environment offered to students in the School;

- to evaluate the quality and availability of learning and research resources in the School;

- to assess the quality of the student learning and research environment provided by the School;

- to consider the extracurricular learning opportunities made available to taught and research students by the School under review, that add value to their learning experience;

- to identify any aspects of the School’s approach to learning and research resources and environment which are particularly innovative or represent good practice;

- to recommend actions to remedy any shortcomings.

**Section E: Maintenance and Enhancement of Quality and Standards:**

The Panel will consider the maintenance and enhancement of quality and standards in the School in order:

- to make recommendations for further enhancement of the School’s QA and QE processes;

- to investigate whether the School is properly undertaking its responsibilities as set out in the Codes of Practice for Research and Taught Programmes of Study;

- to evaluate methods used by the School to enhance its provision (e.g. peer observation, appraisal, staff development);

- to evaluate the effectiveness of the School’s approach to responding to student feedback (e.g. NSS, Student Voice Committee);

- to consider mechanisms for the dissemination of good practice within the School;

- to identify any aspects of the School’s approach to the maintenance and enhancement of quality and standards which are particularly innovative or represent good practice;

- to recommend actions to remedy any shortcomings.

**Section F: Managing Higher Education with Other Partnerships**

Where a School manages higher education in partnership with other institutions that contribute to the School’s programmes of study (i.e. under the following arrangements: Partner Colleges, Dual/Joint awards, Academic Centres, programmes entered by articulation, the delivery of modules by a partner organisation for specific credit either as standalone modules or as part of a Kent programme or programmes including student exchanges, study abroad or placements) there will be a **pre-review meeting** consisting of the Chairperson and Secretary in order to review the key paperwork pertaining to the programmes involving partnerships and analyse any quality issues regarding the partnerships. Based on the documentation submission the Chairperson will
determine if further information is required for the review and, in the case of Partner Colleges, whether a visit is required.

7. Review Documentation

7.1 Schools should send all members of the Review Panel (including the secretary) the following documentation at least four weeks prior to the review visit. The critical evaluation document should be provided to the review panel in hard copy. All other documentation should be provided to the Panel electronically. Where an external Panel Member specifically requests that the documentation should be sent to them in hard copy rather than be viewed electronically, the School should normally accommodate that request.

- A copy of this Annex.
- The proposed programme for the visit (see guidance in section 10 below).
- Names, positions and home institutions (where external) of the Review Panel members.
- Full list of staff members and their School roles.
- **Critical evaluation document** (see guidance in section 8 below).
  
  **Note:** A copy of the critical evaluation document should also be sent to the relevant Faculty Dean at least four weeks prior to the review visit.

- Full list of all undergraduate and postgraduate programmes offered by the School, including variants as applicable. Programmes delivered in collaboration with a Partner should be clearly indicated as such. The name of the Collaborative Partner should be given.

- Programme specifications and handbooks relating to all taught and research programmes.
- Module specifications where those modules are offered as versions at different levels (e.g. level 5 and 6 versions of the same module).
- Prospectus entries for both taught and research programmes, subject leaflets and any other promotional material used to advertise the programmes.

- School website address.
- The relevant QAA Subject Benchmark Statement(s).
- Assessment practice for all programmes of study.
- The most recent internal periodic review report and the response of the School to that report.
- The most recent taught and research annual monitoring report prepared by the School.
- A completed quality assurance checklist *(a pro-forma is available)*.

- Statistical data on entry qualifications, progression and completion rates, student achievement (for example, means and standard deviations for each element of assessment for each module), degree classifications and first employment destinations for the past three years for u/g and p/g taught students.

- Statistical data on (i) current research student numbers, (ii) research student funding, (iii) entry requirements, (iv) progression (pass, referral and fail rates), (v) withdrawal rates (including reasons for leaving), (vi) submission and completion times and rates (these to be submitted by programme of study and by supervisor) and (vii) employment destinations of former students for the past three years.

- NSS data and feedback for the last three years and responses to these.

- Reports of External Examiners for taught programmes for the last three years and responses to these.
• Minutes of the School Education Committee\textsuperscript{2} for the last three years.
• Minutes of relevant Boards of Studies meetings for the last three years.
• Minutes of Student Voice Committee/Staff-Student Liaison Committee meetings for the last three years.
• Minutes of the School Graduate Studies Committee for the last three years.
• The most recent School Plan.
• (Where appropriate to the programmes of study) the most recent report from a Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB) and the School response.
• (Where appropriate to the programmes of study) feedback from employers, sponsors and other external funders.

7.2 The University acknowledges that a PSRB accreditation may require the School concerned to provide data to the accrediting body in a specific format. Where a School has recently gathered and provided data to an accrediting body, which addresses one or more of the sections above, but in a different format from that normally used by the University, it will be appropriate for the School to submit the data to the Review Panel in that format, rather than being required to represent the same data in the style normally used within the University. It should be noted that a PSRB accreditation review cannot be taken as a substitute for a Periodic Programme Review.

8. Critical Evaluation Document

8.1. The School will need to provide a critical evaluation of the education it provides (this evaluation should not normally be more than 10 pages of A4).

8.2. This document should focus on explaining to the Review Panel how the School ensures that all of the education that it offers is of high quality and how it seeks to further enhance the quality of its provision. Specific reference should be made to how the School addresses the needs of international students and students with disabilities, where appropriate. The critical evaluation document should appraise the effectiveness of changes made to its education provision since the previous review. The evaluation should refer to or be accompanied by appropriate evidence, much of which will be found within the documentation listed above, and should comment on the School’s response to the most recent external review and/or report from a statutory or professional body (where applicable).

8.3. The evaluation should specifically address:

SECTION A: Taught Programme Design and Delivery

• Educational Aims of the Provision – a statement of the overall aims of the taught programmes delivered by the School.
• Learning Outcomes – evaluation of the appropriateness, to the educational aims, of the intended learning outcomes of the programmes, making reference to internal and external reference points such as Subject benchmark statements and the FHEQ.
• Confirmation of whether all undergraduate degree specifications conform to the requirement that they include at least 90 credits at level 6 or above at Stage 3.
• If versions of a module are offered at more than one level, an evaluation of whether the stated learning outcomes are i) sufficiently differentiated between versions, and ii) pitched at an appropriate level for the specific version; and an evaluation of whether the assessment is appropriate for testing the achievement of the learning outcomes at the intended level;
• Curricula and Assessment – evaluation of the ways in which programme content and methods of assessment support achievement of the intended learning outcomes of the

\textsuperscript{2} Or Learning and Teaching Committee prior to 2016-17
programme(s); how curricula and assessment together determine the academic level of the award(s) to which the programme(s) lead; the extent to which students achieve the programme aims and intended learning outcomes (including reference to student monitoring and progression).

- **Relationship between Teaching and Research** – a description and evaluation of the effectiveness of links between student learning and discipline-based research in the School.

**SECTION B: Postgraduate Research Provision**

- **Educational Aims of the Provision** – a statement of the overall aims of the School in relation to its postgraduate research provision.
- **Research Student Experience** – an evaluation of the research student experience within the School including the delivery of its programme specifications, student achievement and the maintenance of quality and standards.
- **Research Supervision** – evaluation of the appropriateness of the research supervision provided by the School and its supervisory staff.

**SECTION C: Student Support and Guidance**

- **Personal Academic Support System (PASS)** – description of the operation of PASS and evaluation of the effectiveness of this for taught students.
- **Academic Advisers** – description of its operation and evaluation of the effectiveness of this for taught students.
- **Support for Research Students** – description of the methods used by the School to provide support to its research students and an evaluation of the opportunities provided to students to develop transferable skills in accordance with the Researcher Development Framework.
  An evaluation of the training and support provided to postgraduate students who teach within the School.
- **Personal Development Planning (PDP)** – description of the School’s use of PDP and an evaluation of its implementation.

**SECTION D: Learning Opportunities**

- **Learning Resources** – evaluation of the effectiveness of the deployment of the resources, both human and material, that support the learning and research of students, and of the effectiveness of their linkage to the intended learning outcomes of the programme(s).
- **Student Learning/Research Environment** - evaluation of the quality of the student learning and research environment provided by the School.
- **Additional Learning Opportunities** – consideration of the extracurricular opportunities available to taught and research students that add value to their learning experience.

**SECTION E: Maintenance and enhancement of Quality and Standards**

- Evaluation of the effectiveness of procedures for maintaining and enhancing the quality of provision and the security of academic standards in respect of the programme(s) including the management of quality information and the routes for enhancing practice (e.g. peer observation, appraisal, staff development). This should include an assessment of how the School responds to student feedback (e.g. NSS results, feedback from the Student Voice Committee etc.). The mechanisms used to disseminate good practice within the School should also be discussed. This section should include reference to how compliance with the University Codes of Practice for Research and Taught Programmes of Study is ensured.

The Critical Evaluation Document should also include discussion of the School’s strategies with regard to areas such as staff development, learning resources, assessment and accommodating students with disabilities.

**SECTION F: Managing Higher Education with Other Partnerships**
Where a School manages higher education in partnership with other institutions who contribute to the School’s programmes of study (i.e. under the following arrangements: Partner Colleges, Dual/Joint awards, Academic Centres, programmes entered by articulation, the delivery of modules by a partner organisation for specific credit either as standalone modules or as part of a Kent programme or programmes including student exchanges, study abroad or placements) a **commentary on the partnership(s) must be included**. This must include specific comments regarding each type of partnership, including the management of academic standards within the provision, the quality of learning opportunities provided and any risks perceived within the provision. If there are any issues regarding a specific partner these can also be highlighted here. Where the provision includes Partner College-based provision, quality management staff from the Partner College should be asked to submit a narrative (no more than two sides of A4) to the School, which specifically addresses section 8F and is designed to assist the School in writing its response to this section.

9. **Review Panel Preliminary Assessment, Consultation and Actions**

9.1. Members of the Panel will consider the documentation (which will be sent to them at least four weeks prior to the review visit).

9.2. The relevant Faculty Dean will receive a copy of the critical evaluation document four weeks prior to the review visit. Should the Dean wish to provide the Review Panel with a written statement, this should be submitted to the Review Panel two weeks prior to the review visit. Alternatively, the Faculty Dean may elect to meet with the Chair of the Review Panel briefly prior to the review or with all Review Panel members during the visit itself. The Faculty Dean may use these opportunities to outline what they regard as the notable strengths of the School and highlight any key area(s) they believe the Panel should focus on during the review.

9.3. Each Panel member should provide the Chair of the Panel with some brief feedback on the documentation including a list of key points they believe need to be focused on during the review visit.

9.4. Where a School manages higher education in partnership with other institutions that contribute to the School’s programmes of study (i.e. under the following arrangements: Partner Colleges, Dual/Joint awards, Academic Centres, programmes entered by articulation, the delivery of modules by a partner organisation for specific credit either as standalone modules or as part of a Kent programme or programmes including student exchanges, study abroad or placements) there will be a pre-review meeting (refer to section 6F).

9.5. The Chair of the Panel will use any feedback from the Panel (see 9.3) any information provided by the relevant Faculty Dean (see 9.2), and any concerns raised by the pre-review for partnerships (see 9.4) when planning the Panel’s approach to the review. The Chair of the Panel will consult with other members of the Panel when planning the review.

Advance consultation may include:

- assigning a specific area of the review to each Panel member;
- selecting School staff members required to attend each meeting;
- identifying any further documentation the Panel wishes the School to provide prior to or during the review visit.

The Chair of the Panel may also, following its advance discussion, propose changes to the programme for the visit. In particular, the Panel may feel that some meetings might be shortened or cancelled in view of the documentary evidence that it has received. The Panel may also, if it considers it to be necessary, ask for further meetings to be scheduled.

The Secretary of the Review Panel should communicate any action points arising from the advance consultation to the School **at least a week prior to the review visit**.

10. **Review Visit Programme**
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10.1. The review visit will normally extend over a **two day period**, although, the length of the visit may be increased where so determined by the size and complexity of the provision under review. Where a School offers substantial provision on other sites or has students who are substantially provided for on other sites, the programme for the review should accommodate a visit to these sites to examine the resources provided. In cases where a Review Panel is considering a School with cognate responsibility for programmes delivered at a partner college, the review visit may need to be extended beyond the normal two-day period to allow sufficient time for the Panel to review this provision effectively (i.e. to visit the college and meet with current college staff and students).

10.2. The review visit will not be for fewer than two days (including for the periodic review of Centres). A single day is insufficient time for a Review Panel to properly cover all of the areas of enquiry and also, as appropriate, to undertake a tour of the relevant facilities.

10.3. The programme for the visit will be proposed by the School in consultation with the Chair of the Panel. The programme should incorporate the following sections unless a variation to the standard programme has been negotiated and agreed between the Chair of the Panel and the School. The proposed programme for the visit will be included in the documentation sent to the Panel four weeks prior to the review visit, but, the Chair of the Panel may propose changes to the programme in light of the documentation the Panel receives from the School (see 9.4). An example of a standard review programme would be the following:

**Day One**
- Welcome by the Head of School
- Private meeting of Panel (1 hour)
- Meetings with Students (1 ½ hours, which may be split into separate meetings with undergraduate and postgraduate students)
- Lunch and private meeting of Panel (1 hour)
- Meeting re: Taught Programme Design and Delivery (1 ½ hours)
- Meeting re: Postgraduate Research Provision (1 ½ hours)

**Day Two**
- Private meeting of Panel (1 hour)
- Meeting re: Learning Opportunities (1 ½ hours) to include an inspection of resources if appropriate.
- Meeting re: Student Support and Guidance (1 ½ hours)
- Lunch and private meeting of Panel (1 hour)
- Meeting re: Maintenance and Enhancement of Quality and Standards (1 ½ hours)
- Private Meeting of Panel (1 ½ hours)
- Feedback to School.

Where relevant to the provision the above schedule should be adjusted to accommodate a meeting to discuss the School’s management of provision offered in collaboration with external partners (defined as per Section F of this document).

11. **Review Visit**

11.1. The visit should begin with a private meeting of the Panel during which members will share their views on documentation and plan the subsequent meetings.

11.2. The programme should include meetings with representative groups of students (e.g. separate meetings with undergraduate and postgraduate taught students and postgraduate research students).
11.3. There should then be separate meetings with appropriate members of the School to discuss issues relating to each of the following:

SECTION A - Taught Programme Design and Delivery
SECTION B - Postgraduate Research Provision
SECTION C - Student Support and Guidance
SECTION D - Learning Opportunities
SECTION E - Maintenance and Enhancement of Quality and Standards
SECTION F - Managing Higher Education with Other Partnerships (where applicable)

The aims of each review meeting are clearly stated in section 6.

Key staff members including the Head of School and those with responsibility for taught and research programmes should be available to attend relevant meetings. The School may also wish to invite members of staff from outside the School to attend meetings of the review (e.g. a representative from Information Services or the International Partnerships/Recruitment Offices) where this is appropriate to the programmes under consideration. The Panel may also have specified particular members of staff it would like to meet with during the review visit (see 9.4).

11.4. The Panel should finally meet privately to consider its conclusions before reporting these orally to the School. The Panel should use the report template (Appendix A) to structure its feedback to the School.

11.5. **Review Panel Recommendations**

The Panel should prioritise each of its recommendations by labelling them as **essential**, **advisable** or **desirable** as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Essential</strong>  (i.e. must be done/high degree of urgency)</td>
<td>Where a Review Panel finds it necessary to make an essential recommendation, all members of the panel must have agreed that the quality of learning opportunities and/or academic standards were currently at risk through non-fulfilment of the recommendation. Under these circumstances, the Review Panel must recommend that the programmes in question continue subject to the fulfilment of the essential recommendation(s). It should be noted that in cases where a Review Panel makes an essential recommendation which cannot be fulfilled by the School/Faculty/University, this may result in the programmes being discontinued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisable</strong>  (i.e. should be done/medium degree of urgency)</td>
<td>A Review Panel will make an advisable recommendation in cases where it has agreed that the quality of learning opportunities and/or academic standards may be put at risk in the future through non-fulfilment of the recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desirable</strong>  (i.e. for consideration/not urgent)</td>
<td>A Review Panel will make desirable recommendations in cases where it perceives opportunities for the School to enhance its educational provision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is acknowledged that some recommendations (e.g. in relation to resources or institutional policies) may be outside the immediate control of the School and Panels should, therefore, specify whether the recommendation is being made to the School, the Faculty or the University.

11.5.1. Where a University-level recommendation has specific reference exclusively to the undergraduate provision offered by a school, it should be addressed to the Education Board for consideration and action.
11.5.2. Where a University-level recommendation has specific reference exclusively to the postgraduate provision offered by a school, it should be addressed to the Graduate School Board for consideration and action.

11.5.3 Where either (i) a University-level recommendation has generic reference to UG and PG provision, or (ii) where the Faculty’s commentary on the actions taken by the School has generic reference to both UG and PG provision, the matter should be referred to both the Education Board (delegated to ASQC) and the Graduate School Board for consideration and action. Where the Boards fail to agree on the action(s) to be taken in response to such recommendations or commentary, the matter will be referred to the Chairs of the respective Boards in order that the disagreement might be resolved.

11.6. The Panel may also, if it considers it necessary, ask for further documentation or for further meetings subsequent to the visit.

12. **Action to be taken following the Review Visit**

12.1. The Secretary to the Panel will prepare a draft report and send this to the Chair of the Review Panel or, if the Review Panel so requests, to all members, for revision and/or approval **not more than two weeks** after completion of meetings. The reports will follow the format of the template (Appendix A).

12.2. The Secretary to the Panel should send a copy of the report as approved by the Chair of the Panel to the Head of School and ask that it be checked for factual accuracy. The Secretary should exercise discretion in deciding whether changes requested by the Head of School are of sufficient substance as to require the approval of the Chair of the Review Panel.

12.3. The Secretary to the Review Panel should send a copy of the final report to all members of the Panel and to the Faculties Support Office.

12.4. The Faculties Support Office should send a copy of the report to the Dean, the Head of School and the School Administration Manager. The Head of School should be asked to arrange for the report to be considered by the School and, within three months, to provide a response from the School to the report for consideration by Faculty Board. The School response should also be copied to the Chair of the Review Panel, for their information.

12.4.1 Where the review is of the provision of a Validated Institution and the response to the report comes, therefore, from the partner, the cognate School should submit a short commentary on that response.

12.5. If the Faculty Board considers that the School has responded satisfactorily to the Review Panel report, it shall forward it to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) and Graduate School Board (as appropriate to the level of the programmes concerned) together with its own views on the documentation and its recommendation; i.e. that the programmes under review should continue, should continue subject to conditions or should not continue.

12.6. Should a Review Panel recommend that a programme or programmes should not continue, the Secretary of the Review Panel should so inform the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Education and Student Experience or the Dean of the Graduate School (as appropriate to the level of the programmes concerned) and the Dean of the Faculty concerned without delay. It should be noted that the Education Board holds specific responsibility for approving the continuation of undergraduate programmes (delegated to ASQC), and the Graduate School Board holds responsibility for approving the continuation of postgraduate programmes.

12.7. In cases where programmes of study are approved to continue subject to conditions (i.e. the report includes essential recommendations as per 11.5 or where a Faculty so requests it), the School will be required to submit a one-year follow-up report to Faculty Board commenting on the implementation and progress of actions taken to satisfy any conditions set to allow for the continuation of programmes.

12.8. The Faculty Board will report to ASQC and the Graduate School Board as to whether it considers that the actions taken by the School have proven satisfactory or unsatisfactory. If the report is
unsatisfactory ASQC or the Graduate School Board may, in cases involving failure to meet set conditions, recommend that the programmes concerned be discontinued.

13 Deferral of a PPR

13.1 On an exceptional basis, a School may need to request a deferral of the scheduled year of its PPR. Where a deferral is requested this may be for no more than one additional academic year.

13.2 The procedure for a deferral request is:

(i) The School will complete a deferral request form and submit it to the Faculties Support Office (FSO).

(ii) The FSO will seek the relevant Faculty Dean’s approval for the request to go forward. If approved, the Dean (or their nominee) will countersign the form, which the FSO will then submit to the Quality Assurance Office.

(iii) The QA Office will check the request and then submit it to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Education and Student Experience (or their nominee) for consideration and approval or rejection of the deferral request.

(iv) The QA Office will notify the FSO and the School concerned of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Education and Student Experience’s decision and will report it to the next meeting of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.

13.3 The rationale for a deferral should set out the circumstances leading to the request. It should be noted that a change of personnel within the School concerned will not be considered suitable grounds for deferral. The rationale should include confirmation that the requested PPR deferral will not adversely impact on any PSRB requirements (where relevant).

13.4 Where a School PPR is deferred to the next academic year, the School will then resume the five-year review cycle from that point.
Periodic Programme Reviews

Organisation of Reviews and Responsibilities

A. FACULTY:

Prior to the review:
The Faculty is responsible for:

- organising the appointment of the Review Panel by:
  - notifying the School of the need to nominate external members for the Review Panel \((\text{Easter prior to the academic year in which the periodic programme review is due to take place})\);
  - nominating a Chair of the Review Panel from within the Faculty \((\text{by the end of the Summer Term prior to the academic year in which the periodic review is due to take place})\);
  - contacting one of the other Faculties to arrange the appointment of another Review Panel member from within the University \((\text{by the end of the Summer Term prior to the academic year in which the periodic review is due to take place})\);
  - contacting the Quality Assurance Office to confirm the Review Panel Secretary \((\text{at the beginning of the academic year in which the periodic review is due to take place})\).

- completing the Review Panel appointment form and arranging for this to be approved by the Dean of the Faculty - CVs of the two external members of the Review Panel will be attached to this form \((\text{by the end of the Summer Term prior to the academic year in which the periodic review is due to take place})\).

- sending the approved Review Panel appointment form to the Quality Assurance Office so that external and student members can be written to with details of their appointments \((\text{as soon as this is available})\).

- communicating the membership of the Review Panel to the School so that it can contact Review Panel members and organise a date for the review \((\text{as soon as this is available})\).

- communicating the membership of the Review Panel to the Chair and Secretary of the Review Panel \((\text{as soon as this is available})\).

Post review:

- Following receipt of the final report from the Secretary of the Review Panel, the Faculties Support Office should send a copy of the report to the Dean, the Head of School and the School Administration Manager.

- The Faculty is responsible for ensuring that the School responds to its review report within three months of the date of receipt. This response will be considered by the Faculty Board. If the Faculty Board considers that the School has responded satisfactorily to the Review Panel report, it shall forward it to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee and Graduate School Board together with its own views on the documentation and its recommendation: i.e. that the programmes under review should continue, should continue subject to conditions or should not continue.

B. SCHOOL:

Prior to the review:
The School\(^3\) is responsible for:

---

\(^3\) There are some Schools which comprise a number of different subject sections. In these cases, separate periodic reviews may be undertaken in each subject area. In other cases, more than one subject area may be reviewed in a single periodic programme review. In cases where more than one subject section is involved in a review, it is the
• nominating external reviewers in the relevant subject area(s) with suitable experience and expertise and communicating these nominations (with CVs attached) to the Faculty (by the end of the summer term prior to the academic year in which the periodic review is due to take place)

• organising the date of the review in consultation with all Review Panel members and the secretary following the appointment of the Panel by the Dean. Reviews typically last two days. It is good practice for the School to offer Review Panel members a range of options when looking for a suitable date for the review (the date should be confirmed by the beginning of the academic year in which the periodic review is due to take place)

• booking rooms for the review visit

• reserving accommodation for external members of the review panel (note – the Quality Assurance Office will cover the external members’ accommodation/travel costs and expenses following receipt of a completed expenses claim form. External members can either (i) pay for the accommodation and claim it back or (ii) the hotel can send its invoice to the Quality Assurance Office)

• arranging refreshments and lunches for review panel members during the visit

• proposing a programme for the review visit (in consultation with the Chair of the Review Panel – see section 10 of Annex F)

• preparing the review documentation as outlined in section 7 of Annex F and sending it to all review panel members four weeks prior to the review

• sending a copy of the critical evaluation document to the Dean four weeks prior to the review

• making sure that key staff members will be available to attend relevant meetings during the review (e.g. Director of Graduate Studies should be present at the meeting on postgraduate research provision)

• ensuring that representative groups of students will be available to meet with the review panel during the visit.

Post review:

The School is responsible for:

• checking the factual accuracy of the review report (Head of School) following its receipt from the Secretary to the Review Panel

• arranging for the final review report to be considered within the School following its receipt from the Faculties Support Office, and provide a response from the Head of the School for consideration at Faculty Board.

C. QUALITY ASSURANCE OFFICE:

The Quality Assurance Office (part of the Unit for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching) is responsible for:

• publishing a schedule of periodic programme reviews

• appointing the secretary of the Review Panel (in consultation with the Faculties)

• appointing and briefing a student Panel member, in liaison with the Student Union as appropriate (at the beginning of the academic year in which the periodic review is due to take place)

• sending external members of the Review Panel their appointment letters and a copy of the procedures (i.e. Annex F of the University’s Code of Practice)

________________________
responsibility of the relevant sections to liaise with each other to ensure that the School’s responsibilities (as outlined in the document) are completed.
• paying external members of the Review Panel their fee for participation in the review and reimbursing them with their expenses (following receipt of their completed claims forms)
• paying the student Panel member their fee for participation in the review (following receipt of the completed forms).

D. THE FACULTY DEAN:

The Dean is responsible for considering the critical evaluation document and deciding whether to (i) provide the review panel with a written statement (two weeks prior to the review), (ii) meet with the Chair of the Review Panel briefly prior to the Review or (iii) meet with the all review panel members during the review visit. The Dean may use these opportunities to outline what they regard as the notable strength of the School and highlight any key areas they believe the Panel should focus on during the review.

E. THE REVIEW PANEL:

The Terms of Reference of the Review Panel are outlined in Annex F of the University’s Code of Practice.

The Chair of the Review Panel is responsible for:

• agreeing the programme for the review visit following its proposal by the School
• consulting with other Panel members during the preliminary assessment of the review documentation to agree an approach to the visit (see section 9 of Annex F of the University’s Code of Practice). For example: the Chair of the Review Panel may decide to hold a brief preliminary meeting with the University-based members of the Review Panel to consider the areas outlined in section 9 of Annex F of the University’s Code of Practice
• leading the review visit
• agreeing the final review report (following consultation with other review panel members as appropriate).

The Secretary of the Review Panel is responsible for:

• liaising with the Chair of the Review Panel following receipt of the review documentation to confirm how the preliminary assessment and consultation will be undertaken (see section 9 of Annex F)
• communicating any action points (for the School) arising from advance consultation between the review panel members to the School at least a week prior to the review visit
• preparing a draft review report (see Appendix A) and sending a copy of the review report to the Chair of the Review Panel (and other panel members as appropriate) for agreement within two weeks of the review visit
• sending a copy of the review report (as approved by the Chair of the Review Panel) to the Head of the School so that it can be checked for factual accuracy
• sending a copy of the report (as approved by the Chair of the Review Panel and checked by the Head of School) to the Faculties Support Office
• informing the relevant Faculty Dean and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Education and Student Experience or the Dean of the Graduate School (as appropriate) without delay in cases where a Review Panel has recommended that programmes of study should not continue.

The Chair, the Secretary and other members of the Review Panel have the combined responsibility of fulfilling the terms of reference of the Review Panel as outlined in Annex F.
Guidance for Schools

Schools can contact the Quality Assurance Office or their relevant Faculty for general advice of the periodic review process. If Schools consider that they would benefit from a briefing on the periodic review process in anticipation of the visit, they can contact the Quality Assurance Office to arrange this.

Information on fees for external members of Review Panels can be found on the QA Office website: http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/extexaminers/local/fees.html