



Periodic Programme Review Procedure

Documentation Management

Document Record

Maintained by:	Quality Assurance
Owned by:	University Education Committee
Approval Date:	November 2016
Last Amended:	September 2017
Last Reviewed:	September 2017
Next Review Date:	August 2018
Current Version:	2.1
Location of Master Document:	https://intra.brunel.ac.uk/s/QSO/Team/Monitoring and Review/Periodic Programme Review (PPR)

Version Control

Document Version	Amendments	Amended By	Date	Approved By
2.0	Procedure replacing Academic Programme Review	Head of Quality Assurance	November 2016	Quality Assurance Committee
2.1	See Document Rollover 2017-18 Checklist Records	Quality Assurance Manager	July 2017	University Education Committee

Periodic Programme Review (PPR) Procedure

1 Introduction

- 1.1 All higher education providers are expected to have effective procedures in place to routinely monitor and periodically review their programmes. This procedure adheres to the expectations set out in the [UK Quality Code for Higher Education Part A: Setting and maintaining academic standards and Chapter B8: Programme Monitoring and Review](#), and the [European Standards and Guidelines \(ESG\) 2015 Part 1](#).
- 1.2 The opportunity to periodically reflect on the academic experience of students, the academic standards achieved, and the continuing currency and relevance of its provision, is central to an institution's quality and standards assurance processes.
- 1.3 Periodic Programme Review (PPR) is the process whereby the College's educational provision is reviewed through self-evaluation and peer review. It is normally conducted every 5 years, and has the following aims:
- To enable Senate to have confidence in the standards, currency, coherence, and relevance of the provision;
 - To evaluate the effectiveness of the student academic experience including quality of learning opportunities; to identify impact and good practice; and to make recommendations for improvement and enhancement;
 - To identify and correct any deviations from alignment with external points of reference such as QAA subject benchmark statements, sections of the Quality Code, national qualifications framework, ESG Part 1, and requirements of Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs);
 - To inform the College and University in strategic planning and future developments of the portfolio.
- 1.4 The review takes place in the context of fostering the continuing process of reflection and evaluation required to improve and enhance the quality of learning opportunities provided and students' academic experience.
- 1.5 The review is data-driven, using both qualitative and quantitative data, and recommendations arising from the review form the basis for a quality improvement and enhancement plan which is monitored through the Annual Monitoring process. The standard PPR dataset specification is shown in Appendix 1.
- 1.5 PPR is a paperless process and, therefore, all documentation should be gathered and provided in electronic format.**

2 Membership of Review Panel

2.1 Membership, from Colleges other than that under review, will normally consist of the following for each meeting:

Chair:

Dean; Vice-Dean (Education) or Deputy Dean (Academic Affairs)

Internal members:

Minimum two experienced academic or research staff with expertise covering learning, teaching and research.

External reviewers:

Minimum two external subject specialists for each discipline to be reviewed.

At least one representative from employers, PSRB/accrediting bodies, or alumni.

Student representatives:

One undergraduate or postgraduate taught student and one research student;

Union of Brunel Students Vice-President for relevant College

Professional Services:

Up to two representatives from appropriate areas (Brunel Educational Excellence Centre, Quality Enhancement Team; Professional Development Centre; Computing; Library)

Independent Member of Council

Review Manager:

Quality Assurance

2.2 Nominations for review panel membership will be made by the College, and approved by the Pro-Vice Chancellor (Quality Assurance and Enhancement).

3 PPR process

3. Scoping of the review

3.1 The scoping exercise, based around at least one meeting between College, department and discipline representatives, Quality Assurance, and Quality Enhancement representatives and the PPR Chair, should take place 9 months prior to the review. The meeting will be organised by Quality Assurance.

3.2 Purpose of the Scoping Exercise:

- Agree grouping of provision to be reviewed, including any partnerships;

- Consider opportunities to amalgamate parts of concurrent or associated external reviews (e.g. by PSRBs);
- Identify any issues or modifications to process necessitated by PSRBs;
- Agree structure and timing for the review meetings;
- Agree required attendees for the review meetings.

4. Documentation required

- 4.1 The documentation required is listed in Appendix 1. The only document required that does not already exist as a result of annual processes is the Self Evaluation Document.
- 4.2 Updated data sets will be provided as required by the relevant department.

5. Preparation of the Self Evaluation Document

- 5.1 The self-evaluation document should be informed by the data and existing documentation. The following areas should be addressed:
- 5.2 Relevant aims and objectives from Division/Department and College plans.
- 5.3 Context (maximum 1 page), which should address a summary of the programme portfolio under review; a summary of staff and other resources; a summary of relationships with PSRBs or other stakeholders (including collaboration with other Colleges); a summary of any partnerships; and a summary of PGR provision.
- 5.4 Evaluation (maximum 9 pages) **drawing on the assembled documentation and data**, addressing each of the following topics. The evaluation should highlight matters of particular concern to the discipline, Department or College, and areas of good practice:
- Topic 1: Relevance, currency and coherence of the programmes

Evaluate briefly developments in the programmes and their curricula since the last PPR with reference to:

- changes in the national or Brunel context;
- subject benchmark statements;
- trends in student demand;
- employer expectations and career opportunities;
- student progression and outcomes;
- external examiners' reports;
- annual module and programme monitoring;
- programme approvals and modifications;
- feedback from students and alumni.

○ Topic 2: Students' Academic Experience – Taught students

Evaluate how effectively learning, teaching and assessment support student achievement through consideration of how:

- teaching provides effective stimulation, challenge and contact time that encourages students to engage and actively commit to their studies;
- curriculum design is effective in stretching students to develop independence, knowledge, understanding and skills that reflect their own potential;
- assessment and feedback are used effectively in supporting students' development, progression and attainment;
- resources are used effectively to aid students' learning;
- students are exposed to and involved in scholarship, research and/or professional practice;
- students from all backgrounds are supported to achieve;
- students acquire knowledge, skills and attributes that are valued by employers and that enhance their personal and/or professional lives.

○ Topic 3: Postgraduate Research Students' Experience

Evaluate how effectively the:

- students' progression and timely completion is supported through the admission, monitoring and supervision arrangements;
- research environment contributes to their development;
- skills training provides support for their future professional aspirations.

○ Topic 4: Enhancements

- highlight innovations and developments that have improved the student's academic experience and outcomes, including evaluations of their effectiveness and impact;
- provide a plan for further enhancements, including how these will be taken forward, the timeline, and process for evaluation.

6 Review

6.1 The following principles apply to ensure appropriate scrutiny of the College's education provision:

- review at discipline-level, informed by external subject specialists, remains fundamental to PPR to ensure sufficient scrutiny is given to the taught programme provision;
- review of PGR provision is embedded within the process;
- in recognition of the fact that the College is the academic unit within which divisions/departments operate, discussions with College senior management team, informed by the discipline reports, will be held.

- 6.2 The Panel will hold a series of meetings with staff and student representatives in the discipline, relevant members of the Department management teams, and employers/PSRB/accrediting bodies/alumni as appropriate. There will be one meeting, not exceeding one day, for each discipline (as agreed at the Scoping Meeting).
- 6.3 The Panel will scrutinise all information provided and hold a pre-meeting to determine the issues to be explored in the PPR meetings with staff, students, employers/PSRB/accrediting bodies/alumni from the discipline. The discipline under review will be informed of the areas of particular interest that will be discussed during the meetings.
- 6.4 Based on the information provided and the PPR meetings,, the Panel will confirm that:
- Colleges have secure control of the academic standards of the University's awards;
 - learning, teaching and assessment are effective in allowing students to achieve those academic standards, and programmes are current, coherent and relevant and are aligned to external reference points;
 - the student academic experience fosters a culture of partnership and supports students to achieve their intended award;
 - disciplines are effective in enhancing their taught and research provision;
 - innovation and good practice is identified, evaluated and shared, and impact measured.
- 6.5 To ensure that the outcome of the PPR supports the College in its planning, the Chair and internal panel members will meet with the College senior management team. This meeting will be informed by the recommendations contained in the discipline reports (see 7.4 below).

7 Outcomes of the Review

- 7.1 The Panel will offer immediate generalised feedback to the College and discipline representatives at the end of the review meetings.
- 7.2 The report will be prefaced by an executive summary, identifying the main findings (strengths and weaknesses) for the discipline, followed by a more detailed record of the Panel's discussion and recommendations. The report will normally adopt the following headings:
- a) Executive summary setting out the main characteristics of the programmes and overall conclusions reached in the following areas:
- quality and standards;
 - the currency and validity of the programmes in light of developing knowledge in the discipline, and developments in learning and teaching;
 - innovation, impact and good practice;
 - student academic experience;

- forward-looking actions for improvement and recommendations for further enhancement.
- b) Brief overview of the review process, including panel membership.
 - c) Statement confirming appropriate quality management and maintenance of academic standards (assessment policies, external examiner reports, use of management information, external reference points).
 - d) Quality of the students' academic experience.
 - e) Quality of the postgraduate research student experience.
 - f) Approach to enhancement, including innovation, evaluation and impact, and sharing of good practice.
- 7.3 The report will be drafted by the Review Manager and reviewed by the Panel before being sent to the College for comments on factual accuracy, normally within 3 working weeks of the last review meeting.
 - 7.4 The finalised discipline reports should normally be available 6 weeks after the last review meeting. These are used as the basis for a meeting with the College senior management team, including the Dean, Vice-Dean Education, and Deputy Dean (Academic Affairs). (see 6.5 above).
 - 7.5 Following this meeting, a summary report of the College PPR is produced, setting out the main findings (common strengths and weaknesses), actions and recommendations (including any recommendations for the University).

8 Consideration and Dissemination

- 8.1 The discipline areas will consider the Panel's recommendations through its formal committee structure (Board of Studies and Departmental Management Board), and confirm, within the quality improvement and enhancement plan, the actions to be taken.
- 8.2 The discipline reports and associated action plans, together with the College PPR summary report (from 7.5 above) and College action plan in response to the recommendations, will be approved by the College Education Committee.
- 8.3 It will be the responsibility of the PVC (Quality Assurance and Enhancement) to ensure that any recommendations for the University and dissemination of identified good practice are considered at the most appropriate level, and that actions are followed up and monitored.
- 8.4 The PPR summary report and College's (and if applicable, the University's) response to the recommendations are presented to Senate by the Chair of the Review Panel. Senate will be asked to note the reports, recommendations and action plan(s).

9 Monitoring of Action Plans

- 9.1 The quality improvement and enhancement plans are monitored on an annual basis through the Annual Programme Monitoring and Review process, which requires updated actions and evaluations to be submitted. These are monitored by the College Education Committees and reported to Senate.
- 9.2 The University action plan is monitored by the University Education Committee and reported to Senate.

Periodic Programme Review – Documentation Required

PPR is a paperless process and, therefore, all documentation should be gathered and provided in electronic format.

College Documentation

1. College strategic plan
2. Self-Evaluation Document (discipline)
3. Report of any strategic review undertaken since the last PPR
4. Current list of academic staff's administrative responsibilities
5. College Education Committee minutes for the last 3 years
6. Department Academic Committee (and post September 2017 Department Management Board) minutes for the last 3 years
7. Board of Studies minutes for the last 3 years

Taught Provision

8. List of all programmes (current and withdrawn since the last PPR) and current modular/study and assessment blocks in the discipline to establish extent of the provision
9. Current publicity material [link]
10. Current Staff/Student Handbooks [link]
11. Current Subject benchmark statement(s) [link]
12. Current programme specifications [link]
13. Modular/study /assessment block outlines; and study guides (if applicable) [link]
14. Report of last PPR and action plan
15. Partnership Quality Audit reports and resulting action plans
16. PSRB reports (if applicable)
17. Report from Pro-Vice Chancellor (Quality Assurance and Enhancement) confirming completion and appropriate follow-up from:
 - Annual Programme monitoring (reports for the last 3 years)
 - External Examiner reports and responses (for the last 3 years)
 - Regulatory Audit reports (for the last 3 years)
18. SSLC minutes (for the last 3 years)
19. Student Partnership Strategy Action Plan
20. Data:
 - application, admission, progression, attrition, award, and equality and diversity data for all programmes since the last PPR
 - total and graduate level employment rates (DLHE)
 - annual NSS/PTES results since the last PPR
 - partnership students' progression and attainment data
 - YourView data for the last 3 years
 - external benchmark data for the subject

Postgraduate Research Student provision

21. Current PGR handbooks
22. PGR Code of Practice [link]
23. Annual Monitoring of research students for the last 3 years
24. Minutes of PGR student (SSLC) meetings
25. PRES results since the last PPR

26. Data:
- Student numbers and funding
 - Supervision monitoring
 - Submission and completion rates
 - Destinations
 - Examination Outcomes

Periodic Programme Review Process

