

Periodic Collaborative Partnership and Programme Review

Guidance for Panel Members

Periodic Review

All collaborative programmes and partnerships are subject to a Periodic Collaborative Programme Review and a Periodic Collaborative Partnership Review. **Periodic Collaborative Programme Review** normally takes place every six years and provides for confirmation at programme level of the continued validity and relevance of the curriculum and the effectiveness of annual monitoring and review process. **Periodic Collaborative Partnership Review** normally takes place every three years and provides for confirmation at partnership level of the fitness of the partnership arrangements and the effectiveness of annual monitoring and review processes with respect to the partnership.

Panel Members' Role

As panel member your role is three-fold and will consist of initial review documentation and comment submission, participation in panel discussions during the review event and consideration of and comment on the final review report.

Your role begins when you receive the documentation. You are required to scrutinise the documentation and provide a paper on your initial strengths and comments on areas for further investigation at the review. Suggested areas for scrutiny can be found in this guidance. These comments should be sent to the Administrator who sent you the documentation. All panel members' comments will be sent to the Chair in advance of who will then summarise them to inform the discussion at the review.

During the first panel meeting at the review, the Chair will present the summarised comments for discussion and the panel will agree the direction for discussion with the Course Team, which all the panel will participate in.

The panel's findings and outcomes will be presented in a draft report which the panel will have the opportunity to comment on. Once confirmed by the panel it will be submitted to the University Quality Assurance Committee.

Additional information for the Chair

To facilitate an efficient first panel meeting at the event, it is advisable for the Chair to draw panel members' submitted comments together into key themes and areas of interest. This should include potential strengths and areas requiring further discussion which may or may not result in a condition or recommendation. It is advisable for the Chair to include their own items from their scrutiny of the documentation.

The written documentation submitted for the event, when triangulated with discussions in the student and staff meetings, will normally provide sufficient evidence to allow the panel to reach decisions on the outcomes. On occasion, a panel member may request further evidence and if they wish to do this they should submit the request to the Chair via the organiser of the event. In deciding whether to request the further evidence, the following considerations should be made:

- With discussion at the student and staff meetings, is there likely to be sufficient evidence, without the need for the additional request?

- Is the evidence requested likely to provide the information sought?
- Is the evidence likely to be easy to produce?
- Is the question the evidence is aimed to answer, legitimate and appropriate for the review?
- Has the request been submitted in time for the provision's team to be able to provide it?

Documentation

The documentation supplied to inform the discussion and decision of the Review panel consists of:

1. Periodic Review Commentary
2. Programme Specifications and Course Structure Forms
3. External Examiner Reports or Summary (*last 2 years*)
4. Head of Department Annual Report (ASQER) (*latest report*)
5. University Academic Contact (ASQER) Annual Report (*latest report*)
6. Partner Institution Contact Annual Report (ASQER) (*latest report*)
7. Associate Dean (Students) Commentary
8. Collaborative Operational Handbook
9. Partner institution staff curricula vitae
10. Student/Course Handbook
11. Visit reports
12. Staff development reports
13. Previous review report and action plan (*approval report if this is the first review*)
14. Partner Specific Academic Regulations (*if applicable*)
15. Professional/Statutory/Regulatory Body (PSRB) Reports/Action Plans (*if applicable*)
16. For External Assessor only: set of Unit Descriptors

If there is any documentation missing, please inform the Administrator.

Where to start?

You may find it useful to begin by reading the [Programme Monitoring and Review Policy](#) and [Operational Handbook](#) as these provide information on the purpose of periodic review, its place in the university's monitoring and review process and, particularly, the relationship of periodic review to annual review and the different scope of these two processes. It will also be useful for External Assessors to read the [Curriculum Framework Document 2012](#) and [Policy on Maximum Assessment Loads](#).

The Periodic Review Commentary document has been written by the University Academic Contact specifically for the review. As such it should be a useful starting point to quickly gain an understanding of the background to the programmes overall design, development of both programmes and the partnership, and how they have been informed by relevant factors. It will also detail strengths and/or issues raised by the External Examiners, future developments for both the programmes and partnership and may well alert you to areas that you would like to investigate further.

This guidance is intended to aid you in your consideration. It is not intended to be wholly comprehensive or over prescriptive, nor are you limited to the questions provided.

Review Outcomes

If an issue arises during the event that has the potential to lead to a 'no' outcome and could be clarified by an existing, readily available, piece of written evidence, this could legitimately be requested or offered and, if essential, the Chair can agree a short adjournment. If further evidence

could be provided in this circumstance but is not immediately available, the Chair is, exceptionally, permitted to defer the event, or a part of the event. The follow up deferred process should be determined by the panel at their final meeting of the day to decide on draft outcomes and key points and will take the form of:

- Chair's action, or
- Reconvened internal panel with External Assessor correspondence

Review Report

The panel (usually the Chair) will produce a succinct report giving Yes/No outcomes on:

- Continued validity and relevance of the curriculum
- Effective Annual Monitoring and Review Processes
- Fitness of Partnership Arrangements Confirmed for a further three years

and a written comment will be provided on whether programmes are consistent with the University's equal opportunities policies.

The first outcome can take the form of 'yes/no' for **all** programmes considered at the event, or 'yes' for some provision and 'no' for other provision. The second outcome can be 'yes/no' overall but must be 'no' if any provision receives a 'no' for any part of the provision.

In the event of a 'no' outcome on 'continued validity and relevance of the curriculum' either for any or all of the programmes considered at the review the Chair must inform the Deputy Academic Registrar (Quality and Partnerships) immediately the event is completed. Feedback should be given to the Head of Department that this is the panel's decision and that a senior member of QMD, together with the Chair of the review event, will meet with senior Faculty/Department colleagues to discuss the 'next steps'. This meeting will be organised by QMD. The Head of Department can read the further steps that will be required in paragraphs 3.25 of the PMR Operational Handbook.

Remember that where any or all programmes are given a 'no' for this outcome, the outcome for 'effective Annual Monitoring and Review Processes' must be 'no'.

In the event of a 'no' outcome on 'effective Annual Monitoring and Review Processes' as a result of a 'no' outcome on 'continued validity and relevance of the curriculum' the actions will be as above. In the event of a 'no' for this outcome due to another aspect of provision, including not meeting the equal opportunities policies, the Chair of the event will inform the Deputy Academic Registrar (Quality and Partnerships) immediately the event is completed, and provide a draft of the conditions specified. The Head of Department should be informed of the outcome to the event and referred to paragraph 3.26 of the PMR Operational Handbook.

Areas/questions for consideration

Strategy

- What were the original aims and goals of the Partner and the Department in relation to this Partnership?
- Have these been met?
- Have the strategic aims changed since original approval or its last review(s)?
- What contingency plans are in place by the University Department and the partner in the event of the partner being unable to deliver the programme?

Programme aims, structure and outcome

- Are aims and learning outcomes well defined, understandable and in line with the relevant level descriptors in the national Framework for Higher Education Qualifications?
- Does the programme(s) meet the aspirations and demands of stakeholders such as students, employers and professional bodies?
- Is the syllabus consistent with national expectations?
- Are learning outcomes attained at the right level and is there appropriate progression of level?
- Are learning outcomes appropriate in terms of the students' knowledge and understanding, cognitive skills, subject specific and practical/professional skills, personal development, and key and employability skills?
- Is there an appropriate mix of these?
- Is there the right balance between breadth and depth of study?
- Is there appropriate division between core and optional/elective units and appropriate flexibility in the course structure?
- Are subject and interdisciplinary developments, including advances in research and scholarship, reflected in the curriculum?
- Are admissions requirements appropriate both to the target intake, the curriculum and outcomes of the programme(s)?
- Does the programme(s) accommodate and support the needs of students who enter with diverse qualifications?
- Is the programme(s) delivered in the most appropriate mode(s), meeting the needs of all students?
- Is the programme(s) appealing and likely to engage students?
- Is the programme(s) adequately resourced (both personnel and physical resources)?
- Are all areas of the Curriculum Framework met (or have any exceptions have been approved)?

In addition for the External Assessor to consider based upon the Unit Descriptors:

- Do they appear appropriate for the Award and Title of the relevant programme(s)?
- Do the learning outcomes appear to be in line with the relevant level descriptors in the FHEQ?
- Are relevant Subject Benchmark Statement(s) and/or Occupational Standards reflected appropriately?

Partnership management and administration

- Are the roles and responsibilities of the Partner and the Department clearly understood?
- Have both parties satisfactorily fulfilled the roles & responsibilities?
- Do staff have the appropriate qualifications and experience to teach at the level of the programme?
- What is the Partners' recruitment process and how are new staff supported and monitored?
- What arrangements are in place for staff development and support for both the Partner and the Department?
- What are the communication routes and tools between the Partner and the UoP and are they effective?
- What is the academic staff commitment and workloads for both the Partner and the Department?
- Are there any local and/or national regulatory requirements that need to be considered?
- What are the partner's equality policies and the evidence these are being adhered to?
- What contingency plans are in place by the University Department and the partner in the event of the partner being unable to deliver the programme?

Learning, teaching and assessment

- Is there an appropriate assessment strategy including, for example, approval, assignment management etc?
- What impact do cultural differences and local variables have?
- What is the language of delivery? If it is other than English, how does the University ensure standards and quality?
- Are assessment strategies clearly described and capable of providing evidence of achievement of the learning outcomes?
- Is the overall assessment load appropriate?
- Is there an appropriate range of unseen formal examinations and coursework without undue emphasis on unseen formal examinations?
- Is formative assessment and feedback to students on both formative and summative coursework and exams provided?
- Do assessment criteria and marking schemes demonstrate that appropriate judgements can be made about threshold and other levels of achievement?
- Are teaching and learning strategies clearly described?
- Is there an appropriate mix of activities eg lectures/tutorials/practicals/laboratory/clinical/field work etc?
- Do teaching, learning and assessment strategies make use of the University's or the partner's VLE and any innovative or good practice aspects?
- Are all areas of the Curriculum Framework met including: Personal Tutor framework; Personal Development Planning; Graduate academic and, employability and career management skills (or any exceptions that have approval)

Student Feedback and Support

- What are the student feedback mechanisms and its consideration?
- How often do Staff Student Consultative Committees and Boards of Studies, or equivalent, meet at the Partner and do those reports feed into the University's Department's Board of Studies?
- What are the feedback mechanisms back to students?
- What tutorial and pastoral support is provided for the students?

Student admission, progressing & achievement

- What are the required student numbers and admission requirements?
- What is the admissions approval process?
- What is the Induction process and how is the Department involved? Is there an induction session at all levels?
- Does the student profile fit with the intended target group(s)?
- Has the profile changed over time and, if so, have there been changes to the programme(s) to meet changing needs?
- Are progression and achievement data consistent with national expectations and those of the university and department(s)?
- Have they drifted over time?
- Do they suggest particular issues that need to be addressed?
- Do they evidence effectiveness of changes that have been introduced?

Monitoring and review

- Do the reports adequately reflect the programme's strengths?
- Do they adequately identify issues that, from evidence that you gather during the review process, appear to be of importance to the programme(s) under review?
- Do they provide a good assessment of the programme(s)' fitness **for** purpose?
- Is there evidence that they promote the maintenance of strengths and help address problems?
- Do they have a positive impact on academic quality and the maintenance of standards?
- Is there full and proactive engagement with course development and the evaluation of quality and standards?
- Are external comments, such as those contained in the External Examiner summary report and professional body reports, fully and promptly addressed?
- Are student concerns addressed?

Resources and facilities

- Is the learning environment appropriate?
- What are the resources and facilities available for students?
- Is the computing or specialist equipment appropriate and is there relevant support available?
- What core texts are supplied in the Library?
- Are the partner library facilities appropriate for the needs of the students?
- Is there any liaison between the librarian's at the partner and the University libraries?

Areas/questions for consideration – student meeting:

Curriculum

- Is the course what you expected it to be?
- Are you aware of progression in the course you are doing – is it getting more challenging as you move through the levels?
- How does the fieldwork/placement complement the curriculum? Are the arrangements well managed? (as relevant)
- Do health and safety issues form part of the curriculum? (where relevant)

Assessments

- Are you clear about what you have to do?
- Are you given the timetable for assessment at the start of the semester?
- Is the assessment appropriate with regards to load and types?
- Do you receive marking criteria explaining how you can achieve the best grades?
- How is feedback on your work given to you? (coursework and exams? Feedback sheets? Generic comments? Web?)
- How helpful do you find the feedback given to you?
- What sort of timescales are there for you receiving work back?
- Do you have group work? How widespread is that? How do you find it?
- Do you have formative assessment/feedback?

Learning and Teaching

- How do you find the strategies/methods used?
- Do you have a tutorial programme? Does it include study and key skills?
- How good is the quality of the teaching?
- Do you receive guidance for independent study?

Student Progression & Achievement/Student Support

- How did you find out about the University?
- Do you feel a University of Portsmouth student?
- How did you find the Induction?
- What information about the University was provided to you before the start of the programme?
- Do you know where to get a copy of the Course/Student Handbook, Programme Specification, Academic Regulations?
- Do you know who to go to if you need help with academic work and other matters?
- Do you have a personal tutor and how often do you meet?
- Are staff available and supportive?
- Do you know who to contact at the University?
- Do you know that you are a member of the University's Student's Union?

Learning Resources

- Are rooms and equipment appropriate at your institution?
- Is the Library accessible and well stocked with required books and journals?
- Do you use your University of Portsmouth Student Card?
- Do you use any online University services, such as the Library, the course VLE, Google, etc?

Quality Assurance

- How are your views sought? – induction feedback? Unit/course feedback? SSCC/BoS?
- Is there feedback to you on your feedback issues?
- Are you aware of any changes that have come about from your comments?
- What additional comments would you like to make about your partner institution, the University of Portsmouth, the course, or studying on a collaborative programme?