Periodic Programme Revalidation: Procedure

1. ## Scope

    1.1. Each school is required to undertake Periodic Programme Revalidation (PPR) for all programmes on a cyclical basis. Each review will be conducted at subject level (with more than one per school, where applicable).

    1.2. The PPR process will consider:
    - the student experience;
    - the academic standards of the programmes and any evidence of change over time;
    - enhancement of the programme;
    - the continued validity and relevance of all programmes including the impact of incremental change;
    - the programme specifications and unit descriptors;
    - how the design of the programme engages students through teaching methods, assessment and formative activities;
    - the programmes' overall strategy for assessing students' learning and how this is demonstrated through the connections across Units of the programme;
    - Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion;
    - Alignment with the University Education Strategy, and the Bristol Futures Curriculum Framework

2. ## Outline of the Process

    2.1. A Review Coordinator will be assigned from the AQPO to work with the School throughout the PPR process.

    2.2. Typically, a PPR will constitute a series of round-table discussions that cover the key themes arising from the Review Participants' analysis of the portfolio of information (see 2.12 and 2.13).

    2.3. With the exception of schools that have a full or mid-scale accreditation in place, PPR meetings will normally take place across one full day (see annex A).

    2.4. Where there is full or mid-scale accreditation an extended UQT review will occur for revalidation purposes and a single meeting with the school (usually including the Head of School and School Education Director plus others as appropriate) will be arranged to allow discussion of any queries based on review of internal metrics and information. This will occur once the report from the accreditation body has been received and the school has provided a response and will normally be within 12 months of the professional body accreditation visit.

    2.5. Programmes that have been recently approved through the <u>full</u> programme approval process for example, university-level approval for new programmes and major curriculum review of existing programmes, but not new pathways that were considered through the low-risk faculty approval route, may be exempt from PPR during the first 3 intake years unless concerns are raised through other quality assurance mechanisms.

    Review Team

    2.6. The team will normally be chaired by a University Education Director (Quality) and for a full PPR would normally include:
    - up to two Student Quality Reviewers, at least one from the home faculty;
    - A suitable external examiner from the school's pool of current external examiners;
    - An external critical friend from a similar department at another institution;

- A Faculty Education Director from the faculty that owns the programmes (except where the PPR is of programmes where the FED is closely involved, in which case a member of UAQSC will be appointed by the Chair of UAQSC in their stead)
- A member of AQPO (Review Coordinator)

And for an enhanced UQT review to consider revalidation of full- or mid-scale accredited programmes the chair would be joined by:

- one Student Quality Reviewer;
- a member of AQPO

2.7. The Head of School and School Education Director are expected to engage fully in all meetings planned in relation to any programme revalidation process.

2.8. Student Course Representatives and Members of the Committees of Student Academic Society/ies must be included in discussions during the PPR. Alumni may also be invited to attend relevant meetings.

2.9. Other staff will be invited to join relevant discussions to further explore and enhance programme delivery methods.

2.10. Industry or employer representatives may be invited to meetings or consulted prior to the meeting. Advice from the Careers Service will be taken in order to tailor this to each school.

2.11. Early in the process for full PPR, the Review Coordinator will liaise with the School and PPR Chair to confirm the programmes to be covered, the review participants and the general format of the review.

Portfolio of Information

2.12. The PPR is based on an analysis of a portfolio of information relating to the current validity and standards of programmes, principally from existing programme monitoring activities such as Education Action Plans. It will also be an opportunity for the school to provide additional information in the form of a SWOT analysis. The portfolio of information will include:

- School Education Action Plan
- Statistical Data (Application:Offer:Intake ratios; Intake Analysis; Progression; Award; Destination of Leavers from Higher Education (DLHE) data; continuation indicators from OfS; student survey results)
- Details of existing employability agreements
- Summary of UQT visit reports
- Programme specifications
- Unit specifications for mandatory units
- Report of programme changes over the last 3 years
- School's SWOT analysis
- Brief mapping of how the programmme(s) map to the Bristol Futures Curriculum Framework, if there has been no recent or planned engagement with the Curriculum Enhancement Programme. Where engagement has occurred an update from the CEP will be sought by the revalidation team.
- Details of Staff involved in teaching and administering the programmes (e.g. profile of staff across the school)

2.13.   For revalidation of programmes undergoing full- or mid-scale accreditation the following documents will form the portfolio of information:

- The accreditation submission document, review report, and response from the school
- School Education Action Plan
- Statistical Data (Application:Offer:Intake ratios; Intake Analysis; Progression; Award; Destination of Leavers from Higher Education (DLHE) data; continuation indicators from OfS; student survey results)
- Programme, and mandatory unit specifications
- Details of existing employability agreements
- Summary of UQT visit reports
- School's SWOT analysis
- Brief mapping of how the programmme(s) map to the Bristol Futures Curriculum Framework, if there has been no recent or planned engagement with the Curriculum Enhancement Programme. Where engagement has occurred an update from the CEP will be sought by the revalidation team.

2.14.   In advance of a full PPR, the Review Coordinator will circulate the Portfolio of Information to the Review Team who are requested to consider this in the light of the University's Education Strategy, identify any themes arising and feedback to the Review Coordinator.

2.15.   The Review Coordinator will collate the feedback from the Review Team's analysis of the portfolio and liaise with the Review Chair and School to agree the particular areas of focus or themes that will be addressed in the Review. The agenda will be agreed at this meeting.

3. Responsibilities

3.1. The Review Coordinator and Review Chair will meet with the Head of School and School Education Director as early as possible to confirm the remit of any full PPR, relevant dates and the timing of the submission of the SWOT analysis.

3.2. The School will provide nominations for the external participants, and confirm details of representatives from external partnerships etc.

3.3. The Review Coordinator will be responsible for coordinating the Portfolio of Information and liaising with the Review Team.

3.4. The School will be responsible for providing the space required for a full PPR and will ensure that relevant students (current and alumni), and school staff are available for the Review.

4. Outcomes of the PPR

4.1. The outcomes of the PPR will be recorded in a report with recommendations. The report will be signed off by the school and Chair before being disseminated to the UAQSC.

4.2. Recommendations from a full PPR will be made to the school and categorised into three levels:

i.   Immediate action required;

ii. Intermediate issue needs to be addressed before the start of the next academic year;

iii. Further planning is required to ensure the continued improvement of the students' learning opportunities.

4.3. Recommendations may also be made to the Faculty, the University, and the Curriculum Enhancement Programme (CEP) (e.g. to initiate a CEP activity with the school).

4.4. Revalidation of the programmes will be confirmed when the school satisfactorily responds to any recommendations by updating their School EAP. The EAP will be considered by the Review Team Chair and reported to the UAQSC.

4.5. All PPR reports with the corresponding EAP sections will be reported to the UAQSC. Where level (i) recommendations have been made, the report and action plan will be reviewed by UAQSC (or the Chair of UAQSC) within two weeks of the date of the report, and a further progress report considered by the Committee no less than six months later. If the recommendations in the report fall into category (ii) and (iii) the report and action plan would be considered by the UAQSC at the final meeting of the academic year, with the progress reports being considered at the January meeting.

4.6. If a School fails to respond to category (i) or (ii) actions within the allocated timeframe the Dean and PVC-Education will be informed, programmes would not be revalidated and the School would be required to implement a teaching out plan.

4.7. The outcomes of the PPR will be shared with students by upload to the relevant Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Blackboard site(s).

5. Interaction with existing QA processes

5.1. The School EAP Process will be conducted as normal during the year a PPR is due.

5.2. UQT reports will inform the PPR process and the outcomes of the PPR will be followed up by UQT.

Annex A

Potential schedule/timetable for a Periodic Programme Revalidation

AQPO will work with the relevant School to compile a schedule of meetings. The number, length and size of meetings will vary depending on the subject, whether there has been a recent PSRB visit, if the review covers UG and PGT, the number of programmes involved etc.

Some meetings may be developmental/exploratory meetings prior to the review.

Formal review meetings will normally take place across one full day. Meetings will normally take place with the following people but this is not an exclusive list:

- Head of School;

- School Education Director (or equivalent);

- Programme Director/s;

- Unit Directors;

- Senior Tutor;

- Teaching staff;

- Professional Service Staff (School Manager, Student Administration Manager, Graduate Administration Manager, Student Administrators etc.);

- Industry or employer representatives;

- Students (normally course representatives);

- Alumni;

- Collaborative partners.

Periodic Programme Revalidation in the Department of XXXX

Month/ Year

Draft Plan and Agenda

Notes as required

Review Panel	School/Department Members of Review
Chair: External(s): FED(s): AQPO Representative: SQR(s):	Head of School School Education Director Student Administration Manager School Manager Deputy Heads of Teaching (if applicable)
Programmes being reviewed: 1.	
Programmes excluded from review (and brief reason): 2.	

Time	Meeting	Attendees
9:15 – 10:15	Welcome, introduction and review of SWOT analysis and data	• Review Panel • Head of School • School Education Director • School Manager
	Refreshments	
10:15– 11:45	Round table discussion about what is working well in the programmes, what would the school want to keep and what would it change? Areas to consider: • Teaching delivery • Assessment and feedback (prog level assessment), TESTA outcomes • Mapping to Curriculum Framework • Student support/academic community • Learning spaces/library • Recruitment/Admissions	• Review panel • School members of review • Year Coordinators
11:45-12:00	Panel meeting	• Review panel
12:00 – 13:30	Lunch with students	• Review panel • Student representatives • Chair of student societies
13:30-14:00	Panel meeting	• Review Panel
14:00 – 16:00	Meeting as required to delve deeper into any arising themes e.g. around Student progression Issues	• Review panel • School members of review
	Refreshments	
16:00 – 16:30	Final meeting to set recommendations/action plan	• Review Panel
16:30-17:00	Final meeting to discuss revalidation and resulting actions	• Review panel • School members of review