Senate Handbook

Senate Reviews

This Handbook supplements Regulations governed by Senate.

It includes policies, procedures, advice and/or guidance that staff are expected to follow in the proper conduct of University business.

Contents

Major changes to this document since version 2.6 September 2022:

- Revised panel student representation for PCRs (6.2)
- Revised documentation for PCRs (6.2)
- Additon of PCR report template (Appendix C)

1 Reviews of learning and teaching provision

1.1 Background and context

1.1.1 Why should we review learning and teaching provision?

Regular and periodic review of learning and teaching provision is a well-established principle across the higher education sector. The UK Quality Code for Higher Education provides a key reference point for UK higher education.[1] Accepted practice is for reviews of learning and teaching provision to take place on both short-term (regular – usually annual) and longer-term (periodic) cycles.

The review of learning and teaching provision should be at the core of the University's mission in delivering high-quality relevant education opportunities to its students. Review of teaching provision should take into account good practice in learning and teaching, the introduction of and experimentation with new teaching methods and pedagogic tools, and feedback from staff, students, industrial advisors, external examiners, potential employers and other interested parties.

The University endorses this view and has made provision for:
- regular, annual review of teaching provision for all taught courses, through *annual reflective reviews*;[2]
- periodic review of teaching and research student provision by Schools,
- periodic review of courses,
- periodic review of partnerships.

Review of taught provision is a multi-layered process through annual reflection, course reviews (both periodic and adhoc), partnership reviews and Senate Reviews of Schools.

This Handbook outlines the structures, purposes and operation of longer-term reviews of learning, teaching and assessment.

1.1.2 Purposes of periodic review of learning and teaching provision

The purposes of more periodic monitoring of learning and teaching provision (i.e. on a 3-6 year cycle) are:

- To assess the continuing quality, currency and relevance of educational provision in the context of the University's Education and Research strategies;
- To review student demand, employer expectations, and employment opportunities in the context of the educational provision and student support needs;
- To review the impact of changes since the last periodic review on the design and delivery of courses and the provision of student support;
- To ensure the continuing availability of staff and other educational and research student resources required for effective educational provision; and
- To reflect upon the impact of external changes and requirements, including the needs of employers, accrediting bodies or other stakeholders, and any sector developments in academic practice or educational technology.

---

[1] UK Quality Code for Higher Education https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code
[2] Further details of the conduct of annual reflective reviews can be found in the Senate Handbook on Managing Taught Courses.

Periodic monitoring necessarily takes a broader view of learning and teaching provision than is possible in the annual reflective review cycle, and would normally include advice and input from external participants of high calibre and with academic and/or professional credibility.

1.2 Types of periodic review

1.2.1 Introduction

The principal unit of periodic review has been determined by Senate to be the total provision (taught courses and research student provision) of a school. All Schools will normally be reviewed in this way at least once every six years.

Other types of periodic review (Section 1.2.2) are additional to the Senate review of a School and are designed to achieve a specific and complementary purpose.

Senate reviews are restricted to scrutinising and evaluating the quality and standards of the academic provision and of the student experience, taking into consideration resource and staffing issues only where they impinge on that provision.

1.2.2 Types of periodic review

Senate further recognises that certain types of academic provision require a greater level of scrutiny that may not be captured at a School-level, or may cross School boundaries. It has therefore approved the following types of periodic review:

a) **SENATE REVIEW OF A SCHOOL (SRS)**: instigated by Education and Research Committees, to cover all learning and teaching delivered by a single School (i.e. all taught courses and individual modules which contribute to a named award of the University, and the general provision and support provided to all registered students, including research students).

b) **PARTNERSHIP REVIEWS:** to review the educational provision delivered with an academic partner.   Reviews will be instigated by Education Committee and/or Research Committee dependent on the nature of the educational provision involved in the partnership. There are two types of Partnership Review:
   - **Year One Partnership Review (Y1PR)** - Review of educational provision involving significant contributions from a partner institution one year after the initiation of a new partnership.
   - **Partnership Review (PR)** – regular review of educational provision involving significant contributions from a partner institution.

c) **FOCUSSED REVIEW (FR)**: instigated by Education Committee and/or Research Committee to cover particular types of provision to be reviewed at regular intervals to include reviews which may cover learning and teaching provision by more than one School (e.g. individual courses requiring significant co-ordination between Schools).

d) **SPECIAL MEASURES REVIEW (SMR)**: Instigated by Education Committee and/or Research Committee. Not formally designated as recurring periodic reviews but to be applied if there are circumstances that require a regular and detailed intervention in an aspect of the University's academic provision. In these cases "periodic" may infer weeks or months rather than years, in contrast to the reviews outlined above.

e) **COURSE REVIEWS:** to review the learning and teaching provision of a single taught course or a programme (comprising more than one course) to ensure that it continues to meet, or exceed, the threshold standards as described by the qualifications descriptors set out in the national frameworks for higher education qualifications and to ensure the quality of the student experience. A course review must take place at least once every ten years. Course reviews

take place in addition to Annual Reflective Reviews, accreditation visits[3] from professional institutions, and the Senate review of a School.

There are two types of Course Review:
- **Course Review Panel (CRP) –** to review significant changes proposed for a course. CRP's can be instigated at any point by a School's Director of Education. <u>A CRP may be relatively narrow in scope and may not be designated</u> as Periodic Course Review (PCR) – although the CRP report may be relevant supporting information for a PCR.
- **Periodic Course Review (PCR) –** instigated by Education Committee, as required, to review the learning and teaching provision of a single taught course or a programme (comprising more than one taught course) to ensure that all taught award-bearing provision is formally reviewed at least once every ten years.

1.2.3 General outline and conduct of periodic reviews

For the categories SRS, Y1PR, PR and FR , review panels will normally include (where relevant) representation from Senate's Education and Research Committees, Senate members, the student body, and appropriate persons external to the University to provide impartial and independent advice. The review panel will be serviced by Education Services staff and will liaise with a specific nominated person from the School or area being reviewed.

The relevant Pro-Vice-Chancellor for a school will be tasked with responding to the findings of the review panels for the SRS, Y1PR, PR and FR reviews. A first response will be submitted to the Education and Research Committees (where relevant) shortly after the review, and a second response a year later (or six months later in respect of Y1PR). Upon receipt of these responses, the Education and Research Committees (where relevant) will decide if any further action is required.

For the categories of CRP and PCR, review panels will normally include the School Director of Education, School academic staff not involved in the provision under review, a member of Professional Services staff, the student body and an external subject matter expert. The review panel will be serviced by Education Services staff and will liaise with a specific nominated person from the School or area being reviewed.

Course/Programme Directors will be tasked with responding to the findings of the review panels for PCR reviews. A first response will be submitted to Education Committee shortly after the review, and a second response a year later. Upon receipt of these responses, Education Committee will decide if any further action is required.

By their nature, Special Measure Review panels will require bespoke membership, as the reviews represent more a programme of intervention. Education Committee and/or Research Committee will ask at least one member of academic staff (i.e., a Course Director where relevant) from the same School, and at least one from outside the School, to meet with the relevant staff involved in the area of provision under review in an ongoing and structured way to help them prepare and progress an action plan. Administrative resource will be provided by the relevant School. The action plan and regular updates will be presented to Education Committee and/or Research Committee until Education Committee and/or Research Committee and the relevant Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) and Director of Education and/or Director of Research are all satisfied that the provision under review is operating as it should and that no recurrence of issues are likely to present themselves.

---

[3] <u>All reviews will be designed to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort with the requirements of professional accreditation.</u>

1.3   Administrative arrangements

The administrative arrangements for all Senate reviews will include support from Education Services[4] (for the general conduct of the review and its progression prior to and after completion) and from the area being reviewed (i.e. the School, course team or service department). In broad terms, administrative support should be provided by these two areas as outlined below.

A member of staff appointed by the Academic Registrar will provide secretarial support to the review panel. Duties will include:

(i)   Provide authoritative guidance on review procedures;
(ii)   liaising with review panel members to agree how to proceed with the review. This will include a decision on how many meetings will be required and with whom. The Secretary is also responsible for passing this information to the area being reviewed;
(iii)   assisting external members with accommodation and parking arrangements, and expense claims;
(iv)   liaising with an identified administrative contact within the area being reviewed to ensure that appropriate documentation is provided to the review panel;
(v)   taking notes of all meetings of the review panel where possible. In cases where the panel divides and holds separate meetings concurrently, it may be necessary for review panel members to compile appropriate notes;
(vi)   producing, with the review panel, the final report;
(vii)   sending the final review panel report to the area being reviewed to allow it to identify any factual inaccuracies and provide a response to the Education and Research Committees (where relevant); and
(viii) Ensure follow up actions are addressed and reported to the Education and Research Committees (where relevant).

The area being reviewed will be responsible for a number of administrative arrangements:

(i)   identifying a key administrative contact to liaise with the Secretary;
(ii)   agreeing dates and times of meetings with the review panel members and the Secretary;
(iii)   organising the provision of documentation to be made available to the review panel; and
(iv)   arranging meetings that the review panel has requested, including booking meeting rooms, inviting and briefing relevant staff and students who the review panel wish to meet, and providing other facilities as required, such as telephone, printer, PC, etc. Reasonable costs will be met by the relevant School.

---

[4] Normally this means Quality Assurance and Enhancement for SRS, Y1PR, PR, FR, SMR and the relevant School Assistant Registrar for PCR/CRP

2 Senate Review of a School (SRS)

2.1 Introduction

A Senate review of a School (SRS) should cover all of the educational provision delivered by one of the four Schools of the University: this would include all taught courses and individual modules which contribute to a named award of the University, and the general provision and support provided to all registered students, including research students. The review process will be conducted against standard terms of reference (outlined in Section 2.4) but will be tailored according to the risk-based approach outlined in Section 2.2. The detailed conduct of a review will be discussed and agreed in advance with the relevant Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School), to ensure local structures and needs are taken into consideration, and to allow flexibility in the light of developing School structures.

2.2 Risk-based approach

The SRS is not intended to consider all documentation and statistics relevant to educational provision comprehensively. Rather, it should be a reflective process, take into account the views of all relevant stakeholders (both internal and external to the University), and focus on those issues likely to have the greatest impact upon the quality and standards of educational provision in the School. It is a principle of this risk-based approach that the administrative burden should be minimised and the benefits of constructive, collaborative and self-critical periodic review maximised.

2.3 Overall process and timeline

The conduct of a SRS takes two years: this includes a year of setting up and conducting the review itself, followed by a year in which the School will review and instigate any recommendations outlined in the report of the review panel. SRS reviews will be instigated at the start of the academic year, with the bulk of meetings between a review panel and staff and students of the School towards the end of the academic year, usually in June and July.

The general procedure for a SRS shall be as follows:

- Education and Research Committees confirm with the School that it will be reviewed;

- the Pro-Vice-Chancellors for Education and Research, the Academic Registrar (or appropriate deputies) and Quality Assurance and Enhancement will meet with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) and the School's Directors of Education and Research to discuss how the standard terms of reference (see Section 2.4) will be applied for their School, whether to include additional terms of reference, and how the School will present a self-evaluation at the outset to the appointed review panel;

- Quality Assurance and Enhancement will discuss (with the School, the Pro-Vice-Chancellors for Education and Research), the Cranfield Student Association (CSA) and others) nominations for the review panel and have a final panel confirmed by Education and Research Committees. The membership of the review panel will be constructed along standard lines agreed in advance (see section 2.5);

- the School will produce its self-evaluation document, in an agreed format (see Section 2.6 for further guidance on what this might contain). It is essential that this document should be both reflective and self-critical and should aim to help the review panel to identify where it should focus its attention. It is not intended that the briefing document be extensive (20-30 pages in length);

- Reports will be produced from Education, Research and Student Experience Committees as outlined in Section 2.6;

- the review panel will receive the documentation and review it, to identify which areas of the provision it could usefully explore in more detail, and to consider how to undertake its further

engagement with the School. The review panel may also consider at this point whether it requires changes or additions to its membership to conduct the review and discuss this with the Pro-Vice-Chancellors for Education and Research for approval;

- the review panel may decide for themselves how best to manage their investigations. It will articulate any further documentation it would like to receive and outline any meetings it may wish to have with relevant staff and students. It may also decide whether it may or may not need to form "sub-panels" to focus on specific areas within a School (e.g. a specific department, a set of courses, research student provision, the School's academic strategy etc.);

- the level of engagement with the School will normally entail a single "School visit day" in which all meetings will be scheduled, but in certain cases meetings may need to be scheduled over several separate days depending on the scope of the review and the availability of key members of staff;

- after the review panel has concluded all meetings and discussions, the Chair and Secretary will meet with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) to convey its initial findings;

- a full report containing the review panel's findings and recommendations will be sent to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) for factual corrections and amendments. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) will also be asked to make an initial response to the final agreed report, for consideration at Education and Research Committees;

- Education and Research Committees will review the report and the School response and articulate (if required) or approve a clear action plan for the School;

- the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) will be asked to make a further response to the Education and Research Committees one year after the review has taken place to report on progress. In exceptional circumstances, the Education and Research Committees may request this report to be submitted earlier if they have particular concerns about any aspect of the School's provision;

- upon receipt of this second response, Education and Research Committees will then decide if any further action is required. Once the Education and Research Committees are satisfied with the outcome of the action plan it will be considered that the conclusion of the process has been reached.

This timeline is also represented in the following table:

	EDUCATION COMMITTEE (EC) and RESEARCH COMMITTEE (RC)	SCHOOL	REVIEW PANEL
Jun	SRS for forthcoming year to be reviewed and the School notified →	School confirms acceptance of being taken forward for review	
Sep	Confirmation of SRS. PVC-E and PVC-R, Academic Registrar, PVC School, DoE and DoR and Secretary meet to confirm terms of reference		
Sep - Oct	Officers instigate set-up of review panel	School prepares self-evaluation briefing document and supporting documents	
Nov	EC and RC confirm review panel membership and ToR EC and RC prepare a report on key issues to be considered in the review. Co-Chairs of Student Experience Committee meet with School student representatives to identify student-centred issues to be considered in the review		Secretary begins to arrange review timetable
Dec			
Jan			Secretary collates paperwork and organises the initial review panel meeting
Feb		Responds to panel requests and provides documentation	Meets to review documentation and highlight areas of focus, including any further information required and meetings to be held. School DoE and DoR to be invited to meeting.
Mar – May		Secretary arranges meetings between School and review panel	Panel members prepare for meetings
Jun - Jul		School visits are held	
Jul - Aug			Report is prepared and relayed to Education Services
Aug - Sep		School submits corrections and/or a response to the report to Education & Research Committee	
Sep	Receives report and agrees future action plan for School		
Aug (+ 1 year)		School submits a further response outlining actions taken since the review and plans for the future	
Sep (+ 1 year)	Receives updated response		

2.4 Terms of reference and scope

2.4.1 Terms of Reference

1. To assess the continuing quality, currency and relevance of educational provision in the context of the University's Education and Research strategies;
2. To review the School's self-evaluation and reports from its students, Senate's Education and Research Committees, and any other relevant information pertaining to the educational provision of the School;
3. To review student demand, employer expectations, and employment opportunities in the context of the School's educational provision and student support needs;
4. To review the impact of changes since the last Senate Review on the design and delivery of the courses and the provision of research student support;
5. To ensure the continuing availability of staff and other educational and research student resources required for effective educational provision; and
6. To reflect upon the impact of external changes and requirements, including the needs of employers, accrediting bodies or other stakeholders, and any sector developments in academic practice or educational technology.

2.4.2 Scope

The following areas of educational provision are within the scope of the SRS:

i.   the School's academic portfolio:
   a.   the management and provision of research student supervision and support;
   b.   the management and development of the academic provision for taught courses (i.e. the rationale behind the range of current and proposed courses);
   c.   the appropriateness and range of teaching and assessment methods employed across the School and the extent to which innovation in academic practice is encouraged and evident in the course design and delivery;
   d.   the extent to which the course design and delivery aligns with the University Education Strategy and complies with Senate's Handbooks

ii.   the School's learning resources:
   e.   academic staffing levels, expertise, professional recognition, and the maintenance and development of academic practice and good academic standing;
   f.   b. provision of a high-quality learning and research environment including physical and digital infrastructure.

iii. cross-School provision and interaction, including the range of provision, and academic and administrative arrangements:

iv.   teaching provision in association with academic or industrial partners, including the range of provision, and academic and administrative arrangements;

v.   student support, including taught courses and research students:
   g.   provision of information and guidance, on induction and throughout registration;
   h.   development of individual learning and monitoring of progression;
   i.   development of intellectual environment (i.e. the culture and ethos of the learning environment);
   j.   development of a supportive environment to promote mental health and wellbeing;
   k.   management and innovation of both short- and long-term research projects;

vi.   feedback and continuous improvement of the student experience:
   l.   student feedback mechanisms, and use of feedback outcomes;
   m.   use of external feedback (including external examiners, industrial advisory panels, industry partners, accreditation bodies) and wider sector guidance

2.5   Review panel membership[5]

The review panel for a SRS will normally consist of the following members:

Chairperson – the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) or the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) (or nominee from Education or Research Committee providing that he or she is not directly connected with the School being reviewed).

Senate Members – at least one member of Senate not directly connected with the School, and with either a taught or research focus (to offer a contrasting viewpoint to the appointed Chair), appointed by the Chair.

External Members – at least one person from outside the University, who is of an appropriate standing to participate in a review of the academic activity of the School, appointed by the Chair on behalf of Senate, and on the recommendation of the Pro Vice Chancellor of the School being reviewed. (It would not be inappropriate if one of the external members of Council was appointed in this capacity.)

Student Representative – a member of the CSA Executive or student body who is not directly connected to the School, appointed by the Chair on behalf of Senate, on the nomination of the CSA Executive.

Secretary – normally a member of Quality Assurance and Enhancement, appointed by the Chair on behalf of Senate, and on the nomination of the Academic Registrar. The role of the Secretary is to provide authoritative guidance on review procedures and on University Regulations and external frameworks, and to help the review panel produce a final report.

The final panel will be confirmed by the Education and Research Committees

2.6   Documentation requirements

Prior to its first meeting, the SRS review panel shall receive:

2.6.1   Self-evaluation document from the School

A key document in the review process will be the self-evaluation document (SED) provided by the School. While there is no expectation that this document is provided in a rigid and structured format, it is strongly recommended that the advice outlined below is followed to help construct the documentation produced for the review panel.

The SED should:
- address the agreed terms of reference for the review;
- provide a concise contextual overview of educational provision in the School outlining the taught course portfolio and its recent and future development and describing provision for intellectual development and research culture for its research students
- the mechanisms and structures in place in the School to ensure quality and standards of educational provision and enhance the student learning experience;
- be reflective and self-critical in tone rather than descriptive;
- make reference to objective and verifiable metrics and feedback from students and external stakeholders to support assertions and conclusions;
- identify key areas of risk to the maintenance of quality, standards and the student learning experience and how these are being mitigated;
- identify opportunities for development and innovation of education provision in the School.

---

[5] Where research provision forms part of any review there should be balanced representation from Education Committee and Research Committee on the panel (where possible).

As a guide, the main body of the self-evaluation document should be between 20-30 pages.

2.6.2 Report from the Education and Research Committees

The Review Panel will receive a combined report from the Education and Research Committees. The draft report will be assembled by colleagues from the Education Services and Student Experience professional service units based on intelligence around recent and relevant educational provision issues. The draft report will be reviewed by the Education and Research Committees and a final version approved for submission to the Review Panel.

2.6.3 Report from the Student Experience Committee

The Review Panel will receive a report from the Student Experience Committee. The draft report will be assembled by the Co-Chairs of the Student Experience Committee based on recent taught and research student experiences and feedback. The draft report will be reviewed by the Student Experience Committee and a final version approved for submission to the Review Panel.

2.7   Report from the review panel

2.7.1 General outline

At the end of the process, the review panel shall produce a report for the Education and Research Committees to consider. The final report of the review panel will be subject to factual corrections proposed by the School, and will be accompanied by a response from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School)

The purpose of the review panel report is to provide assurance to Senate, Education Committee and Research Committee that the School is undertaking its roles and responsibilities in the delivery of a high standard of education provision and student experience (in relation to learning and teaching activities). It also serves to highlight to Senate, Education Committee and Research Committee any current or potential concerns or issues that may require immediate redress or future management. Finally, the report should also highlight good practice identified by the members of the review panel that are particularly commendable and/or worth disseminating more widely throughout the University.

The reports will be retained and may be used in future Senate or Council reviews, and as evidence in external audits, reviews or accreditation exercises.

Guidance on the structure of the review panel report can be found in **Appendix A**

2.7.2 School response to the review panel report

At the end of the review process, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) will be invited in the first instance to consider the report and, if necessary, discuss any factual inaccuracies or ambiguities that should be amended for the final version. This may require further meetings between the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) and the Chair of the review panel, if such corrections are not straightforward.

Once a final version of the report has been agreed, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) will be invited to produce a response to the report to Education and Research Committees. There is no required structure or format for this response, but the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) should ensure that it acknowledges or otherwise comments on each of the commendations and recommendations made by the review panel. (There may be some which refer to activities or responsibilities outwith the School being reviewed, and this is an opportunity for the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) to support or otherwise comment on the points made.)

Where the number of recommendations is extensive or complex, it may be appropriate for the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) to include or append a formal action plan.

2.7.3 Final consideration by Education and Research Committees

The Education and Research Committees will receive and consider the report of the review panel and any responses and will either approve the actions proposed by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School), or agree with him or her alternative courses of action. Each Committee reserves the right to invite the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) to attend for discussion.

Where commendations and recommendations relate to activities or action required in other parts of the University, Education and Research Committees will articulate how those will be followed up, and will manage future engagement with any progress required.

One year after the completion of the SRS and the agreement of any courses of action, Education and Research Committees will conduct a progress review, through the submission of a statement or report from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School). In most cases, it is unlikely that meetings between Education and Research Committees and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) would be required, but each committee reserves the right to invite the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) to attend for further discussion.

3   Partnership Reviews

Partnership reviews will be instigated by Education Committee and/or Research Committee (dependent on the nature of the educational provision involved in the partnership). An initial review schedule will be approved by Education Committee and/or Research Committee during the academic partner approval process based on the complexity and duration of the collaboration. The schedule will be regularly reviewed as part of the partnership review process to ensure it remains appropriate, noting that a review must take place at least once every six years.

Education Committee and/or Research Committee reserves the right to instigate interim reviews based on outcomes from Partnership reviews and/or changes to the partnership provision.

There are two types of Partnership Review:

- **Year One Partnership Review (Y1PR)** - Review of educational provision involving significant contributions from a partner institution one year after the initiation of a new partnership.

- **Partnership Review (PR)** – Regular review of educational provision involving significant contributions from a partner institution.

3.1   Year One Partnership Review (Y1PR)

3.1.1 Introduction

Year One Partnership reviews will be instigated by Education Committee and/or Research Committee (dependent on the nature of the educational provision involved in the partnership) one year after initiation of a new partnership involving academic (award bearing) provision. These should be seen as a supportive framework to assist the Sponsoring School and its new Partner Institution to work collaboratively to ensure that:
- the educational provision and associated student experiences are of a high standard;
- those responsible for delivering the provision are undertaking their respective roles and responsibilities in an appropriate way.

The review process for each Year One Partnership review will vary considerably, with terms of reference being set out at the point at which the review is instigated. Education Committee has developed a "starting point" terms of reference as set out in section 3.1.3 to be used for outlining detailed and specific terms of reference. The detailed conduct of a review will be discussed and agreed in advance with the relevant parties, to ensure that the purpose of any review is clear at the outset and to ensure that all needs or restrictions are taken into consideration.

Year One Partnership reviews will concentrate on the practicalities of supporting and delivering the partnership. The review will involve engagement with service departments within the University that are actively involved with the delivery of the partnership (e.g. education services, library services, IT-related learning support, academic staff development). Any recommendations arising from Year One Partnership reviews will be considered by Education Committee and/or Research Committee, which will restrict ongoing transmission of recommendations to the appropriate bodies within the University for further review or action.

3.1.2 Overall process and timeline

The conduct of a Y1PR takes approximately twelve months (dependent upon the nature of the partnership) : this includes six months of setting up and conducting the review itself, followed by six months in which any recommendations approved by Education Committee and/or Research Committee are instigated or otherwise referred.

The general pattern on a Y1PR shall be as follows:

- Education and Research Committees consider and confirm whether any Y1PRs are to be undertaken in an academic year;

- in confirming a review, Education and/or Research Committee shall consult with Quality Assurance and Enhancement to identify a Chair, appropriate terms of reference and to outline, where appropriate, what documentation it would expect to be included in any review;

- the Chair and Quality Assurance and Enhancement will then meet with the key parties to discuss how to interpret the agreed terms of reference (see section 3.1.3), how an initial set of documentation (including any self-evaluation) will be produced and the deadlines for submission of the documentation for the appointed review panel;

- the Chair and Quality Assurance and Enhancement will discuss with key parties, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and/or Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research), and the Cranfield Student Association (CSA) nominations for the review panel and have a final panel confirmed by Education Committee and/or Research Committee. The membership of the review panel will be constructed along standard lines agreed in advance (see section 3.1.4);

- documentation in the agreed format will be submitted and the review panel will review it, to identify which areas of the provision it could usefully explore in more detail, and to consider how to undertake further engagement with relevant people. The review panel may also consider at this point whether it requires changes or additions to its membership to conduct the review and discuss this with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and/or Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) for approval;

- the review panel may decide for themselves how best to manage their investigations. It will articulate any further documentation it would like to receive and outline any meetings it may wish to have with relevant staff and students. It may also decide whether it may or may not need to form "sub-panels" to focus on specific areas;

- meetings may either be concentrated into a single day of investigations, or scheduled over several separate days depending on the scope of the review and the availability of key members of staff;

- after the review panel has concluded all meetings and discussions, the Chair and Secretary will co-ordinate the production of a full report containing the review panel's findings. The content of the report may be shared with key parties for factual corrections and amendments, along with a request for a response to the final agreed report, for consideration at Education Committee and/or Research Committee;

- Education Committee and/or Research Committee will review the report and any responses and articulate (if required) or approve a clear action plan;

- Education Committee and/or Research Committee will receive a progress report on the action plan six months after the review has taken place. In exceptional circumstances, Education Committee and/or Research Committee may request this report to be submitted earlier if they have any particular short-term concerns;

- Education Committee and/or Research Committee will then decide if any further action is required. Once Education Committee and/or Research Committee are satisfied with the outcome of the action plan it will be considered that the conclusion of the process has been reached.

This timeline is also represented in the following table:

	EDUCATION COMMITTEE (EC) and/or RESEARCH COMMITTEE (RC)	QUALITY ASSURANCE & ENHANCEMENT	PROVIDERS	REVIEW PANEL
Jun	Discussion of any planned Y1PRs for forthcoming year: relevant key parties ("providers") notified			
Jul	Confirmation of Y1PR	Chair and QA&E meet to discuss and articulate terms of reference (ToR)	Confirm acceptance of being taken forward for review	
		Chair and QA&E meet with key parties to interpret ToR and agree contacts and deadlines for submission of documentation		
Jul -Sep		QA&E instigate set-up of review panel	Prepare initial documentation	
Oct	Confirms review panel membership and ToR			Secretary begins to arrange review timetable
Nov				Secretary collates paperwork and organises the initial review panel meeting
Dec				Meets to review documentation and highlight areas of focus, including any further information required and meetings to be held
Jan - Feb			Respond to panel requests and provide documentation	
			Secretary arranges meetings between relevant students and staff and the review panel	
				Panel members prepare for meetings
Feb - Mar			Meetings are held	
Mar - Apr				Report is prepared
May		Submit report and response to EC and/or RC	Submit corrections and/or a response to the report to EC and/or RC via QA&E	
June	Receives report and agrees future action plan			
Dec	Receives updated response	Submit updated response to EC and/or RC	Submit further response(s) outlining actions taken since the review and plans for the future	

3.1.3   Standard terms of reference

The characteristics of each academic partnership are unique and therefore, by definition, there are no standard terms of reference for a Y1PR. Education Committee have developed a "starting point" terms of reference with which to frame individual Y1PRs as set out below. In most cases only a subset will be required.

Terms of reference for any Review shall be discussed with relevant parties across the University, but the final terms of reference shall be set and approved by Education Committee and/or Research Committee, or by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and/or Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research), if timescales do not permit a formal meeting.

To determine the effectiveness of arrangements in the following areas of provision:

i.   **the taught courses offered within the partnership:**
     a.   the quality of documentation relating to the course(s), including the course specification documents, module descriptors, course handbooks and webpages;;
     b.   the arrangements for the monitoring, review and development of each taught course, including the structures in place to manage input from any partners as appropriate;
     c.   the day-to-day management and administration of each taught course.
     d.   the extent to which innovative approaches to learning, teaching and assessment are used and the potential for them to be disseminated more widely.

ii.   **learning resources:**
     a.   academic staffing levels, expertise, professional recognition, and the maintenance and development of academic practice and good academic standing;
     b.   provision of a high quality learning and research environment including physical and digital infrastructure.
     c.   the accuracy of any formal articulation of the roles and responsibilities of each partner in the areas outlined in ii.a-c above.

iii.   **student support:**
     a.   provision of information and guidance, on induction and throughout registration;
     b.   development of individual learning and monitoring of progression;
     c.   development of intellectual environment (i.e. the culture and ethos of the learning environment);
     d.   development of a supportive environment to promote mental health and wellbeing;
     e.   management of both short- and long-term research projects;
     f.   the accuracy of any formal articulation of the roles and responsibilities of each partner in the areas outlined in iii.a-d above.

iv.   **feedback and continuous improvement of the student experience:**
     a.   oversight of all provision by sponsoring School committees and officers, including the effectiveness of any articulated monitoring arrangements of partner provision;
     b.   student feedback mechanisms, and use of feedback outcomes;
     c.   use of external feedback (including external examiners, industrial advisory panels, industry partners, accreditation bodies) and wider sector guidance;;
     d.   the accuracy of any formal articulation of the roles and responsibilities of each partner in the areas outlined in iv.a-c above;
     e.   assessment of the comparability of the overall provision to students with identical or similar provision elsewhere in the University.

3.1.4 Review panel membership[6]

The review panel for a Y1PR will consist of the following members:

Chairperson – the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) or Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) or nominee from Education or Research Committee providing that he or she is sufficiently independent of the Y1PR taking place.

Senate Members – at least one member of Senate not directly connected with the scope of the Y1PR (wherever possible), appointed by Education Committee and/or Research Committee on behalf of Senate.

Student Representative – a member of the CSA Executive or student body who is not directly connected to the scope of the Y1PR (wherever possible), appointed by Education Committee and/or Research Committee on behalf of Senate, on the nomination of the CSA Executive. The student representative is expected to consult with and represent the views of students on the courses concerned.

Secretary – normally a member of Quality Assurance and Enhancement, appointed by Education Committee and/or Research Committee on behalf of Senate, and on the nomination of the Academic Registrar. The role of the Secretary is to provide authoritative guidance on review procedures and on University Regulations and external frameworks, and to help the review panel produce a final report.

3.1.5 Suggested set of initial documentation

The following are an indicative set of documents. In most cases only a subset will be required agreed by the Chair and Secretary.

Prior to its first meeting, the Y1PR review panel shall receive:

A.   Documentation provided by the Partner Institution
    i.   a **partnership-evaluation briefing document** prepared by the partnership institution which should address the points outlined in Section 3.1.3 above and include any changes that either have been, or could be, made to the roles and responsibilities shared between the partners and any School-level monitoring reports.
    ii.   a **full list of courses** covered by the partnership.
    iii.   **a full list of academic staff involved in the partnership**, including staff of the University and staff of the partners, with an indication of which are Recognised Teachers and identifying any changes since the Course Validation.
    iv.   documentation relating to **research student provision and support** (where it exists):
        a. the partner's student handbook (or equivalent) for research students.
        b. a document outlining the current status and progress of each research student in the partnership (including, as a minimum, primary supervisor, and date and outcome of last formal progress review).
    v.   documentation relating to **each taught course covered by the partnership**, including:
        a. the taught course handbook (or equivalent).
        b. the course specification (s) and module descriptors.
        c. a sample of examination papers and assignment questions, and related guidance for examiners and markers (e.g. model answers, marking schemes, and thesis marking guidelines).
        d. a sample of records of examiners' marks and comments (if available)
        e. examination board minutes (if available).
        f. external examiners report (if available).

---

[6] Where research provision forms part of any review there should be balanced representation from Education Committee and Research Committee on the panel (where possible)

g. a sample of student feedback.

h. an analysis of student performance to date.

B. Documentation provided by the sponsoring School.
   i   a **partnership-evaluation briefing document** prepared by the relevant Sponsoring School should include any changes that either have been, or could be, made to the roles and responsibilities shared between the partners and any School-level monitoring reports.

C. Documentation provided by Education Services
   i.   a **report from Education Committee** and/or Research Committee prepared specially for the review, highlighting any matters raised about the partnership since its inception.

   ii. a **report from the Academic Registrar** prepared specially for the review, outlining his or her findings regarding appeals, complaints and cases of general or academic misconduct relevant to the provision in the partnership being reviewed.

D. Other documentation to be collected by the Secretary to the review panel
   i.   a **report from the Partner Institution student representatives**, if they choose to make one.

3.1.6 Conduct of the Year One Partnership review

The conduct of any Y1PR shall be under the direction of the appointed review panel. The broad outline is indicated in section 3.1.2 above.

Initially, the review panel shall receive and review documentation pulled together by the Secretary, who may delegate its production or collation to appropriate staff in one or more Schools.

Where documentation that needs to be produced specifically for the review (e.g. a self-evaluation by academic staff on all sides of the Partnership) it should be drafted in accordance with the principles and advice outlined in section 2.6.1 (for Senate Reviews of Schools), specifically any document should:
- address the agreed terms of reference for the review;
- provide a concise contextual overview of the operation of the partnership, and the measures and mechanisms that are in place ensure it is of a high standard;
- be reflective and self-critical in tone rather than descriptive;
- identify key areas of risk to the maintenance of quality, standards and the student learning experience and how these are being mitigated.

Upon receipt of the initial documentation, the review panel will consider which areas of the provision it could usefully explore in more detail, and how to undertake further engagement with relevant people. This may involve requests for further documentation and specific meetings with staff from both the host School and the Partner Institution and/or students.

For a Y1PR the review panel will determine as soon as practicable (usually immediately or soon after their initial meeting) whether off-site visits will be necessary as part of their undertakings, and whether any off-site visit will require a formal tour of facilities (and what this may include). The costs of any off-site visit shall be met by the School(s) associated with the provision, which may or may not make arrangements to pass on or share costs with any partner. Guidance and report template for periodic off-site visits is available at
https://intranet.cranfield.ac.uk/EducationServices/Pages/Registryforms.aspx.

3.1.7   Report from the review panel

General outline

At the end of the process, the review panel shall produce a report for Education Committee and/or Research Committee to consider. The final report of the review panel will be subject to factual corrections proposed by key parties associated with the Y1PR, and may be accompanied by additional commentaries or responses.

The purpose of the review panel report is to provide assurance to Senate, Education Committee and or Research Committee that the educational provision and associated student experiences are of a high standard, and that those responsible for collaborating in delivering the provision are undertaking their roles and responsibilities in an appropriate way. It also serves to highlight to Senate, Education Committee and/or Research Committee any current or potential concerns or issues that may require immediate redress or future management. Finally, the report should also highlight good practice identified by the members of the review panel that are particularly commendable and/or worth disseminating more widely throughout the University.

The reports will be retained and may be used in future Senate or Council reviews, and as evidence in external audits, reviews or accreditation exercises.

Further information on the structure of the review panel report can be found in **Appendix A**

Responses to the review panel report

At the end of the review process, the review panel, in consultation with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and/or Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) (if appropriate) shall identify those persons who it feels should have an opportunity to comment on its findings. Each of these will be invited in the first instance to consider the report and, if necessary, discuss any factual inaccuracies or ambiguities that should be amended for the final version. This may require further meetings with the Chair of the review panel, if such corrections are not straightforward.

Once a final version of the report has been agreed, they will then be invited to produce a response to the report to Education Committee and/or Research Committee. There is no required structure or format for this response, but any response should acknowledge or otherwise comment on any of the directly-relevant commendations and recommendations made by the review panel.

Where the number of recommendations is extensive or complex, it may be appropriate for a response to include a formal action plan.

Final consideration by Education Committee and/or Research Committee

Education Committee and/or Research Committee will receive and consider the report of the review panel and any responses: it shall then either approve any actions proposed, or agree alternative courses of action. Education Committee and/or Research Committee shall also articulate how each recommendation will be followed up, and will manage future engagement with any progress required.

Six months after the completion of the Y1PR and the agreement of any courses of action, Education Committee and/or Research Committee will conduct a progress review, through the submission of statements or reports from relevant parties. Education Committee and/or Research Committee will reserve the right to invite specific members of staff or students to attend its meeting for further discussion.

As part of the six month review Education Committee and/or Research Committee will assess the schedule of planned Partnership Reviews (see section 3.2) and reconfirm or make any revisions it

thinks necessary to assure itself of the timeliness of each review based on the outcomes of the Y1PR.

Education Committee and/or Research Committee reserves the right to instigate interim reviews based on outcomes from the Y1PR and/or changes to the partnership provision.

Once Education Committee and/or Research Committee are satisfied with the outcome of the action plan it will be considered that the conclusion of the process has been reached.

3.2 Partnership Review (PR)

3.2.1 Introduction

A Partnership review will be instigated by Education Committee and/or Research Committee to ensure that the educational provision and associated student experiences are of a high standard; and that those responsible for delivering the provision are undertaking their respective roles and responsibilities in an appropriate way.

An initial review schedule will be approved by Education Committee and/or Research Committee during the academic partner approval process. The schedule will be regularly reviewed as part of the partnership review process to ensure it remains appropriate, noting that a review must take place at least once every six years.

Education Committee and/or Research Committee reserves the right to instigate interim reviews based on outcomes from Partnership reviews and/or changes to the partnership provision.

The review process for each Partnership review will vary considerably, with terms of references being set out at the point at which the review is instigated. Education Committee has developed a "starting point" terms of reference as set out in section 3.2.3 to be used for outlining detailed and specific terms of reference. The detailed conduct of a review will be discussed and agreed in advance with the relevant parties, to ensure that the purpose of any review is clear at the outset and to ensure that all needs or restrictions are taken into consideration.

A Partnership review will necessarily concentrate on issues or themes relating to learning and teaching. They may or may not involve engagement with or review of service departments within the University (e.g. library services, IT-related learning support, academic staff development). Any recommendations arising from a Partnership Review will be considered by Education Committee and/or Research Committee, which will restrict ongoing transmission of recommendations to the appropriate bodies within the University for further review or action.

3.2.2 Overall process and timeline

The conduct of a PR takes twelve months: this includes six months of setting up and conducting the review itself, followed by six months in which any recommendations approved by Education Committee and/or Research Committee are instigated or otherwise referred. PR reviews will likely commence at the start of the academic year, with the bulk of meetings arranged by a review panel in February and March (although Education Committee and/or Research Committee may implement a PR at any time in the academic calendar).

Education Committee and Research Committee will therefore keep under review a programme of PRs across the University, and determine at its first meeting in any academic year which reviews (if any) are to be conducted in the forthcoming cycle.

The general pattern on a PR shall be as follows:

- Education Committee and/or Research Committee consider and confirm whether any PRs are to be undertaken in an academic year;

- in confirming a review, Education Committee and/or Research Committee shall consult with Quality Assurance and Enhancement to identify a Chairperson (Chair), appropriate terms of reference and to outline, where appropriate, what documentation it would expect to be included in any review;

- the Chair and Quality Assurance and Enhancement will then meet with the key parties to discuss how to interpret the agreed terms of reference (see Section 3.2.3), how an initial set of documentation (including any self-evaluation) will be produced and the deadlines for submission of the documentation for the appointed review panel;

- the Chair and Quality Assurance and Enhancement will discuss with key parties, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and/or Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research), and the Cranfield Student Association (CSA) nominations for the review panel and have a final panel confirmed by Education Committee and/or Research Committee. The membership of the review panel will be constructed along standard lines agreed in advance (see section 3.2.4);

- documentation in the agreed format will be submitted and the review panel will review it, to identify which areas of the provision it could usefully explore in more detail, and to consider how to undertake further engagement with relevant people. The review panel may also consider at this point whether it requires changes or additions to its membership to conduct the review and discuss this with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and/or Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) for approval;

- the review panel may decide for themselves how best to manage their investigations. It will articulate any further documentation it would like to receive and outline any meetings it may wish to have with relevant staff and students. It may also decide whether it may or may not need to form "sub-panels" to focus on specific areas;

- meetings may either be concentrated into a single day of investigations, or scheduled over several separate days depending on the scope of the review and the availability of key members of staff;

- after the review panel has concluded all meetings and discussions, the Chair and Secretary will co-ordinate the production of a full report containing the review panel's findings. The content of the report may be shared with key parties for factual corrections and amendments, along with a request for a response to the final agreed report, for consideration at Education Committee and/or Research Committee;

- Education Committee and/or Research Committee will review the report and any responses and articulate (if required) or approve a clear action plan;

- Education Committee and/or Research Committee will receive a progress report on the action plan twelve months after the review has taken place. In exceptional circumstances, Education Committee and/or Research Committee may request this report to be submitted earlier if they have any particular short-term concerns;

- Education Committee and/or Research Committee will then decide if any further action is required. Once Education Committee and/or Research Committee are satisfied with the outcome of the action plan it will be considered that the conclusion of the process has been reached.

This timeline is also represented in the following table:

	EDUCATION COMMITTEE (EC) and/or RESEARCH COMMITTEE (RC)	QUALITY ASSURANCE & ENHANCEMENT	PROVIDERS	REVIEW PANEL
Jun	Discussion of any planned PRs for forthcoming year: relevant key parties ("providers") notified			
Jul	Confirmation of PR Chair and QA&E meet to discuss and articulate terms of reference (ToR) Chair and QA&E meet with key parties to interpret ToR and agree contacts and deadlines for submission of documentation		Confirm acceptance of being taken forward for review	
Jul -Sep		QA&E instigate set-up of review panel	Prepare initial documentation	
Oct	Confirms review panel membership and ToR			Secretary begins to arrange review timetable
Nov				Secretary collates paperwork and organises the initial review panel meeting
Dec				Meets to review documentation and highlight areas of focus, including any further information required and meetings to be held
Jan - Feb			Respond to panel requests and provide documentation Secretary arranges meetings between relevant students and staff and the review panel	Panel members prepare for meetings
Feb - Mar			Meetings are held	
Mar - Apr				Report is prepared.
May		Submit report and response to EC and/or RC	Submit corrections and/or a response to the report to EC and/or RC via QA&E	
June	Receives report and agrees future action plan			
June (+ 1 year)	Receives updated response	Submit updated response to EC and/or RC	Submit further response(s) outlining actions taken since the review and plans for the future	

3.2.3 Standard terms of reference

By definition, there are no standard terms of reference for a PR. Education Committee has developed a "starting point" terms of reference with which to frame individual PRs as set out below. In most cases only a subset will be required.

Terms of reference shall be discussed with relevant parties across the University, but the final terms of reference shall be set and approved by Education Committee and/or Research Committee, or by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and/or Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research), if timescales do not permit a formal meeting.

To determine the effectiveness of arrangements in the following areas of provision:

i.   **the taught courses offered within the partnership:**
   a. the quality of documentation relating to the course(s), including the course specification documents, module descriptors, course handbooks and webpages;;
   b. the arrangements for the monitoring, review and development of each taught course, including the structures in place to manage input from any partners as appropriate;
   c. the management and administration of each taught course;
   d. the appropriateness and range of teaching and assessment methods employed within the taught course and the extent to which innovation in academic practice is encouraged and evident in the course design and delivery;

ii.   **learning resources:**
   a. academic staffing levels, expertise, professional recognition, and the maintenance and development of academic practice and good academic standing;
   b. provision of a high quality learning and research environment including physical and digital infrastructure.
   c. the accuracy of any formal articulation of the roles and responsibilities of each partner in the areas outlined in ii.a-c above.

iii.   **student support:**
   a. provision of information and guidance, on induction and throughout registration;
   b. development of individual learning and monitoring of progression;
   c. development of intellectual environment (i.e. the culture and ethos of the learning environment);
   d. development of a supportive environment to promote mental health and wellbeing;
   e. management and innovation of both short- and long-term research projects;
   f. the accuracy of any formal articulation of the roles and responsibilities of each partner in the areas outlined in iii.a-d above.

iv.   **feedback and continuous improvement of the student experience:**
   a. oversight of all provision by School committees and officers, including the effectiveness of any articulated monitoring arrangements of partner provision;
   b. student feedback mechanisms, and use of feedback outcomes;
   c. use of external feedback (including external examiners, industrial advisory panels, industry partners, accreditation bodies) and wider sector guidance.d.   the accuracy of any formal articulation of the roles and responsibilities of each partner in the areas outlined in iv.a-c above;
   e. assessment of the comparability of the overall provision to students with identical or similar provision elsewhere in the University.

3.2.4 Review panel membership[7]

The review panel for a PR will normally consist of the following members:

Chairperson – the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) or Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) or nominee from Education or Research Committee providing that he or she is sufficiently independent of the PR taking place.

Senate Members – at least one member of Senate not directly connected with the scope of the PR (wherever possible), appointed by Education Committee and/or Research Committee.

External Members – at least one external member who is of an appropriate standing to participate in a review. Education Committee and/or Research Committee may determine for itself who may be appropriate to nominate as an external member for any individual PR. It would not be inappropriate if one of the external members of Council was appointed in this capacity.

Student Representative – a member of the CSA Executive or student body who is not directly connected to the scope of the PR (wherever possible), appointed by Education Committee and/or Research Committee on behalf of Senate, on the nomination of the CSA Executive. The student representative is expected to consult with and represent the views of students on the course(s) concerned.

Secretary – normally a member of Quality Assurance and Enhancement, appointed by the Education Committee and/or Research Committee on behalf of Senate, and on the nomination of the Academic Registrar. The role of the Secretary is to provide authoritative guidance on review procedures and on University Regulations and external frameworks, and to help the review panel produce a final report.

3.2.5 Suggested set of initial documentation

The following are an indicative set of documents. In most cases only a subset will be required agreed by the Chair and Secretary.

Prior to its first meeting, the PR review panel shall receive:

A. **Documentation provided by those responsible for the partnership**
   i.   a **self-evaluation briefing document** usually prepared jointly by those leading the partnership to include information on how the partnership contributes to the school's educational strategic plan.
   ii.   **documentation covering the partnership** arrangements (e.g. legal contracts or Memoranda of Understanding, statements of roles and responsibilities, annual operating statements for the previous three years (where these exist), any School-level monitoring reports, any reviews of risk assessments).
   iii. a **full list of courses** covered by the partnership.
   iv.   **a full list of academic staff involved in the partnership and delivery**, including staff of the University and staff of the partners, with an indication of which are Recognised Teachers
   v.   an **analysis of student trends**, which should be based on statistics in SITS provided by Education Services, covering recruitment and outcomes.
   vi.   documentation relating to **research student provision and support** (where it exists):
         a. the partner's student handbook (or equivalent) for research students.

---

[7] Where research provision forms part of any review there should be balanced representation from Education Committee and Research Committee on the panel (where possible)

b. a document outlining the current status and progress of each research student in the partnership (including, as a minimum, supervisors, and date and outcome of last formal progress review).

vii. documentation relating to **each taught course covered by the partnership**, including:
a. the taught course handbook (or equivalent).
b. the course specification and module descriptors (if these are not provided in the taught course handbook).
c. a sample of examination papers and assignment questions, and related guidance for examiners and markers (e.g. model answers, marking schemes, and thesis marking guidelines).
d. a sample of records of examiners' marks and comments.
e. examination board minutes for the last three years.
f. Annual Reflective Review (ARR reports) for the last three years.
g. Summary of external examiners reports for the last three years and responses (where available).
h. Approved minutes of any relevant committee, limited to the previous three years.

B. **Documentation provided by Education Services**
i. a **report from Education Committee** and/or Research Committee prepared specially for the review, highlighting any matters raised about the partnership since its last review.
ii. a **report from the Academic Registrar** prepared specially for the review, outlining his or her findings regarding appeals, complaints and cases of general or academic misconduct relevant to the provision in the partnership being reviewed.

C. **Other documentation to be collected by the Secretary to the review panel**
:
i. a **report from the School student representatives**, if they choose to make one.

3.2.6 Conduct of the Partnership Review

The conduct of any PR shall be under the direction of the appointed review panel. The broad outline is indicated in section 3.2.2 above.

Initially, the review panel shall receive and review documentation pulled together by the Secretary, who may delegate its production or collation to appropriate staff in one or more Schools.

Where documentation that needs to be produced specifically for the review (e.g. a self-evaluation by academic staff), it should be drafted in accordance with the principles and advice outlined in section 2.6.1 (for Senate Reviews of Schools), specifically any document should:

- address the agreed terms of reference for the review;
- provide a concise contextual overview of the educational provision under review, and the measures and mechanisms that operate to ensure it is of a high standard;
- be reflective and self-critical in tone rather than descriptive;
- identify key areas of risk to the maintenance of quality, standards and the student learning experience and how these are being mitigated.

Upon receipt of the initial documentation, the review panel will consider which areas of the provision it could usefully explore in more detail, and how to undertake further engagement with relevant people. This may involve requests for further documentation and specific meetings with staff and/or students.

Where a review includes provision from outside the University, the review panel will determine as soon as practicable (usually immediately or soon after their initial meeting) whether off-site visits will be necessary as part of their undertakings, and whether any off-site visit will require a formal tour of facilities (and what this may include). The costs of any off-site visit shall be met by the School(s) associated with the provision, which may or may not make arrangements to pass on or

share costs with any partner. Guidance and report template for periodic off-site visits is available at https://intranet.cranfield.ac.uk/EducationServices/Pages/Registryforms.aspx

3.2.7 Report from the review panel

General outline

At the end of the process, the review panel shall produce a report for Education Committee and/or Research Committee to consider. The final report of the review panel will be subject to factual corrections proposed by key parties associated with the PR, and may be accompanied by additional commentaries or responses.

The purpose of the review panel report is to provide assurance to Senate, Education Committee and/or Research Committee that the educational provision and associated student experiences are of a high standard, and that those responsible for delivering the provision are undertaking their roles and responsibilities in an appropriate way. It also serves to highlight to Senate, Education Committee and/or Research Committee any current or potential concerns or issues that may require immediate redress or future management. Finally, the report should also highlight good practice identified by the members of the review panel that are particularly commendable and/or worth disseminating more widely throughout the University.

The reports will be retained and may be used in future Senate or Council reviews, and as evidence in external audits, reviews or accreditation exercises.

Further information on the structure of the review panel report can be found in Appendix A

Responses to the review panel report

At the end of the review process, the review panel, in consultation with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and/or Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) (if appropriate) shall identify those persons who it feels should have an opportunity to comment on its findings. Each of these will be invited in the first instance to consider the report and, if necessary, discuss any factual inaccuracies or ambiguities that should be amended for the final version. This may require further meetings with the Chair of the review panel, if such corrections are not straightforward.

Once a final version of the report has been agreed, they will then be invited to produce a response to the report to Education Committee and/or Research Committee. There is no required structure or format for this response, but any response should acknowledge or otherwise comment on any of the directly-relevant commendations and recommendations made by the review panel.

Where the number of recommendations is extensive or complex, it may be appropriate for a response to include a formal action plan.

Final consideration by Education Committee and/or Research Committee

Education Committee and/or Research Committee will receive and consider the report of the review panel and any responses: it shall then either approve any actions proposed, or agree alternative courses of action. Education Committee and/or Research Committee shall also articulate how each recommendation will be followed up, and will manage future engagement with any progress required.

Twelve months after the completion of the PR and the agreement of any courses of action, Education Committee and/or Research Committee will conduct a progress review, through the submission of statements or reports from relevant parties. Education Committee and/or Research Committee will reserve the right to invite specific members of staff or students to attend its meeting for further discussion.

As part of the twelve month review Education Committee and/or Research Committee will assess the schedule of planned Partnership Reviews and reconfirm or make any revisions it thinks necessary to assure itself of the timeliness of each review based on the outcomes of the PR.

Education Committee and/or Research Committee reserves the right to instigate interim reviews based on outcomes from the PR and/or changes to the partnership provision.

Once Education Committee and/or Research Committee are satisfied with the outcome of the action plan it will be considered that the conclusion of the process has been reached.

4   Focussed Review (FR)

4.1   Introduction

Focussed reviews will be instigated by Education Committee and/or Research Committee, either to address monitoring exercises that form part of the University Laws and Regulations, or in response to a particular need. An example of where a Focussed review would take place on a regular cycle would be the review of learning and teaching provision by more than one School (e.g. individual courses requiring significant co-ordination between Schools).

The review process for each Focussed review will vary considerably, with terms of references being set out at the point at which the review is instigated. Education Committee has developed a "starting point" terms of reference as set out in section 4.3 to be used for outlining detailed and specific terms of reference.. The detailed conduct of a review will be discussed and agreed in advance with the relevant parties, to ensure that the purpose of any review is clear at the outset and to ensure that all needs or restrictions are taken into consideration.

Focussed reviews will necessarily concentrate on issues or themes relating to learning and teaching. They may or may not involve engagement with or review of service departments within the University (e.g. library services, IT-related learning support, academic staff development). Any recommendations arising from Focussed reviews will be considered by Education Committee and/or Research Committee, which will restrict ongoing transmission of recommendations to the appropriate bodies within the University for further review or action.

4.2   Overall process and timeline

The conduct of a FR takes twelve months: this includes six months of setting up and conducting the review itself, followed by six months in which any recommendations approved by Education Committee and/or Research Committee are instigated or otherwise referred. FR reviews will likely commence at the start of the academic year, with the bulk of meetings arranged by a review panel in February and March (although Education Committee and/or Research Committee may implement a FR at any time in the academic calendar).

Education Committee and/or Research Committee will therefore keep under review a programme of FRs across the University, and determine at its first meeting in any academic year which reviews (if any) are to be conducted in the forthcoming cycle. Themes for Focussed review may be proposed by any member of staff or the CSA Executive, who will be asked to provide Education Committee and/or Research Committee with a rationale for their request.

The general pattern on a FR shall be as follows:

- Education Committee and/or Research Committee considers and confirms whether any FRs are to be undertaken in an academic year;

- in confirming a review, it shall consult with Quality Assurance and Enhancement to identify a Chairperson (Chair), appropriate terms of reference and to outline, where appropriate, what documentation it would expect to be included in any review;

- the Chair and Quality Assurance and Enhancement will then meet with the key parties to discuss how to interpret the agreed terms of reference (see Section 4.3), how an initial set of documentation (including any self-evaluation) will be produced and the deadlines for submission of the documentation for the appointed review panel;

- the Chair and Quality Assurance and Enhancement will discuss with key parties, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and/or Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research), and the Cranfield Student

Association (CSA) nominations for the review panel and have a final panel confirmed by Education Committee and/or Research Committee. The membership of the review panel will be constructed along standard lines agreed in advance (see section 4.4);

- documentation in the agreed format will be submitted and the review panel will review it, to identify which areas of the provision it could usefully explore in more detail, and to consider how to undertake further engagement with relevant people. The review panel may also consider at this point whether it requires changes or additions to its membership to conduct the review and discuss this with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and/or Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research)for approval;

- the review panel may decide for themselves how best to manage their investigations. It will articulate any further documentation it would like to receive and outline any meetings it may wish to have with relevant staff and students. It may also decide whether it may or may not need to form "sub-panels" to focus on specific areas;

- meetings may either be concentrated into a single day of investigations, or scheduled over several separate days depending on the scope of the review and the availability of key members of staff;

- after the review panel has concluded all meetings and discussions, the Chair and Secretary will co-ordinate the production of a full report containing the review panel's findings. The content of the report may be shared with key parties for factual corrections and amendments, along with a request for a response to the final agreed report, for consideration at Education Committee and/or Research Committee;

- Education Committee and/or Research Committee will review the report and any responses and articulate (if required) or approve a clear action plan;

- Education Committee and/or Research Committee will receive a progress report on the action plan twelve months after the review has taken place. In exceptional circumstances, Education Committee and/or Research Committee may request this report to be submitted earlier if they have any particular short-term concerns;

- Education Committee and/or Research Committee will then decide if any further action is required. Once Education Committee and/or Research Committee are satisfied with the outcome of the action plan it will be considered that the conclusion of the process has been reached.

This timeline is also represented in the following table:

	EDUCATION COMMITTEE (EC) and/or RESEARCH COMMITTEE (RC)	QUALITY ASSURANCE & ENHANCEMENT	PROVIDERS	REVIEW PANEL
Jun	Discussion of any planned FRs for forthcoming year: relevant key parties ("providers") notified			
Jul	Confirmation of FR Chair and QA&E meet to discuss and articulate terms of reference (ToR) Chair and QA&E meet with key parties to interpret ToR and agree contacts and deadlines for submission of documentation		Confirm acceptance of being taken forward for review	
Jul -Sep		QA&E instigate set-up of review panel	Prepare initial documentation	
Oct	Confirms review panel membership and ToR			Secretary begins to arrange review timetable
Nov				Secretary collates paperwork and organises the initial review panel meeting
Dec				Meets to review documentation and highlight areas of focus, including any further information required and meetings to be held
Jan - Feb			Respond to panel requests and provide documentation Secretary arranges meetings between relevant students and staff and the review panel	Panel members prepare for meetings
Feb - Mar			Meetings are held	
Mar - Apr				Report is prepared.
May		Submit report and response to EC and/or RC	Submit corrections and/or a response to the report to EC and/or RC via QA&E	
June	Receives report and agrees future action plan			
June (+ 1 year)	Receives updated response	Submit updated response to EC and/or RC	Submit further response(s) outlining actions taken since the review and plans for the future	

4.3   Standard terms of reference

By definition, there are no standard terms of reference for a FR. Education Committee has developed a "starting point" terms of reference with which to frame individual FRs as set out below. In most cases only a subset will be required.

Terms of reference shall be discussed with relevant parties across the University, but the final terms of reference shall be set and approved by Education Committee and/or Research Committee, or by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and/or Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research), if timescales do not permit a formal meeting. .

To determine the effectiveness of arrangements in the following areas of provision:

i.   the provision made by the course team:
  a.   the appropriateness of the course-level learning outcomes and the way each taught course is designed to achieve them;
  a.   the arrangements for the monitoring, review and development of each taught course, including the structures in place to manage input from any partners as appropriate;
  b.   the quality of documentation relating to each taught course, including the course specification documents, module descriptors, course handbooks and webpages;
  c.   the management and administration of the taught course(s);
  d.   the appropriateness and range of teaching and assessment methods employed within each taught course and the extent to which innovation in academic practice is encouraged and evident in the course design and delivery;
  e.   the extent to which the course design and delivery aligns with the University Education Strategy and complies with Senate's Handbooks

ii.   learning resources:
  a.   academic staffing levels, expertise, professional recognition, and the maintenance and development of academic practice and good academic standing;
  b.   provision of a high quality learning and research environment including physical and digital infrastructure.

iii.   student support:
  a.   provision of information and guidance, on induction and throughout registration;
  b.   development of individual learning and monitoring of progression;
  c.   development of intellectual environment (i.e. the culture and ethos of the learning environment);
  d.   development of a supportive environment to promote mental health and wellbeing;
  d.   management and innovation of both short- and long-term research projects.

iv.   feedback and continuous improvement of the student experience:
  b.   student feedback mechanisms, and use of feedback outcomes;
  c.   use of external feedback (including external examiners, industrial advisory panels, industry partners, accreditation bodies) and wider sector guidance.

4.4   Review panel membership[8]

The review panel for a FR will normally consist of the following members:

Chairperson – the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) or Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) or nominee from Education or Research Committee providing that he or she is sufficiently independent of the PR taking place.

---

[8] Where research provision forms part of any review there should be balanced representation from Education Committee and Research Committee on the panel (where possible)

Senate Members – at least one member of Senate not directly connected with the scope of the FR (wherever possible), appointed by Education Committee and/or Research Committee on behalf of Senate.

External Members – at least one external member who is of an appropriate standing to participate in a review. Education Committee and/or Research Committee may determine for itself who may be appropriate to nominate as an external member for any individual FR. It would not be inappropriate if one of the external members of Council was appointed in this capacity.

Student Representative – a member of the CSA Executive or student body who is not directly connected to the scope of the FR (wherever possible), appointed by Education Committee and/or Research Committee on behalf of Senate, on the nomination of the CSA Executive. The student representative is expected to consult with and represent the views of students on the course(s) concerned.

Secretary – normally a member of Quality Assurance and Enhancement, appointed by Education Committee and/or Research Committee on behalf of Senate, and on the nomination of the Academic Registrar. The role of the Secretary is to provide authoritative guidance on review procedures and on University Regulations and external frameworks, and to help the review panel produce a final report.

4.5   Suggested set of initial documentation

The following are an indicative set of documents. In most cases only a subset will be required agreed by the Chair and Secretary.

Prior to its first meeting, the FR review panel shall receive:

A.   Documentation provided by those responsible for the course
   i.   a **self-evaluation briefing document** prepared by the course team to include detail on the relevant Schools educational strategic plan, or provide information on how the taught course contributes to the strategy behind the academic portfolio of the School
   ii.   **a full list of academic staff involved in the course delivery**, with an indication of which are Recognised Teachers.
   iii. an **analysis of student trends**, which should be based on statistics in SITS provided by Education Services, covering recruitment and outcomes.
   iv.   documentation relating to the taught course, including:
        a. the taught course handbook (or equivalent).
        b. the course specification and module descriptors (if these are not provided in the taught course handbook).
        c. a sample of examination papers and assignment questions, and related guidance for examiners and markers (e.g. model answers, marking schemes, and thesis marking guidelines).
        d. a sample of records of examiners' marks and comments.
        e. examination board minutes for the last three years.

The review panel should also have access to standard pre-existing supporting documentation:
   i.   **Annual Reflective Review (ARR) reports**, including any commentaries on individual reports submitted by student representatives, for the previous three years.
   ii.   **Summary of external examiner reports and responses (where available)**, for the previous three years.
   iii. **any final reports from accreditation bodies**, for current or recently-lapsed accreditation.
   iv.   Approved minutes of any relevant committee, limited to the previous three years.

B.   Documentation provided by Education Services
   i.   a **report from Education Committee** and/or Research Committee prepared specially for the review, highlighting any matters raised about the taught course.
   ii.   a **report from the Academic Registrar** prepared specially for the review, outlining his or her findings regarding appeals, complaints and cases of general or academic misconduct relevant to the provision being reviewed.

C.   Other documentation to be collected by the Secretary to the review panel
   i.   a **report from the School student representatives**, if they choose to make one.

4.6   Conduct of the Focussed review

The conduct of any FR shall be under the direction of the appointed review panel. The broad outline is indicated in section 4.2 above.

Initially, the review panel shall receive and review documentation pulled together by the Secretary, who may delegate its production or collation to appropriate staff in one or more Schools.

Where documentation that needs to be produced specifically for the review (e.g. a self-evaluation by academic staff), it should be drafted in accordance with the principles and advice outlined in section 2.6.1 (for Senate Reviews of Schools), specifically any document should:

- address the agreed terms of reference for the review;
- provide a concise contextual overview of the learning and teaching provision under review, and the measures and mechanisms that operate to ensure it is of a high standard;
- be reflective and self-critical in tone rather than descriptive; identify key areas of risk to the maintenance of quality, standards and the student learning experience and how these are being mitigated.

Upon receipt of the initial documentation, the review panel will consider which areas of the provision it could usefully explore in more detail, and how to undertake further engagement with relevant people. This may involve requests for further documentation and specific meetings with staff and/or students.

Where a review includes provision from outside the University, the review panel will determine as soon as practicable (usually immediately or soon after their initial meeting) whether off-site visits will be necessary as part of their undertakings, and whether any off-site visit will require a formal tour of facilities (and what this may include). The costs of any off-site visit shall be met by the School(s) associated with the provision, which may or may not make arrangements to pass on or share costs with any partner. Guidance and report template for periodic off-site visits is available at https://intranet.cranfield.ac.uk/EducationServices/Pages/Registryforms.aspx

4.7   Report from the review panel

General outline

At the end of the process, the review panel shall produce a report for Education Committee and/or Research Committee to consider. The final report of the review panel will be subject to factual corrections proposed by key parties associated with the FR, and may be accompanied by additional commentaries or responses.

The purpose of the review panel report is to provide assurance to Senate, Education Committee and/or Research Committee that the learning and teaching provision and associated student experiences are of a high standard, and that those responsible for delivering the provision are undertaking their roles and responsibilities in an appropriate way. It also serves to highlight to Senate, Education Committee and/or Research Committee any current or potential concerns or

issues that may require immediate redress or future management. Finally, the report should also highlight good practice identified by the members of the review panel that are particularly commendable and/or worth disseminating more widely throughout the University.

The reports will be retained and may be used in future Senate or Council reviews, and as evidence in external audits, reviews or accreditation exercises.

Further information on the structure of the review panel report can be found in Appendix A

Responses to the review panel report

At the end of the review process, the review panel, in consultation with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and/or Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) (if appropriate) shall identify those persons who it feels should have an opportunity to comment on its findings. Each of these will be invited in the first instance to consider the report and, if necessary, discuss any factual inaccuracies or ambiguities that should be amended for the final version. This may require further meetings with the Chair of the review panel, if such corrections are not straightforward.

Once a final version of the report has been agreed, they will then be invited to produce a response to the report to Education Committee and/or Research Committee. There is no required structure or format for this response, but any response should acknowledge or otherwise comment on any of the directly-relevant commendations and recommendations made by the review panel.

Where the number of recommendations is extensive or complex, it may be appropriate for a response to include a formal action plan.

Final consideration by Education Committee and/or Research Committee

Education Committee and/or Research Committee will receive and consider the report of the review panel and any responses: it shall then either approve any actions proposed, or agree alternative courses of action. Education Committee and/or Research Committee shall also articulate how each recommendation will be followed up, and will manage future engagement with any progress required.

Twelve months after the completion of the FR and the agreement of any courses of action, Education Committee and/or Research Committee will conduct a progress review, through the submission of statements or reports from relevant parties. Education Committee and/or Research Committee will reserve the right to invite specific members of staff or students to attend its meeting for further discussion.

Once Education Committee and/or Research Committee are satisfied with the outcome of the action plan it will be considered that the conclusion of the process has been reached.

5   Special Measures Review (SMR)

As outlined above, Special Measures Reviews are not intended for regular reviews of academic provision but instead are instigated if Education Committee and/or Research Committee believes a proactive intervention is required. This may be instigated through a number of routes:

- concerns raised by the Director of Education or Director of Research, or by the relevant Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School), about operational practices;
- concerns raised by significant numbers of students, or by the Cranfield Students' Association, as a result of unresolved formal or informal complaints about the quality or standards of the academic provision or associated learning support;
- concerns raised by the Academic Registrar, if it comes to his or her attention that activity (or lack of activity) may represent a reputational risk to the University.

Unlike standard reviews of learning and teaching, SMRs act to examine operational activities over an extended period of time, with a view to providing recommendations for the course team to take forward to address any alleged shortcomings. This period of time is likely to be a few weeks, but may continue if matters remain unresolved.

In setting up a SMR panel, Education Committee and/or Research Committee will appoint one of its members as Chair. It will also appoint at least one member of academic staff (i.e., a Course Director where relevant) from the same School, and at least one member of academic staff from outside the School, to meet with relevant staff involved in the area of provision under review in an ongoing and structured way to help them review any alleged concerns or deficiencies. Administrative resource will be provided by the relevant School.

The scope of any SMR, and any associated terms of reference of the panel, will be agreed by Education Committee and/or Research Committee, in consultation with the relevant Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School). The SMR panel will be expected to draw up an action plan, which will be agreed with the staff involved in the area of provision under review and the School Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Director of Education and/or Director of Research.

While an SMR is in progress, the Chair of the SMR panel will provide verbal updates at Education Committee and/or Research Committee, and will submit any draft or agreed action plans. The SMR panel will exist until Education Committee and/or Research Committee, and the relevant Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) and relevant Director of Education and/or Director of Research are all satisfied that the area(s) of provision is operating as it should and that no recurrence of issues are likely to present themselves.

Education Committee and/or Research Committee may reserve the right to instigate a Focussed Review following a Special Measures Review.

6   Course Reviews

Course Reviews will be instigated to review the learning and teaching provision of a single taught course or a programme (comprising more than one taught course) to ensure that it continues to meet, or exceed, the threshold standards as described by the qualifications descriptors set out in the national frameworks for higher education qualifications and to ensure the quality of the student experience. A course review must take place at least once every ten years. Course reviews take place in addition to Annual Reflective Reviews, accreditation visits[9] from professional institutions, and the Senate review of a School.

There are two types of Course Review:
- **Course Review Panel (CRP) –** to review significant changes proposed for a course. CRP's can be instigated at any point by a School Director of Education. <u>A CRP may be relatively narrow in scope and may not be designated</u> as Periodic Course Review (PCR) – although the CRP report may be relevant supporting information for a PCR.

- **Periodic Course Review (PCR) -** to review the learning and teaching provision of a single taught course or a programme (comprising more than one taught course) to ensure that all taught award-bearing provision is formally reviewed at least once every 10 years.

6.1   Course Review Panel (CRP)

6.1.1 Introduction

As outlined above, Course Review Panels are not intended for regular reviews of academic provision but instead are instigated by the School Director of Education as and when required and form part of the change approval process.

A Course Review Panel would normally be instigated by the School's Director of Education (DoE) in the context of significant course change such as :
- a Course Team or School wishing to make significant changes to a course or programme request that a review takes place;
- the School's Director of Education following receipt of requests for multiple and/or complex changes to a course or programme (even where those individual changes could have been approved by the DoE) requests a review to take place;
- a new Pathway of an existing course is proposed (noting that a new course within an existing programme requires validation through the formal University course validation process[10]);
- merging of existing courses into a new named Programme is proposed
- introduction of a new mode of course delivery novel to the School is proposed
- changes to an existing course are proposed to meet an Apprenticeship Standard (particularly relevant for integrated degrees);
- changes to an existing course are proposed which may impact on Accreditation of a course.

Where the delivery of an existing (or modified course) is proposed in a new location and/or with a new or additional academic partner, Quality Assurance and Enhancement, should be contacted in the first instance for guidance on the correct approval process.

Course Review Panels have two primary functions:

---

[9] <u>All reviews will be designed to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort with the requirements of professional accreditation.</u>
[10] Further information can be found in the Senate Handbook on Setting up a New Taught Course.

a) to ensure that changes to existing courses or programmes result in that course or programme continuing to meet, or exceed, the threshold standards as described by the qualifications descriptors set out in the national frameworks for higher education qualifications; meet current Education Strategy; and ensure the quality of the student experience.

b) to ensure that there is a clear and sensible transition plan to enable existing registered students to complete their course where these students are impacted by the changes.

CRPs are also part of the process of continuous improvement and enhancement and the meeting between the Panel and the Proposing Team should be wholly supportive rather than adversarial. This is Peer Review and all participants in the panel meeting can and should bring ideas to help further improve the course/programme/student experience. A further aim of the Panel is to identify good practice in course design or Learning, Teaching and Assessment that could be shared more widely; the CRP can recommend actions and offer advice on best practice to the Proposing Team.

6.1.2 Overall process

- The School Director of Education and School Assistant Registrar will notify the Course Team that a CRP is required and agree a date for the meeting.

- The School Director of Education and School Assistant Registrar will discuss and agree the membership of the review panel (see section 6.1.5).

- Where a review includes provision from outside the University, the review panel will determine whether off-site visits will be necessary as part of their undertakings, and whether any off-site visit will require a formal tour of facilities (and what this may include). The costs of any off-site visit shall be met by the School associated with the provision, which may or may not make arrangements to pass on or share costs with any partner. Guidance and report template for periodic off-site visits is available at https://intranet.cranfield.ac.uk/EducationServices/Pages/Registryforms.aspx

- Course Teams prepare documentation (see section 6.1.6) for submission to the Secretary 15 working days prior to the CRP.

- The Secretary collates documentation and organises the CRP meeting.

- The Panel will receive the documentation 10 working days prior to the review to identify areas it may usefully wish to explore in more detail, formulate questioning and request any further documentation via the Secretary. The Secretary will collate and provide a list of indicative questions from the Panel to the Course Team 5 working days prior to the CRP and request any supplemental documentation. The Secretary should provide the Panel with a list of generic indicative questions that the panel may wish to utilise when formulating their own questioning, which is available on the Education Services intranet pages https://intranet.cranfield.ac.uk/EducationServices/Pages/Registryforms.aspx.

- At the start of the CRP meeting the Panel with review and finalise the questioning prior to the Course Team joining the meeting to discuss the proposal.

- The Course Team will vacate the meeting following discussion of the proposal and the Panel will agree outcomes, noting any conditions or recommendations.

- The Course Team will be asked to re-join the meeting to receive Panel feedback and agree a deadline for meeting any conditions and recommendations.

- The Secretary to the Panel will prepare an appropriate report (see section 6.1.7 and Appendix B) after the CRP for approval by the Chair. The report will then be presented to the Course Team. Once the Course Team have addressed the conditions set by the panel (normally the Chair in conjunction with the Secretary confirm whether conditions have/have not been met) the report, together with the overview and course specification prepared by the Course Team should be presented to Education Committee for approval.

6.1.3 The outcomes of a CRP

The outcomes of a CRP can be:
- ➢ Recommend approval to Education Committee (no conditions; with/without recommendations)
- ➢ Recommend approval to Education Committee (subject to conditions; with/without recommendations)
- ➢ Fail to approve (proposal requires significant work before being re-presented)[11]

Normally conditions should be applied where there would otherwise be a breach of threshold standards; or a proposal would breach a Senate Regulation; or is out of line with an explicit Education Committee directive. In any other case, views are expected to result in Recommendations.

Normally conditions **must** be met before the proposal can be put forward to Education Committee. However where conditions are based on securing additional resources such as staff or equipment with a long procurement time, approval can be made subject to the conditions being met before the course commencement date. Normally the Chair of the CRP in conjunction with the Secretary to the CRP is sufficient to confirm that the conditions have/have not been met. Conditions can be set at Course, School or University Level.

Recommendations **do not** have to be met in order for the course to gain approval. However, the Course Team should respond to the recommendations in the first Annual Reflective Review report for the programme or course.

6.1.4 Standard terms of reference

By definition there are no standard terms of reference for a Course Review Panel. The Director of Education should agree specific terms of reference relevant to the course changes proposed.

6.1.5 Review panel membership

The review panel for a CRP will normally consist of the following members:

Chairperson – Director of Education from within School

Academic Staff Members – at least two members of Academic Staff from within the School who are not directly connected with the course(s) being reviewed and who have undergone formal course validation training, appointed by the Chair.

External Member – at least one external subject matter expert who is of an appropriate standing to participate in the review, appointed by Quality Assurance and Enhancement, at the recommendation of the School. The external subject matter expert will act as the external benchmark in respect of the subject and level; review the coherence of the course(s)

---

[11] Do not be afraid to recommend that a course team takes more time to consider their changes. If you do this the Panel Chair and Secretary should speak directly with the DoE before submitting the report.

in terms of content, assessment and intellectual integrity; and make recommendations on the basis of best practice and enhancement.

Professional Services Member – normally a member of Quality Assurance and Enhancement who has undergone formal course validation training, appointed by the Chair.

Student Representative – a Course Representative from within the School who is not directly connected to the scope of the review (wherever possible), appointed by the Chair. The student representative is expected to consult with and represent the views of students on the course(s) concerned.

Secretary – the School Assistant Registrar (or nominee), appointed by the Chair. The role of the Secretary is to provide authoritative guidance on review procedures and on University Regulations and external frameworks, and to help the review panel produce a final report.

6.1.6 Documentation Requirements

Prior to the review the Panel shall receive from the Course Team:

- An overview document providing the rationale and nature of the proposed changes and (where applicable) details on transition plans to enable existing registered students to complete their course where these students are impacted by the changes.
- Course Documentation to include the Course Specification(s) and all module descriptors (both existing and new) with proposed changes presented in track changes.
- A Report from the current course representative(s) of the courses under review, which should provide the views of the current cohort on the proposed change.

6.1.7 Report from the review panel

At the end of the process, the Chair and Secretary will co-ordinate the production of a full report for Education Committee to consider.

The purpose of the review panel report is to provide assurance to Senate and Education Committee that the learning and teaching provision and associated student experiences are of a high standard, and that those responsible for delivering the provision are undertaking their roles and responsibilities in an appropriate way. It also serves to highlight to Senate and Education Committee any current or potential concerns or issues that may require immediate redress or future management. Finally, the report should also highlight good practice identified by the members of the review panel that are particularly commendable and/or worth disseminating more widely throughout the University.

The reports will be retained and may be used in future Senate or Council reviews, and as evidence in external audits, reviews or accreditation exercises.

A report template can be found in Appendix B[12]

6.2 Periodic Course Review (PCR)

6.2.1 Introduction

Taught courses continually evolve as a result of incremental improvement driven by annual reflective review and less frequent significant changes such as those resulting from the CRP process. A

---

[12] A Word version of the template is available from Quality Assurance and Enhancement

Periodic Course Review (PCR) will be instigated by Education Committee to review the learning and teaching provision of a single taught course or a programme (comprising more than one course) to ensure that it continues to meet, or exceed, the threshold standards as described by the qualifications descriptors set out in the national frameworks for higher education qualifications and to ensure the quality of the student experience. A course review must take place at least once every ten years. PCRs take place in addition to Annual Reflective Reviews, accreditation visits[13] from professional institutions, and the Senate review of a school.

Where a Focussed Review (FR) or Partnership Review (PR) has taken place within a 10 year period on any particular course it will be deemed that the course will have met the requirements of a Periodic Course Review.

Where a course has been subject to a substantive review such as some CRP or professional institution accreditations, Education Committee may consider this as a partial contribution to the PCR, depending upon the quality of the case and evidence provided in support of it.

Standard terms of reference have been approved by Education Committee (Section 6.2.3). The detailed conduct of a review will be discussed and agreed in advance with the relevant parties, to ensure that the purpose of any review is clear at the outset and to ensure that all needs or restrictions are taken into consideration.

Periodic Course Reviews will necessarily concentrate on issues or themes relating to learning and teaching. They may or may not involve engagement with or review of service departments within the University (e.g. library services, IT-related learning support, academic staff development). Any recommendations arising from Periodic Course Reviews will be considered by Education Committee, which will restrict ongoing transmission of recommendations to the appropriate bodies within the University for further review or action.

6.2.2 Overall process and timeline

The conduct of a PCR takes twelve months: this includes six months of setting up and conducting the review itself, followed by six months in which any recommendations approved by Education Committee are instigated or otherwise referred. The PCR process will commence at the start of the academic year, with the bulk of meetings arranged by a review panel in February and March (although Education Committee may implement a PCR at any time in the academic calendar).

Education Committee will keep under review a programme of PCRs across the University, and will annually determine which reviews (if any) are to be conducted in the forthcoming cycle at the recommendation of the School Director of Education and Quality Assurance and Enhancement.

The indicative annual pattern shall be as follows:

- Education Committee considers and confirms whether any PCRs are to be undertaken in an academic year;

- the Chair and Secretary will then meet with the key parties to discuss how an initial set of documentation will be produced and the deadlines for submission of the documentation for the appointed review panel;

- the Chair and Secretary will discuss and agree the membership of the review panel which will be constructed along standard lines agreed in advance (see section 6.2.4);

- documentation in the agreed format will be submitted and the review panel will review it, to identify which areas of the provision it could usefully explore in more detail, and to consider

---

[13] All reviews will be designed to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort with the requirements of professional accreditation.

how to undertake further engagement with relevant people. The review panel may also consider at this point whether it requires changes or additions to its membership to conduct the review for approval by the Chair;

Where documentation that needs to be produced specifically for the review (e.g. a self-evaluation by academic staff), it should be drafted in accordance with the principles and advice outlined in section 2.6.1 (for Senate Reviews of Schools), specifically any document should:

- address the agreed terms of reference for the review;
- provide a concise contextual overview of the learning and teaching provision under review, and the measures and mechanisms that operate to ensure it is of a high standard;
- be reflective and self-critical in tone rather than descriptive;
- identify key areas of risk to the maintenance of quality, standards and the student learning experience and how these are being mitigated.

- where a review includes provision from outside the University, the review panel will determine as soon as practicable (usually immediately or soon after their initial meeting) whether off-site visits will be necessary as part of their undertakings, and whether any off-site visit will require a formal tour of facilities (and what this may include). The costs of any off-site visit shall be met by the School(s) associated with the provision, which may or may not make arrangements to pass on or share costs with any partner. Guidance and report template for periodic off-site visits is available at https://intranet.cranfield.ac.uk/EducationServices/Pages/Registryforms.aspx

- the review panel may decide for themselves how best to manage their investigations. It will articulate any further documentation it would like to receive and outline any meetings it may wish to have with relevant staff and students. It may also decide whether it may or may not need to form "sub-panels" to focus on specific areas;

- meetings may either be concentrated into a single day of investigations, or scheduled over several separate days depending on the scope of the review and the availability of key members of staff;

- after the review panel has concluded all meetings and discussions, the Chair and Secretary will co-ordinate the production of a full report containing the review panel's findings to include any conditions or recommendations it may impose. The content of the report may be shared with key parties for factual corrections and amendments, along with a request for a response to the final agreed report, for consideration at Education Committee;

- Education Committee will review the report and any responses and articulate (if required) or approve a clear action plan;

- Education Committee will receive a progress report on the action plan twelve months after the review has taken place. In exceptional circumstances, Education Committee may request this report to be submitted earlier if they have any particular short-term concerns;

- Education Committee will then decide if any further action is required. Once Education Committee is satisfied with the outcome of the action plan it will be considered that the conclusion of the process has been reached.

This timeline is also represented in the following table:

	EDUCATION COMMITTEE	SCHOOL ASSISTANT REGISTRAR (SAR)	COURSE/ PROGRAMME TEAM	REVIEW PANEL
Jun	Discussion of any planned PCRs for forthcoming year: relevant key parties notified by SAR			
Jul	Confirmation of PCR		Confirm acceptance of being taken forward for review	
	Chair and SAR meet with key parties to agree contacts and deadlines for submission of documentation			
Jul -Sep		SAR instigate set-up of review panel	Prepare initial documentation	
Oct	Confirms review panel membership and ToR			Secretary begins to arrange review timetable
Nov				Secretary collates paperwork and organises the initial review panel meeting
Dec				Meets to review documentation and highlight areas of focus, including any further information required and meetings to be held
Jan - Feb			Respond to panel requests and provide documentation	
		Secretary arranges meetings between relevant students and staff and the review panel		
				Panel members prepare for meetings
Feb - Mar			Meetings are held	
Mar - Apr				Report is prepared.
May		Submit report and response to Education Committee	Submit corrections and/or a response to the report to Education Committee via SAR	
June	Receives report and agrees future action plan			
June (+ 1 year)	Receives updated response	Submit updated response to Education Committee	Submit further response(s) outlining actions taken since the review and plans for the future	

6.2.3 Standard terms of reference

Terms of Reference

1. To assess the continuing quality, currency and relevance of the course(s) in the context of the University's Education strategy;
2. To review the impact of changes since the last Periodic Course Review on the design and delivery of the course(s) and the provision of student support;
3. To review the principal review documents (the course team's self-evaluation document, course documentation, course handbooks and webpages) and any supporting documentation requested by the review panel;
4. To ensure the continuing availability of staff and other resources required for effective educational provision;
5. To review external factors and requirements which affect the course including: student demand, employer expectations, employment opportunities, accreditation, and developments in academic practice or educational technology.

Scope

The following areas of educational provision are within the scope of the PCR:

i.   the provision made by the course team:
   a.   the appropriateness of the course-level learning outcomes and the way the course is designed to achieve them;
   b.   the quality of documentation relating to the course(s), including the course specification documents, module descriptors, course handbooks and webpages;
   c.   the management and administration of the taught course(s);
   d.   the appropriateness and range of teaching and assessment methods employed within the taught course and the extent to which innovation in academic practice is encouraged and evident in the course design and delivery;
   e.   the extent to which the course design and delivery aligns with the University Education Strategy and complies with Senate's Handbooks

ii.   learning resources:
   a.   academic staffing levels, expertise, professional recognition, and the maintenance and development of academic practice and good academic standing;
   b.   provision of a high quality learning and research environment including physical and digital infrastructure.

iii.   student support:
   a.   provision of information and guidance, on induction and throughout registration;
   b.   development of individual learning and monitoring of progression;
   c.   development of intellectual environment (i.e. the culture and ethos of the learning environment);
   d.   development of a supportive environment to promote mental health and wellbeing;
   e.   management and innovation of both short- and long-term research projects.

iv.   feedback and continuous improvement of the student experience:
   a.   student feedback mechanisms and use of feedback outcomes;
   b.   use of external feedback (including external examiners, industrial advisory panels, industry partners, accreditation bodies) and wider sector guidance.

6.2.4 Review panel membership

The review panel for a PCR will normally consist of the following members:

Chairperson – Director of Education from within School.

Academic Staff Members – at least two members of Academic Staff from within the School who are not directly connected with the course(s) being reviewed, appointed by the Chair.

External Member – at least one external subject matter expert who is of an appropriate standing to participate in the review, appointed by Quality Assurance and Enhancement, at the recommendation of the School. The external subject matter expert will act as the external benchmark in respect of the subject and level; review the coherence of the course(s) in terms of content, assessment and intellectual integrity; and make recommendations on the basis of best practice and enhancement.

Professional Services Member – normally a member of Quality Assurance and Enhancement, appointed by the Chair.

<u>**Student Representative**</u> **–** the current Course Representative of the course under review, appointed by the Chair (or where a programme, comprising more than one course, is under review the Chair will appoint one Course Representative to represent all courses). The student representative is expected to consult with and represent the views of students on the course(s) concerned.

<u>**Secretary**</u> – the School Assistant Registrar (or nominee), appointed by the Chair. The role of the Secretary is to provide authoritative guidance on review procedures and on University Regulations and external frameworks, and to help the review panel produce a final report.

6.2.5 Suggested set of initial documentation

Prior to its first meeting, the PCR review panel shall receive:

A. **Documentation provided by the course team**
The course team should prepare a **self-evaluation document** (SED) containing:
- a concise contextual overview of the course
- a reflective review of the course development since the last review and a critique of its strengths and weaknesses
- summary statistics of:
  - academic staff involved in course delivery, indicating numbers of Recognised Teachers (information provided by HR), numbers of HEA accredited academics (information provided by APEX)
  - student numbers (information provided by Education Services) and graduate outcomes (information provided by careers).

B. **Documentation provided by the SAS team**
The SAS team should:
- Collate the data needed by the course team for the SED
- Provide the principal course documents (the course handbook, course specification and module descriptors, the course webpages)
- Provide any supporting documentation on request by the review panel which may include Annual Reflective Review (ARR) reports and final reports from accreditation bodies and associated action plans.

C. **Documentation provided by the Secretary to the review panel**
- a report from Education Committee prepared specially for the review, highlighting any matters raised about the taught course(s).
- a report from the Academic Registrar prepared specially for the review, outlining his or her findings regarding appeals, complaints and cases of general or academic misconduct relevant to the taught course(s) being reviewed.

- External Examiner Reports and responses (where available) for the previous three years.
- Course level PTES summary provided by the Director of Education.

6.2.6 Report from the review panel

General outline

At the end of the process, the review panel shall produce a report for Education Committee to consider. The final report of the review panel will be subject to factual corrections proposed by key parties associated with the PCR, and may be accompanied by additional commentaries or responses.

The purpose of the review panel report is to provide assurance to Senate and Education Committee that the learning and teaching provision and associated student experiences are of a high standard, and that those responsible for delivering the provision are undertaking their roles and responsibilities in an appropriate way. It also serves to highlight to Senate and Education Committee any current or potential concerns or issues that may require immediate redress or future management. Finally, the report should also highlight good practice identified by the members of the review panel that are particularly commendable and/or worth disseminating more widely throughout the University.

The reports will be retained and may be used in future Senate or Council reviews, and as evidence in external audits, reviews or accreditation exercises.

Further information on the structure of the review panel report can be found in Appendix C

Responses to the review panel report

At the end of the review process, the review panel, in consultation with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) (if appropriate) shall identify those persons who it feels should have an opportunity to comment on its findings. Each of these will be invited in the first instance to consider the report and, if necessary, discuss any factual inaccuracies or ambiguities that should be amended for the final version. This may require further meetings with the Chair of the review panel, if such corrections are not straightforward.

Once a final version of the report has been agreed, they will then be invited to produce a response to the report to Education Committee. There is no required structure or format for this response, but any response should acknowledge or otherwise comment on any of the directly-relevant commendations and recommendations made by the review panel.

Where the number of recommendations is extensive or complex, it may be appropriate for a response to include a formal action plan.

Final consideration by Education Committee

Education Committee will receive and consider the report of the review panel and any responses: it shall then either approve any actions proposed, or agree alternative courses of action. Education Committee shall also articulate how each recommendation will be followed up, and will manage future engagement with any progress required.

Twelve months after the completion of the PCR and the agreement of any courses of action, Education Committee will conduct a progress review, through the submission of statements or reports from relevant parties. Education Committee will reserve the right to invite specific members of staff or students to attend its meeting for further discussion.

Once Education Committee are satisfied with the outcome of the action plan it will be considered that the conclusion of the process has been reached.

Appendix A: Structure of the review panel report for SRS, Y1PR, PR and FR

The review panel is advised to structure its report to include the following sections:

- summary of main findings and broad conclusions;
- brief commentary on the review panel's investigations under each of the approved terms of reference; one or more sections outlining the areas in which the review panel focussed their investigations, and their detailed findings;
- a digest of commendations and recommendations for action or improvement;
- an appendix, outlining the evidence base used in the periodic review (i.e. a list of documents and meetings held).

There is no formal requirement for the review panel to adopt this structure, as it should feel free to provide a report that it feels best articulates it findings. Significant deviations from the above format, however, should be preceded with a clear explanation about the reasons for departing from the expected structure.

Summary of main findings

The report should be preceded with an executive summary, which captures the main elements of the report and its findings, and could be read as a standalone summary. It should include a broad overview of the review panel's assessment of the School's approach to the provision, maintenance and development of its educational provision, and where relevant with the partner institution.

Commentary on terms of reference

One of the objectives for the review panel will be to demonstrate that they have considered each of the terms of reference for the review (i.e. both the standard terms of reference and any additional terms of reference for the review). It would be appropriate for the review panel to structure this section using the terms of reference as individual headings and outlining:

- a précis of how its investigations covered this term of reference (this will include reference to documentation received and meetings undertaken, including the nature of any exploratory discussions);
- a statement of whether the relevant structures and procedures are exemplary, adequate or inadequate, with appropriate evidence;
- a list of any interesting and/or innovative approaches in that area, which are worthy of commendation;
- any recommendations the review panel would like to make including suggestions for appropriate courses of action[14].

The review panel is not required to provide an exhaustive account under each heading, but should include enough information in its report to demonstrate that its investigations covered that area of provision. It is acceptable for the review panel to make no commendations or recommendations, if they are satisfied that the School's activities are being appropriately managed.

Detailed investigations

In any review, the review panel will likely identify either particular aspects of the academic provision or specific issues or processes that they have decided to focus on in their discussions. It is therefore appropriate that the report covers these investigations in more detail and outside the context of the necessarily broad terms of reference.

---

[14] Recommendations may include other areas of the University to consider

Each report of detailed investigation should be structured in a similar manner to that above, with some indication from the review panel about why it was interested in exploring that area.

Digest of commendations and recommendations

To facilitate the consideration of the report, and its review by Education Committee, the report should include a summary or digest of commendations and recommendations in the report, with references to the main body of the text for reference.

Appendix

The appendix should include sufficient information for Education Committee to understand how the review was conducted by the review panel. It should outline the evidence base used in the review (i.e. a list of documents and meetings held). In order to facilitate the enhancement of future reviews, the appendix may also include feedback or suggestions to Senate and Education Committee for improvement of the process, or outline ways in which the current review was conducted that could usefully be avoided or improved.

Course Review Panel Report

[Awards, Degree Title]

Department: Education Services

Date: [Day Month Year]

Course Review Panel Report

[Awards, Degree Title]

Panel and Proposing Team Membership

Course Review Panel Membership

Chair:
Secretary:
External:
Internal (Academic):
Internal (Academic):
Internal (PSU):
Student:

Proposing Team Members

Course/Programme Director:
Course Team:

1. Context of a Course Review Panel

Course Review Panels (CRPs) are part of the change approval process and have two primary functions:

c) to ensure that changes to existing courses or programmes result in that course or programme continuing to meet, or exceed, the threshold standards as described by the qualifications descriptors set out in the national frameworks for higher education qualifications and to ensure the quality of the student experience.

d) to ensure that there is a clear and sensible transition plan to enable existing registered students to complete their course where these students are impacted by the changes.

CRPs draw on the evidence presented by the Proposing Team to demonstrate how the proposed provision addresses Institutional Policies, Regulations and Guidelines (with particular reference to the Senate Handbooks 'Setting Up A New Taught Course' and 'Managing Taught Courses'; Senate Guide 'Assessment of Taught Courses' Design and Feedback' and appropriate reference points such as the UK Quality Code for Higher Education or the requirements of Public, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs)). This is normally through the CRP meeting with the Course Team after scrutiny of documentary evidence.

Senate has delegated authority (through Education Committee) to appropriately constituted Course Review Panels to assess whether or not the new proposal meets the threshold standards. The report, together with the overview and course specification prepared by the Course Team will be considered by Education Committee. On the basis that Education Committee will make an appropriate report to Senate regarding approval.

CRPs are also part of the process of continuous improvement and enhancement and the meeting between the Panel and the Proposing Team should be wholly supportive rather than adversarial. This is Peer Review and all participants in the panel meeting can and should bring ideas to help further improve the course/programme/student experience. A further aim of the Panel is to identify good practice in course design or Learning, Teaching and Assessment that could be shared more widely; the CRP can recommend actions and offer advice on best practice to the Proposing Team.

Outcomes

The outcomes of a CRP can be:
  ➢ Recommend approval to Education Committee (no conditions; with/without recommendations)
  ➢ Recommend approval to Education Committee (subject to conditions; with/without recommendations)
  ➢ Fail to approve (proposal requires significant work before being re-presented)[16]

Normally conditions should be applied where there would otherwise be a breach of threshold standards; or a proposal would breach a Senate Regulation; or is out of line with an explicit Education Committee directive. In any other case, views are expected to result in Recommendations.

Normally conditions **must** be met before the proposal can be put forward to Education Committee. However where conditions are based on securing additional resources such as staff or equipment with a long procurement time, approval can be made subject to the conditions being met before the course commencement date. Normally the Chair of the CRP in conjunction with the Secretary to the CRP is sufficient to confirm that the conditions have/have not been met. Conditions can be set at Course, School or University Level.

Recommendations **do not** have to be met in order for the course to gain approval. However, the Course Team should respond to the recommendations in the first Annual Reflective Review report for the programme or course.

2.   Rationale on why a course review has been instigated by the Director of Education

3.   Summary of Discussion

The Panel are pleased to recommend this proposal to Education Committee subject to the **[insert number of conditions] conditions** being met before the proposal is presented to Education Committee. There are also a **number of recommendations** to be considered in the first Annual Reflective Review.

3.1   The Proposal

Conditions:	
Recommendations:	

3.2   Curriculum

---

[16] Do not be afraid to recommend that a course team takes more time to consider their changes. If you do this the Panel Chair and Secretary should speak directly with the DoE before submitting the report.

Conditions:	
Recommendations:	

3.3 Learning, Teaching and Assessment (L, T & A)

Conditions:	
Recommendations:	

3.4 Support for Students

Conditions:	
Recommendations:	

3.5 Staffing and Resources

Conditions:	
Recommendations:	

3.6 Programme and Quality Management

Conditions:	
Recommendations:	

3.7 Modules for approval

NB Existing approved modules do not need to be approved here, but do need to be considered in the overall integrity of the programme. Therefore a copy of the module descriptors for ALL modules associated with this course must be submitted with the course documentation.

Module Title/Reference	Approved Y/N	Comments

4. Summary of Outcome

IN SUMMARY the Panel are pleased to recommend this proposal to Education Committee for approval subject to the conditions outlined above (and summarised below) being met.

SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS:

Conditions [-] are to be met prior to the Course being presented to Education Committee.

		To be completed by the Panel Secretary as evidence comes in	
CONDITION		**DATE MET**	**COMMENTS**

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS to be addressed by in the first Annual Reflective Review of the Course

	RECOMMENDATION

Author: [Name, Role] (Secretary to CVP)
[Day, Month, Year]

NOTE: SECTION BELOW TO BE INCLUDED WHEN CONDITIONS HAVE BEEN MET (remove text in red before finalising report)

The Conditions [C – C] imposed by the Course Review Panel have been met.

Chair of Panel

           Date:

Secretary to Panel   **Date:**

Senate Periodic Course Review Report

[Insert name of Course(s)]

Department: Education Services
Date: [Insert date)

Contents

Scope of the Review

1. As part of its quality assurance processes, and in accordance with the Senate Handbook on Senate Reviews, Cranfield University conducts Periodic Course Reviews (PCRs) to review the learning and teaching provision of a single taught course or a programme (comprising more than one course) to ensure that it continues to meet, or exceed, the threshold standards as described by the qualifications descriptors set out in the national frameworks for higher education qualifications and to ensure the quality of the student experience. A PCR must take place at least once every ten years. PCRs take place in addition to Annual Reflective Reviews, accreditation visits from professional institutions, and the Senate review of a School.

Terms of Reference

2. Standard terms of reference have been approved by Education Committee (see Appendix B). The detailed conduct of a review was discussed and agreed in advance with relevant parties, to ensure that the purpose of the review was clear at the outset and to ensure that all needs or restrictions were taken into consideration.

Panel Membership

3. The Review Panel includes at least one External Subject Matter Expert nominated by the Course Team and appointed on behalf of Education Committee by the Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement. The full panel membership is detailed in Appendix A.

Background

4. [Insert Background detail on the course]

Panel Outcomes

5. The Panel is satisfied that the learning and teaching provision, and the associated student experience are of a good standard, supported by able and committed staff and that those responsible for delivering the provision are undertaking their roles and responsibilities in an appropriate way.

6. The Panel's findings are in the form of commendations on good practice and recommendations for further consideration by both parties of the partnership.

Commendations

7. The Panel commends:

Recommendations

8. In addition to noting the above commendations and good practice for sharing, the Panel has agreed recommendations that require some action or response from particular groups, as outlined in the table below:

	Recommendation
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	

Acknowledgements

The Panel would like to thank [Insert] for its thoroughness in preparing for the Review, the production of the self-evaluation briefing document and its full and open co-operation during meetings with staff and students on the Review Day.

Appendix A: Senate Course Review panel membership

Name	Constituency	Position
	Chair of panel	
	External member	
	Academic Staff Member	
	Student member	
	Professional Services Member	
	Secretary	

Appendix B: Senate Course Review terms of reference

1. To assess the continuing quality, currency and relevance of the course(s) in the context of the University's Education strategy;
2. To review the impact of changes since the last Periodic Course Review on the design and delivery of the course(s) and the provision of student support;
3. To review the principal review documents (the course team's self-evaluation document, course documentation, course handbooks and webpages) and any supporting documentation requested by the review panel;
4. To ensure the continuing availability of staff and other resources required for effective educational provision;
5. To review external factors and requirements which affect the course including: student demand, employer expectations, employment opportunities, accreditation, and developments in academic practice or educational technology.

Scope

The following areas of educational provision are within the scope of the PCR:
   i.   the provision made by the course team:

   a. the appropriateness of the course-level learning outcomes and the way the course is designed to achieve them;
   b. the quality of documentation relating to the course(s), including the course specification documents, module descriptors, course handbooks and webpages;
   c. the management and administration of the taught course(s);
   d. the appropriateness and range of teaching and assessment methods employed within the taught course and the extent to which innovation in academic practice is encouraged and evident in the course design and delivery;
   e. the extent to which the course design and delivery aligns with the University Education Strategy and complies with Senate's Handbooks

   ii.   learning resources:
   a. academic staffing levels, expertise, professional recognition, and the maintenance and development of academic practice and good academic standing;
   b. provision of a high quality learning and research environment including physical and digital infrastructure.

   iii.   student support:
   a. provision of information and guidance, on induction and throughout registration;
   b. development of individual learning and monitoring of progression;
   c. development of intellectual environment (i.e. the culture and ethos of the learning environment);
   d. development of a supportive environment to promote mental health and wellbeing;
   e. management and innovation of both short- and long-term research projects.

   iv.   feedback and continuous improvement of the student experience:
   a. student feedback mechanisms and use of feedback outcomes;
   b. use of external feedback (including external examiners, industrial advisory panels, industry partners, accreditation bodies) and wider sector guidance

Appendix C: Evidence considered as part of the Review

C.1 Documentation

The Panel received and considered prior to the review:

- [List documentation received]

C.2 People Interviewed by the Panel

The timetable for the Review Meeting included sessions with the following:

Course Review Team
- [Insert name and position]

Student Representation:
- A selection of students from the current cohort

C.3 Timetable for review days

[Insert date of Review

Time	Event
	Review Panel Convenes
	Panel meet with Students
	Review Panel discussion
	Panel meet with Course Teams
	Review Panel discussion
	Debrief on outcomes

Senate Periodic Course Review of [Insert Course(s)]	[Insert Name], Chair [Insert Name], Panel Secretary	For: Education Committee Senate
Version 1.0	On behalf of the Review Panel	Cranfield University

Owner	Academic Registrar
Department	Education Services
Implementation date	September 2023
Approval by and date	Academic Registrar, September 2023
Version number and date of last review	Version 2.7; August 2023
Next review by	July 2025