



# 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

<b>1</b>	<b>REVIEWS OF LEARNING AND TEACHING PROVISION</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT	4
1.1.1	WHY SHOULD WE REVIEW LEARNING AND TEACHING PROVISION?	4
1.1.2	PURPOSES OF PERIODIC REVIEW OF LEARNING AND TEACHING PROVISION	4
1.2	TYPES OF PERIODIC REVIEW	5
1.2.1	INTRODUCTION	5
1.2.2	TYPES OF PERIODIC REVIEW	5
1.2.3	GENERAL OUTLINE AND CONDUCT OF PERIODIC REVIEWS	6
1.3	ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS	6
<b>2</b>	<b>PARTNERSHIP REVIEWS</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1	YEAR ONE PARTNERSHIP REVIEW (Y1PR)	8
2.1.1	INTRODUCTION	8
2.1.2	OVERALL PROCESS AND TIMELINE	8
2.1.3	STANDARD TERMS OF REFERENCE	11
2.1.4	REVIEW PANEL MEMBERSHIP	12
2.1.5	SUGGESTED SET OF INITIAL DOCUMENTATION	12
2.1.6	CONDUCT OF THE YEAR ONE PARTNERSHIP REVIEW	13
2.1.7	REPORT FROM THE REVIEW PANEL	14
2.2	PARTNERSHIP REVIEW (PR)	15
2.2.1	INTRODUCTION	15
2.2.2	OVERALL PROCESS AND TIMELINE	15
2.2.3	STANDARD TERMS OF REFERENCE	18
2.2.4	REVIEW PANEL MEMBERSHIP	19
2.2.5	SUGGESTED SET OF INITIAL DOCUMENTATION	19
2.2.6	CONDUCT OF THE PARTNERSHIP REVIEW	20
2.2.7	REPORT FROM THE REVIEW PANEL	21
<b>3</b>	<b>FOCUSSED REVIEW (FR)</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1	INTRODUCTION	23
3.2	OVERALL PROCESS AND TIMELINE	23
3.3	STANDARD TERMS OF REFERENCE	26
3.4	REVIEW PANEL MEMBERSHIP	26
3.5	SUGGESTED SET OF INITIAL DOCUMENTATION	27
3.6	CONDUCT OF THE FOCUSSED REVIEW	28
3.7	REPORT FROM THE REVIEW PANEL	29
<b>4</b>	<b>SPECIAL MEASURES REVIEW (SMR)</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>COURSE REVIEWS</b>	<b>31</b>
5.1	COURSE REVIEW PANEL (CRP)	31
5.1.1	INTRODUCTION	31
5.1.2	OVERALL PROCESS	32
5.1.3	THE OUTCOMES OF A CRP - RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONDITIONS	33
5.1.4	STANDARD TERMS OF REFERENCE	34
5.1.5	REVIEW PANEL MEMBERSHIP	34
5.1.6	DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS	35
5.1.7	REPORT FROM THE REVIEW PANEL	35
5.2	PERIODIC COURSE REVIEW (PCR)	35
5.2.1	INTRODUCTION	36
5.2.2	OVERALL PROCESS AND TIMELINE	36
5.2.3	STANDARD TERMS OF REFERENCE	40
5.2.4	REVIEW PANEL MEMBERSHIP	40
5.2.5	SUGGESTED SET OF INITIAL DOCUMENTATION	41
5.2.6	REPORT FROM THE REVIEW PANEL	42

<b>APPENDIX A:</b>	<b>STRUCTURE OF THE REVIEW PANEL REPORT FOR Y1PR, PR AND FR .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>APPENDIX B:</b>	<b>REPORT TEMPLATE FOR CRP .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>APPENDIX C:</b>	<b>REPORT TEMPLATE FOR PCR .....</b>	<b>452</b>

**Major changes to this document since version 2.7 September 2023:**

- Revised CRP template (Appendix B)

**Major changes to this document since version 2.7 September 2023:**

- Change of reference from School to Faculty (throughout)
- Removal of reference to Senate Review of Schools ( throughout)
- Addition of statement on staff responsibilities (Introduction)
- Addition of statement defining working days (Introduction)
- Inclusion of guidance on self-evaluation documents (throughout)
- Removal of section 2 – Senate Review of a School (2)
- Revised wording on conditions and recommendations (5.1, Appendix B)

# 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, and forms part of the expectations of Higher Education Institutions set out by the Office for Students in their conditions of Registration. 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*;<sup>1</sup>
- 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 focussed reviews.

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.

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.

---

<sup>1</sup> Further details of the conduct of annual reflective reviews can be found in the Senate Handbook on Managing Taught Courses.

## 1.2 Types of periodic review

### 1.2.1 Introduction

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 Faculty-level, or may cross Faculty boundaries. It has therefore approved the following types of periodic review:

- a) **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.
- b) **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 Faculty (e.g. individual courses requiring significant co-ordination between Faculties).
- c) **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.
- d) **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 and accreditation visits<sup>2</sup> from professional institutions.

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 relevant Director of Education. A CRP may be relatively narrow in scope and may not be designated 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> All reviews will be designed to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort with the requirements of professional accreditation.

### 1.2.3 General outline and conduct of periodic reviews

For the categories 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 Faculty or area being reviewed.

The relevant Head of Faculty will be tasked with responding to the findings of the review panels for the 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 relevant Director of Education, Faculty 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 Faculty 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 Faculty, and at least one from outside the Faculty, 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 Faculty. 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 Head of Faculty 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.

## 1.3 Administrative arrangements

The administrative arrangements for all Senate reviews will include support from Education Services<sup>3</sup> (for the general conduct of the review and its progression prior to and after completion) and from the area being reviewed (i.e. the 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;

---

<sup>3</sup> Normally this means Quality Assurance and Enhancement for Y1PR, PR, FR, SMR and the relevant School Assistant Registrar for PCR/CRP

- (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 Faculty.

## 2 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.

### 2.1 Year One Partnership Review (Y1PR)

#### 2.1.1 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 Faculty 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 2.1.3 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.

#### 2.1.2 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 2.1.3), 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 2.1.4);
- 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
<b>Jun</b>	Discussion of any planned Y1PRs for forthcoming year: relevant key parties ("providers") notified			
<b>Jul</b>	Confirmation of Y1PR <div>Chair and QA&amp;E meet to discuss and articulate terms of reference (ToR)</div> <div>Chair and QA&amp;E meet with key parties to interpret ToR and agree contacts and deadlines for submission of documentation</div>		Confirm acceptance of being taken forward for review	
<b>Jul - Sep</b>		QA&E instigate set-up of review panel	Prepare initial documentation	
<b>Oct</b>	Confirms review panel membership and ToR			Secretary begins to arrange review timetable
<b>Nov</b>				Secretary collates paperwork and organises the initial review panel meeting
<b>Dec</b>				Meets to review documentation and highlight areas of focus, including any further information required and meetings to be held
<b>Jan - Feb</b>			Respond to panel requests and provide documentation <div>Secretary arranges meetings between relevant students and staff and the review panel</div>	Panel members prepare for meetings
<b>Feb - Mar</b>			Meetings are held	
<b>Mar - Apr</b>				Report is prepared
<b>May</b>		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	
<b>June</b>	Receives report and agrees future action plan			
<b>Dec</b>	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	

### 2.1.3 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 Faculty 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.

## 2.1.4 Review panel membership<sup>4</sup>

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.

## 2.1.5 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 2.1.3 above and include any changes that either have been, or could be, made to the roles and responsibilities shared between the partners and any Faculty-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).

---

<sup>4</sup> 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 Faculty.**

- i. a **partnership-evaluation briefing document** prepared by the relevant Sponsoring Faculty should include any changes that either have been, or could be, made to the roles and responsibilities shared between the partners and any Faculty-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.

### **2.1.6 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 2.1.2 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 Faculty.

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 (SED)) it should be drafted in accordance with the principles and advice outlined below. While there is no expectation that this document is provided in a rigid and structured format, it is recommended that the 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 question;
- set out the mechanisms and structures in place 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.

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

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 Faculty 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 Faculty(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>.

## **2.1.7 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 2.2) 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.

## **2.2 Partnership Review (PR)**

### **2.2.1 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 2.2.3 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.

### **2.2.2 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 2.2.3), 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 2.2.4);
- 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:

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

### 2.2.3 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 Faculty 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.

## 2.2.4 Review panel membership<sup>5</sup>

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.

## 2.2.5 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 Faculty'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 Faculty-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.

---

<sup>5</sup> 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 Faculty student representatives**, if they choose to make one.

## 2.2.6 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 2.2.2 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 Faculty.

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 (SED)) it should be drafted in accordance with the principles and advice outlined below. While there is no expectation that this document is provided in a rigid and structured format, it is recommended that the 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 question;
- set out the mechanisms and structures in place 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.

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

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 Faculty(ies) 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>

## **2.2.7 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.

## 3 Focussed Review (FR)

### 3.1 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 Faculty (e.g. individual courses requiring significant co-ordination between Faculties).

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 3.3 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.

### 3.2 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 3.3), 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 3.4);

- 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:

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

### 3.3 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.

### 3.4 Review panel membership<sup>6</sup>

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.

---

<sup>6</sup> 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.

### 3.5 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 Faculty's educational strategic plan, or provide information on how the taught course contributes to the strategy behind the academic portfolio of the Faculty.
- 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 Faculty student representatives**, if they choose to make one.

### **3.6 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 3.2 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 Faculty.

Where documentation that needs to be produced specifically for the review (e.g. a self-evaluation by academic staff (SED)) it should be drafted in accordance with the principles and advice outlined below. While there is no expectation that this document is provided in a rigid and structured format, it is recommended that the 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 question;
- set out the mechanisms and structures in place 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.

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

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 Faculty(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>

## 3.7 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.

## 4 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 relevant Director of Education or Director of Research, or by the relevant Head of Faculty 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 Faculty, and at least one member of academic staff from outside the Faculty, 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 Faculty.

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 Head of Faculty. 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 Head of Faculty and relevant 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 Head of Faculty 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.



## 5 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 and accreditation visits<sup>7</sup> from professional institutions.

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 Director of Education. A CRP may be relatively narrow in scope and may not be designated 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.

### 5.1 Course Review Panel (CRP)

#### 5.1.1 Introduction

As outlined above, Course Review Panels are not intended for regular reviews of academic provision but instead are instigated by the relevant 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 relevant Director of Education (DoE) in the context of significant course change such as :

- a Course Team or Faculty wishing to make significant changes to a course or programme request that a review takes place;
- the relevant 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<sup>8</sup>);
- merging of existing courses into a new named Programme is proposed
- introduction of a new mode of course delivery novel to the Faculty 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:

---

<sup>7</sup> All reviews will be designed to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort with the requirements of professional accreditation.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

### 5.1.2 Overall process

- The relevant Director of Education and Assistant Registrar in the Faculty will notify the Course Team that a CRP is required and agree a date for the meeting.
- The relevant Director of Education and Assistant Registrar in the Faculty will discuss and agree the membership of the review panel (see section 5.1.5).
- 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 Faculty 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 5.1.6) 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 will 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 recommendations or conditions.
- The Course Team will be asked to re-join the meeting to receive Panel feedback and agree a deadline for meeting any recommendations or conditions.



- The Secretary to the Panel will prepare an appropriate report (see section 5.1.7 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.

### 5.1.3 The outcomes of a CRP - Recommendations and Conditions

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)<sup>9</sup>

#### Recommendations

During the process Panels may identify areas of potential improvement or enhancement for course teams to consider. Recommendations may also be made where a Panel has concerns over the proposed course changes, but where these concerns do not meet the threshold to be given as a condition.

Recommendations do not need to be met in order for the course to gain approval from Education Committee. However, the Course Team should respond to each recommendation in the next Annual Reflective Review for the course.

#### Conditions

Course Review Panels may set conditions as part of the review process, which must be met prior to the proposed changes being considered for approval by Education Committee. Conditions should only be set where the Panel feel that the proposed changes to a course as currently presented cannot be delivered without remedial action taking place.

Conditions can only be set where the Panel have concerns that the proposed changed course:

- is not set at the appropriate level (Level 4-6 or Level 7 of the OfS [Sector-recognised standards](#));
- does not meet the OfS's expectations of quality and standards as set out in their conditions of Registration B1-B5 (see below);
- will breach a Senate Regulation;
- will breach policies or processes set out in the Senate Handbooks, or any other Education Committee directive.

For apprenticeship courses, conditions may also be set where the proposed course does not meet the requirements or expectations of ifATE and/or Ofsted.

---

<sup>9</sup> 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.

Where a Panel has concerns about a proposed course change which cannot be remedied through a condition(s), the proposal should be referred back to the course team for further work before being represented to the Course Review Panel.

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 changes come into force.

Office for Students' expectations for quality and standards

The University, like all higher education institutions must, in order to remain registered with the OfS, maintain compliance with a series of ongoing conditions, grouped A-G. The B conditions focus on quality and standards, of which conditions B1, B2, B4 and B5 are ongoing and relevant to all course approvals. [Full details of the B conditions](#) can be found on the OfS's website.

Through these B conditions, the OfS expects that:

- all courses are up-to-date, provide educational challenge, are coherent, are effectively delivered and require students to develop relevant skills. (OfS registration condition B1);
- students will receive resources and support and engagement to ensure a high quality academic experience and that those students succeed in and beyond higher education (OfS registration condition B2);
- students are assessed effectively, that each assessment is valid and reliable, relevant awards are credible and that the course assesses technical proficiency which appropriately reflects the level and content of the course (OfS registration condition B4);
- standards set appropriately reflect any applicable sector-recognised standards and awards are only granted to students whose knowledge and skills appropriately reflect any applicable sector-recognised standards. (OfS registration condition B5).

\* OfS Registration condition B3 relates to the delivery of positive student outcomes at a University level.

#### 5.1.4 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.

#### 5.1.5 Review panel membership

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

**Chairperson** – Director of Education from within Faculty

**Academic Staff Members** – at least two members of Academic Staff from within the Faculty 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 Faculty. 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 who has undergone formal course validation training, appointed by the Chair.

**Student Representative** – a Course Representative from within the Faculty 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 Assistant Registrar in the Faculty (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.

### 5.1.6 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.

### 5.1.7 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<sup>10</sup>

## 5.2 Periodic Course Review (PCR)

---

<sup>10</sup> A Word version of the template is available from Quality Assurance and Enhancement

### 5.2.1 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 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 and accreditation visits<sup>11</sup> from professional institutions.

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 5.2.3). 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.

### 5.2.2 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 relevant 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;

---

<sup>11</sup> All reviews will be designed to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort with the requirements of professional accreditation.

- 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 5.2.4);
- 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 for approval by the Chair;

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 (SED)) it should be drafted in accordance with the principles and advice outlined below. While there is no expectation that this document is provided in a rigid and structured format, it is recommended that the 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 question;
- set out the mechanisms and structures in place 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.

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

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



### 5.2.3 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.

### 5.2.4 Review panel membership

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

**Chairperson** – Director of Education from within Faculty.



**Academic Staff Members** – at least two members of Academic Staff from within the Faculty 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 Faculty. 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.

**Student Representative** – 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.

**Secretary** – the Assistant Registrar in the Faculty (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.

### 5.2.5 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.

## **5.2.6 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 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 its 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 Faculty'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<sup>12</sup>.

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 Faculty'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.

---

<sup>12</sup> 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

Department: Education Services

Date: [Day Month Year]

---

<sup>13</sup> A Word version of the template is available from Quality Assurance and Enhancement

## Context of a Course Review Panel

1. Course Review Panels (CRPs) are part of the change approval process and have two primary functions:
  - 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 and to 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.
2. 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 OfS Regulatory Framework, conditions of registration and sector-recognised standards, requirements of IfATE/Ofsted for apprenticeship courses and requirements of PSRBs)). This is normally through the CRP meeting with the Course Team after scrutiny of documentary evidence.
3. Senate has delegated authority (through Education Committee) to appropriately constituted Course Review Panels to assess whether or not the new proposal meets the appropriate level (Level 4-6 or Level 7 as described in the OfS Sector-recognised standards; meets the OfS's expectations of quality and standards as set out in their conditions of Registration B1-B5; does not breach a Senate Regulation; does not breach policies or processes set out in the Senate Handbooks, any other Education Committee directive or any other regulatory requirement.
4. 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.
5. 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

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

7. 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.
8. 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 CVP in conjunction with the Secretary to the CVP is sufficient to confirm that the conditions have/have not been met. Conditions can be set at Course, School or University Level.
9. Recommendations do not have to be met in order for the course to gain approval. However, the Course Team should respond to each recommendation in the first Annual Reflective Review report for the programme or course.

## **Panel Membership**

10. 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.

## **The Proposal**

11. [This should include the terms of reference that the course is being reviewed under and the rationale for the review.]



## Panel Outcomes

12. Having met with the Course Team to review the proposal and consider the specific Terms of Reference for this review the Course Review Panel is satisfied that:
- changes to existing courses or programmes result in that course or programme continuing to meet the appropriate level (Level 4-6 or Level 7) as described in the OfS Sector-recognised standards; meet the OfS's expectations of quality and standards as set out in their conditions of Registration B1-B5; does not breach a Senate Regulation; does not breach policies or processes set out in the Senate Handbooks, any other Education Committee directive or any other regulatory requirement and to ensure the quality of the student experience.
  - 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.

The Panel therefore recommends approval of the proposal to Education Committee subject to **[insert no.] Conditions and [insert no.] Recommendations** as set out below.

**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		CONTEXT <sup>14</sup>	DATE MET	COMMENTS
C1				
C2				
C3				

<sup>14</sup> The Context should include reference to one of the following areas: The Proposal, Curriculum, Learning, Teaching and Assessment, Support for Students, Staff and Resources, Programme and Quality Management.

**CONDITIONS [ - ]** are to be met before the course commencement date and reported to Education Committee.

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS [ - ]** to be addressed in the first Annual Reflective Review of the Course.

			To be completed by the Panel Secretary as evidence comes in	
RECOMMENDATION		CONTEXT	COMMENTS	

## Confirmation of Conditions Met

- The Chair and Secretary of the Panel confirm that **Conditions [ - ] to [ - ]** imposed by the Course Review Panel have been met to enable Education Committee to consider approval of the [insert course title] for a [Month, Year] start date. A full list of modules for approval are noted under Appendix C of the report.

<b>Chair of Panel</b> [Insert Name]	[Insert signature]	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Secretary to Panel</b> [Insert Name]	[Insert signature]	<b>Date:</b>

## Appendix A: Course Review Panel Membership

Name	Position
	Chair of panel
	External Subject Matter Expert
	Academic Staff Member
	Academic Staff Member
	Professional Services Member
	Secretary

## Appendix B: Course Review Proposing Team Members

Name	Position
	Course Director
	Course Team Member

## Appendix C: Module Approval<sup>15</sup>

MODULE TITLE/REFERENCE	APPROVED Y/N	COMMENTS

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

<sup>15</sup> 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.



# **Senate Periodic Course Review Report**

**[Insert name of Course(s)]**

Department: Education Services  
Date: [Insert date]

---

<sup>16</sup> A Word version of the template is available from Quality Assurance and Enhancement

# Contents

**SCOPE OF THE REVIEW**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**PANEL MEMBERSHIP**

**BACKGROUND**

**PANEL OUTCOMES**

**Commendations**

**Recommendations**

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

**APPENDIX A: SENATE COURSE REVIEW PANEL MEMBERSHIP**

**APPENDIX B: SENATE COURSE REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**APPENDIX C: EVIDENCE CONSIDERED AS PART OF THE REVIEW**

**C.1 Documentation**

**C.2 People Interviewed by the Panel**

**C.3 Timetable for review days**

## 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 and accreditation visits from professional institutions.

## 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

<b>Owner</b>	Academic Registrar
<b>Department</b>	Education Services
<b>Implementation date</b>	November 2024
<b>Approval by and date</b>	Academic Registrar, November 2024
<b>Version number and date of last review</b>	Version 3.1; November 2024
<b>Next review by</b>	July 2026