

Review Framework

Ref: PL.028-v004

Brief Description & Purpose:	Northumbria internal review processes are driven by the Office for Students (OfS) Conditions of Registration and the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) UK Quality Code, Advice and Guidance. This Review Framework relates to module, programme and periodic review and to student feedback questionnaires; this is regularly reviewed by Education Committee.		
Applicable to (list cohorts):	Staff: All staff	Students: All students	Third Parties: All who are in a formal relationship with the University
Effective From:	March 2019	Last Review Date:	4 December 2023
Approval Authority:	Education Committee	Approved:	March 2019
Executive Owner:	Academic Registrar (Director of Quality and Academic Support)	Business Owner:	Quality and Teaching Manager
Next Review Date:	4 December 2026	Publication External Y/N	Y



CONTENTS

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Office for Students (OfS) and the Quality Assurance Agency.....	1
1.2	Continuous Programme Performance Review (CPPR)	1
1.3	Periodic Review	1
1.4	Professional Statutory Regulatory Bodies (PSRB)	1
1.5	Teaching Surveys	2
1.6	Abbreviations / Acronyms	2
2	Continuous Programme Performance Reviews	2
2.1	Aims of Continuous Programme Performance Review:.....	2
2.2	Objectives of Continuous Programme Performance Review:	2
2.3	Stages and Timeline	2
2.4	Review and Reporting.....	3
2.5	Documentation and Data	4
2.6	Programme Clusters	5
2.7	Continuous Programme Performance Review System.....	5
2.8	Academic Responsibilities	6
2.9	Student Feedback and Consultation	7
2.10	Governance and Responsibilities	8
3	Periodic Review	8
3.1	Introduction	8
3.2	Aims of Periodic Review	9
3.3	Scope of Periodic Review	9
3.4	Periodic review process	10
3.5	The review panel.....	13
3.6	Timetable and responsibilities for Periodic Review.....	14
4	Professional Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB) Accreditation	16
4.1	Introduction	16
4.2	Procedures for reporting programme accreditation	16
4.3	Actions for Quality and Teaching Excellence	17
4.4	Documentation.....	17
5	Student evaluation questionnaires	17
5.1	Introduction	17
5.2	Module feedback.....	17
5.3	Teaching Surveys	18
6.	Appendices	19
6.1	Appendix 1 – Abbreviations / Acronyms	19
6.2	Appendix 2 – Schedule of inputs of Continuous Programme Performance Review ...	20
6.3	Appendix 3 - Student written submission (SWS) for Periodic Review	21

1 Introduction

1.1 Office for Students (OfS) and the Quality Assurance Agency

Northumbria internal review processes are driven by the Office for Students (OfS)¹ Conditions of Registration and the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA)² UK Quality Code, Advice and Guidance. This Review Framework relates to module, programme and periodic review and to student feedback questionnaires; this is regularly reviewed by Education Committee.

1.2 Continuous Programme Performance Review (CPPR)

Continuous Programme Performance Review (CPPR) is a robust student-focused assurance and enhancement tool aligned to the Office for Students (OfS) Quality and Standards, B3 Condition of Registration, and QAA advice and guidance. It is a key element of the following processes:

- Institutional performance review (e.g. alignment with Office for Students (OfS) Quality and Standards)
- Partner performance review (including Transnational Education, Degree Apprenticeships, Foundation Years)
- Periodic review

1.3 Periodic Review

Periodic review is a peer review process to assure the quality and standards of programmes within a Department. It covers all taught and research provision over a six-year cycle. Relevant documentation is available from the Monitoring and Review webpage³. Summary periodic review reports are published on the Northumbria website⁴.

1.4 Professional Statutory Regulatory Bodies (PSRB)

Northumbria programmes are accredited by a large number of Professional Statutory Regulatory Bodies (PSRB). An accredited programme is defined as one which is recognised by an accrediting body and may confer membership, chartered status, partial exemption or license to practice. Accreditation may be any process of approval leading to assurance that a programme meets the standards required by a particular profession. The procedure for reporting on programme accreditation is given in Section 4. Summary information of PSRB activity is published on the Northumbria website⁵.

¹ See: <https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/regulation/conditions-of-registration/initial-and-general-ongoing-conditions-of-registration/>

² See: <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/advice-and-guidance>

³ See: <https://www.northumbria.ac.uk/about-us/university-services/academic-registry/quality-and-teaching-excellence/monitoring-and-review/>

⁴ See: <https://www.northumbria.ac.uk/about-us/university-services/academic-registry/quality-and-teaching-excellence/monitoring-and-review/periodic-review-reports/>

⁵ See <https://www.northumbria.ac.uk/about-us/university-services/academic-registry/quality-and-teaching-excellence/professional-statutory-and-regulatory-bodies/>

1.5 Teaching Surveys

A summary of arrangements for teaching evaluation questionnaires is given in Section 5.

1.6 Abbreviations / Acronyms

A list of abbreviations / acronyms used in the Review Framework is given in Appendix 1.

2 Continuous Programme Performance Reviews

2.1 Aims of Continuous Programme Performance Review:

Deliver continuous assessment of quality and standards, academic performance, and student experience and outcomes through the robust evaluation of modules and programmes (and as appropriate subjects) at undergraduate (UG) and Postgraduate Taught (PGT) levels, enabled by the presentation of and response to pre-populated performance data at three points in the academic year, and the subsequent implementation of actions and prioritisation of resources.

Provide assurance to Academic Board, the Board of Governors and the University Executive that Northumbria is meeting the OfS [Quality and Standards Conditions](#). Secure the highest-level Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework (TEF) rating.

2.2 Objectives of Continuous Programme Performance Review:

Achieve upper quartile student outcomes by implementing impactful actions in response to student feedback and student outcome data on retention, progression, achievement, and employability.

Enhance the student academic experience by formalising student engagement in the process, and by implementing impactful actions in response to experience data measured through (Module) Evaluation Questionnaires (MEQs), National Student Survey (NSS).

Confirm the quality and standards of Northumbria degrees through a process of external scrutiny of student performance, experience and achievement including external examining and relevant PSRBs and industry/sector bodies.

Clarify responsibilities of those involved in delivering each stage of the quality and standards process and ensure that accountability for the delivery of performance improvements is transparent and understood at Faculty and University levels.

2.3 Stages and Timeline

CPPR is a cyclical process based on the review of performance data, and implementation and evaluation of actions at three points of the academic year:

- September / January / May

The focus of each of the three review points will be informed by the publication of key datasets throughout the academic year:

- September: covering the period June – September
- January: covering the period October – January
- May: covering the period February – May

Data timelines are produced to provide detail on the sets of data to be published at each date period. The data dashboards will be presented at each review point at the agreed level of hierarchy. At each review point SMART actions in response to an analysis of the data are agreed, along with an assessment of the impact of actions implemented in the previous review period.

In July the Head of Department will review the overall annual performance of the Department's modules and programmes (and subjects), including the implementation of actions and their impact, in the context of wider factors such as recruitment, staffing and resources to determine broader strategic priorities for the following year and evidence areas of good practice.

The CPPR process and timeline will be delivered for all UG and PGT programmes, including those that operate on a non-standard calendar, and those delivered in London and Amsterdam, and Transnational Education (TNE).

2.4 Review and Reporting

The process is designed around a hierarchy of review and reporting, and is informed by the following principles:

- The quality and standards of student outcomes and the student experience is the responsibility of colleagues relative to their role (e.g. module, programme, subject, department, faculty and university levels)
- Performance data provided will reflect the appropriate level of responsibility and will be produced by Strategic Planning and Performance (SPP) in accordance with criteria informed by the OfS, Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) and future TEF requirements
- Student engagement will be reflective of the stages of review to capture student voice and feedback on learning, teaching and actions
- SMART actions will be developed at each level as appropriate to enable impactful interventions at the relevant stage to be implemented, monitored, measured and evaluated within the academic year
- An annual review produced by the Head of Department, taking an holistic account of the data and actions, will identify good practice, what worked, what requires further action, alongside any strategic actions for future implementation

Faculty Pro Vice-Chancellors (E) (FPVC (E)) are accountable for CPPR in their Faculties, and for enabling Education Committee, and its sub-committees to assure quality and standards within the University.

Accountability for the delivery and completion of CPPR sits with the Pro Vice-Chancellor (E) reporting to Education Committee, Academic Board, and the Board

of Governors, delegated through Quality and Standards, University, Faculty and Department structures.

2.5 Documentation and Data

CPPR enables collaborative review at department level, designed to elicit a continuous improvement narrative focused on an analysis of performance, enabled by an assessment of key datasets, and the evaluation of the impact of actions implemented. See Appendix 2 for a schedule of inputs of CPPR.

The review form enables:

- Previous performance: To include an assessment on key issues and themes identified by the previous continuous performance review, flagging issues that remain outstanding. This ensures that progress against actions is monitored and recorded regularly
- Module and Programme issues: identifies any module or programme flags through data sets with pre-determined performance indicators and benchmarks. These sections should summarise any issues and the proposed response, and any actions against the given data sets
- Data review: A single source of data will be provided and only these datasets, alongside MEQs and Module Marks are to be used and analysed as part of the CPPR process. The data to be included will enable appropriate assessment of student outcomes, namely:
 - i) Retention (Continuation at University level)
 - ii) Completion
 - iii) Marks profile, resits and good degrees
 - iv) Student voice
 - v) Employer voice
 - vi) Achievement
 - vii) Satisfaction
 - viii) Graduate outcomes
 - ix) Career readiness
- External examiner feedback: Key points and common themes relevant to the stage proforma should be outlined in this section. These might be module or programme specific, or general themes relevant at a higher level. Proposed actions, timelines and expected impact should be listed.
- PSRB: Where modules or programmes are subject to PSRB accreditation or oversight a narrative is required around any key points or common themes in relation to PSRB accreditation visits and reports, or other PSRB feedback or updated guidance
- Student Programme Representatives: Identify and state key points and common themes arising from engagement with programme representatives, including proposed actions, timeline and expected impact
- Partnerships: Where modules or programmes are delivered by or with partners (e.g. TNE, QA) an analysis of partner performance must be outlined in this section, together with any actions identified. At Department level a commentary on the overall performance of the partner should be provided
- Summary Points: A summary of the key points must be stated in the

proforma. The summary should be analytical, with key actions/impact and accountability stated

- Responses/next stage/escalation which could include:
 - i. Feedback to key stakeholders
 - ii. Issues that need to be reported at the next stage

2.6 Programme Clusters

Related programmes have been grouped together to accurately identify programme variants across the Institution, inform programme portfolio management and provide a streamlined approach to review requirements by allowing programmes to be group effectively for meaningful continuous programme performance review, using the following overall principles.

Combine all programmes with the same level and title regardless of location or mode (e.g. At Northumbria, London, Amsterdam and UK and Transnational Education partner delivery).

Additional classification details:

Type	Clustering Principle
Programme frameworks - same bracketed awards and associated variants (with SA, with AP, with YIB/IMI)	Combined
Same title but different awards (BA/BSc)	Separate
Accredited and non-accredited titles	Combined
Full-time, part-time, sandwich, Northumbria distance learning	Combined
London campus	Combined if same award title Separate if different award title
Amsterdam campus	Combined if same award title Separate if different award title
Degree Apprenticeships	Separate if different award title
Higher Apprenticeships	Separate
Partner delivery (includes QA, QA Degree Apprenticeships, Pearson, i2i)	Separate
Integrated Masters and related Undergraduate Honours programmes	Combined
Linked awards	Combined
Undergraduate and Postgraduate delivery	Separate

If there is a clear academic rationale for varying these principles a request should be submitted to the Quality and Teaching Excellence (QTE) team for consideration. Approved variations will be reviewed after one year.

A Cluster will have input from individual programme leaders, teaching teams and, where possible, from student representatives. If a programme cluster includes collaborative programmes, the NU and partner link co-ordinator will ensure that the performance reviews are considered at the relevant department panel.

2.7 Continuous Programme Performance Review System

The continuous programme performance review system is a SharePoint based platform with data feeds supported through the University data warehouse.

The CPPR system is designed to enable a collaborative departmental approach, providing designated staff direct access to the department template and relevant data sets.

The system provides a view to cluster data at different levels of aggregation, including the individual programme (family, route, start month and delivery location).

2.8 Academic Responsibilities

The review stages are at three key points during the academic year with review forms designed as a collaborative department workspace approach.

The specific responsibilities are as follows:

- i. Module Leader:
 - Module Performance Reviews to be completed at the appropriate period during the academic year using the data provided with supporting narrative and recommendations. This will ensure that key issues at module level are raised, supported by data, and can be reviewed for recommendation/action
 - Module Leaders undertake a review of all elements at module level, e.g. number of resits, dropout rates, marks profile, module evaluation, external examiner feedback. Module leaders will meet and consult with students who have studied the module, and share and communicate actions
- ii. Programme Leader:
 - Programme Performance Reviews to be completed three times per academic year using the data provided on key programme performance alongside the outcome of the module reviews with supporting narrative and recommendations
 - Programme Leaders: Consider all data from module reviews, identifying key elements across programmes and any direct effect on the Subject, e.g., “killer modules”. Programme leaders will meet and consult with programme representatives to discuss the data, and share and communicate actions
 - Graduate Futures: Graduate future team will review graduate outcome and career readiness data to support any areas where interventions may be required
- iii. Department Head of Education:
 - Department Head of Education Reviews to be completed three times per academic year, highlighting the key issues and recommendations covering their area of responsibility
 - Department Head of Education: Consider all data from programme reviews and identify common and individual aspects of concern, e.g. high failure rate, student dissatisfaction, poor teaching
- iv. Head of Department:

- Head of Department Performance Review to be completed three times per academic year in response to the information provided at the above stages
 - Head of Department Annual Review (HoD AR) to be completed once per year (July), in order to reflect on the overall annual performance of the Department's modules and programmes (and subjects), including the implementation of actions and their impact, in the context of wider factors such as recruitment, staffing and resources to determine broader strategic priorities for the following year and evidence areas of good practice
 - Head of Department (HoD): Consider all data from the department review and convene a review period panel discussion to agree action and interventions, along with areas of good practice, including areas of concern for faculty consideration, e.g. key issues that appear to be common across the Department. Student feedback is required as part of this process. This is reviewed and discussed at the Department Management Group and signed off. Annual Review is shared with Faculty Executive
- v. Deputy Faculty Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education):
- Faculty Performance Review to be completed three times per academic year in response to the information provided at the above stages
 - DFPVC: Review and sign off HoD reviews, raising any relevant issues with Heads of Department before progressing report recommendations. Produce Faculty Performance Review outlining all areas that require Faculty intervention alongside current Business reports, which is signed off by Faculty Executive. DFPVCs will meet with Faculty student representatives to discuss the data, and share and communicate actions
- vi. Faculty Pro Vice-Chancellor:
- FPVC: Determine issues to be raised at the Education Committee Sub-Committees for university-wide consideration

2.9 Student Feedback and Consultation

The purpose of student consultation and providing feedback:

- i. Demonstrates to students the benefit of the evaluation questionnaire and other data collection. They will be part of the process and therefore in a better position to encourage participation in such activities as MEQs.
- ii. Formally embedding consultation as part of the process ensures that there is consistency across stages, programmes and departments.
- iii. Demonstrates that CPPR is a genuinely co-collaborative approach to student learning and teaching.
- iv. Provides a clear focus for representatives on core activities for engagement that University staff will find most useful.
- v. Aligns with the University policy to ensure that student representatives are involved in changes under CMA. It is a reasonable assumption that changes made to courses will arise from CPPR. As student representatives will be involved in CPPR they will be more qualified to understand the rationale for proposed changes to delivery.
- vi. Aligns the information SU Sabbaticals receive at Education Committee with the information representatives at all stages receive ensuring greater alignment of the whole representative system as a means for

quality improvement.

2.10 Governance and Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Committees and Board are:

- i. Quality and Standards Sub-Committee:
 - A sub-committee of education committee and responsible to Education Committee for the management, evaluation and development of the Continuous Programme Performance Review (CPPR) process in the areas pertaining to quality and standards, to include consideration of the Faculty Performance Review reports. It recommends university-level actions to Education Committee, reports on key issues arising (with actions) and on any good practice identified
- ii. Student Experience Sub-Committee:
 - A sub-committee of education committee and responsible to education committee and will receive Faculty Programme Review reports on key issues impacting on the student experience
- iii. Education Committee:
 - The primary purpose of Education Committee is to provide strategy and policy oversight for teaching excellence and student learning and experience activities at the University. Via its sub-committees it receives high-level summaries of the main university-wide issues identified through the CPPR process, and approves appropriate outcomes as required
- iv. Academic Board:
 - The Board receives and overview report of the CPPR process, including a summary of any areas of concern that would impact on overall quality and standards

3 Periodic Review

3.1 Introduction

The approach to Periodic Review (PR) takes into account the guidance by UK Quality Code for Higher Education and incorporates judgements into our internal processes to provide measurable outcomes. These judgements mirrored those from the previous HEFCE Higher Education Review process, which has now been replaced by the new HEFCE quality assurance model. This model clearly indicates that Periodic Review is a key part of the quality assurance process, judgements have therefore been retained as they provide a clear indication of compliance with requirements.

As well as embedding the Corporate Strategy and Strategic plans, it reflects University re-structuring with a focus on Departments and optimises utilisation of the Academic Quality Assurance System (AQAS). The method is built on an equitable unit of review which is efficient and effective for both the University and Faculties. The revised approach recognises the importance of the student

experience and has been informed by evaluations of the 2009-2014 cycle of reviews; a revised method was introduced for the 2014-2020 cycle. SLAS - Approvals and Review provides guidance information in advance of each Periodic Review to the subject area.

3.2 Aims of Periodic Review

Periodic Review will assure the University that:

- quality assurance and enhancement principles, policies and procedures are being managed in line with Northumbria University's Quality Framework, the Corporate Strategy and Strategic Plans
- high quality, contemporary, relevant and inclusive learning opportunities are provided to enable the students to achieve the University's awards
- student engagement is embedded in the development, design, approval and monitoring of programmes
- student engagement and enhancement of the student experience features as a key element of the continuous improvement cycle
- information provided for the general public, students and those with responsibility for academic standards and quality is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy

In brief, it is a process which:

- Operates under delegated authority from Academic Board
- Aligns with NU's Corporate Strategy, Strategic Plans, KPIs and SPIs
- Upholds QAA principles of externality
- Embeds a student centric approach
- Employs a thematic element informed by identified NU themes
- Is an objective and rigorous peer review process, its decisions being arrived at by a panel with appropriate expertise to carry out the task
- Is evidence based, underpinned by the Academic Quality Assurance System (AQAS)
- Is enhancement focused
- Assures compliance by the Quality Assurance Agency advice and guidance and related expectations and practices

Periodic review is not a process of validation or re-validation; Northumbria programmes (excluding collaborative programmes) are re-validated when required and not on a fixed cycle.

A schedule of Periodic Reviews for the period 2014-2020, together with relevant documentation, is available from the Monitoring and Review webpage.

3.3 Scope of Periodic Review

The Department:

- The unit for Periodic Review is the Department but in some Departments, the student numbers and / or the coverage in terms of subjects will necessitate a further breakdown. Postgraduate Research

(PGR) provision will be reviewed as a separate unit rather than integrating into Departmental reviews.

Education Provision with Others (EPWO) provision:

- As EPWO programmes are approved for a fixed period of time and subject to regular re-approval, the primary form of Periodic Review of these programmes is in their re-approval, and it is there that the detailed scrutiny of the data for these programmes will take place. However, in many cases, the EPWO provision is closely integrated with the home provision so that discussion of aspects of the EPWO programmes may be entirely appropriate as part of the review.

Teaching in and teaching out:

- Consideration is necessary if there are sets of modules, clearly part of the academic area under review but taught on programmes outside the Department (modules taught-out), and / or modules clearly from outside the Department which contribute to the Department's programmes (modules taught-in). The scope of the review will be agreed at a preparatory meeting but the focus of review is primarily on the programmes within the Department and the student experience of these and so taught-in modules are likely to be included, particularly within the review data sets.

New and phasing-out programmes:

- Approved programmes which have not yet recruited will be included in the review from the point of view of illustrating subject development and currency of curriculum. Clearly, there will not be management information relating to such programmes but approval reports etc. may be included as evidence. Programmes which have closed and which **no longer** have enrolled students need not be included. Programmes which are due to close but which do still have enrolled students should be included, since good practice is relevant even in (perhaps particularly in) these circumstances.

3.4 Periodic review process

Formal preparation for Periodic Review will start approximately 6 months before the scheduled review although the process of ensuring that the evidence is in place and documentation is up to date should be ongoing. A preparatory meeting between SLAS – Approvals and Review, the Head of Department and representatives of the Department will agree on the programmes to be covered in the review, size of panel, dates for submission of documentation and dates of the review. A Department Programme Information template should be completed to inform discussions and possible sampling of programmes. This meeting should take place approximately 6 months before the review event. This meeting should also determine how students are to be enabled to provide a written submission (see Appendix 3).

A digest of information on key performance indicators derived from relevant APM data sets showing trends over the last 2 / 3 years will be provided by the Planning

Department, approximately 4 months before the date of the review; key sections of the self-evaluation document (SED) will reflect upon this data.

A Department self-evaluation document (SED) will be submitted 6 weeks before the review, using the SED template which is available from the Internal Review webpage. Participation in the production of the SED should extend to all staff in the Department, and as far as possible, students or their representatives. Note that the SED should cover all programmes in the Department.

A Student Written Submission (SWS; see Appendix 3 for the process of producing this) should be considered alongside the SED. The meeting to produce the SWS should be open to all students in the Department and it should be made available to them all, not only those who are likely to be meeting with review panel members. The relevant template and associated guidance for students is available from the Internal Review webpage.

Other documentation to be available to the members of the review panel at this stage will include:

- i. The completed Department programme information template.
- ii. Programme specifications for the major programmes covered (this will be the sample programmes, if it has been decided that sampling is necessary).
- iii. The digest of information on key performance indicators.
- iv. Annual programme monitoring reports / programme evaluation documents for the last three years (for the sample of programmes, where sampling has been agreed); approval reports for any new programmes included that do not yet have PEP / PPEP reports.
- v. External examiners' reports for the last three years (for the sample of programmes, where sampling has been agreed).
- vi. Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Plans.
- vii. A short guide to the academic structure of the University and other contextual information.
- viii. The panel will also have access by request to other documentation maintained in the evidence base for annual programme monitoring (see Section 2.5). The panel might reasonably expect this information to be available on demand, but will try to give the Department reasonable notice of specific information requirements. Where sampling has been agreed, documentation can still be requested for programmes outside of the sample.

The Chair of the review panel will convene a panel meeting (involving externals by email) on receipt of the documentation to agree on allocation of tasks and on the meetings that will be required.

Periodic review will normally take place over 2 days. A typical agenda is available from the Internal Review webpage but can be varied as agreed by panel and Department staff. The following meetings are normally involved:

- i. Meeting with current students (normally student reps; from the sampled programmes, where sampling has been agreed).
- ii. Meeting with recent graduates, employers, placement providers and / or PSRB representatives.

- iii. Meeting with staff to explore strategic issues relevant to the department profile and development and discuss / clarify any issues which have emerged during preliminary / preparation stages of the review.
- iv. Meeting with staff to consider:
 - **educational aims, curriculum and subject development**
 - **quality of learning opportunities and academic standards**
 - **programme management information**
 - **meeting institutional KPIs and SPIs**
 - **student support**
 - **learning resources**
 - **student engagement & enhancement**
 - **public information provided for students and other stakeholders**
- v. Final clarification meeting with staff to identify and discuss any outstanding issues

The panel can vary this pattern according to the nature of the provision. The panel chair will agree with the Department team which staff should attend which meeting (staff from outside of the Department may be included where relevant). The panel Chair will agree with the relevant Faculty Committee /Group Chair and the Department team which meetings senior staff should attend. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (DVC) and Deputy Academic Registrar will be invited to attend the first and last meetings.

A Periodic Review will not involve any observation of teaching. However, a review panel will wish to assure itself that peer support is in place in accordance with the agreed University Scheme.

Panel chairs and panel members are asked not to overlap with external examiners in the judgements of standards achieved. Reviewers should be satisfied that an effective process of external moderation has taken place; they are not asked to confirm the academic judgement of external examiners. Students' work will not normally be seen, except where this illustrates some enhancement activity.

The panel will want to conduct the review with reference to the template on which it is asked to report, available from the internal review webpage. This maps closely to the required structure for the SED. The report template includes a summary section for publication of a summary of action taken to address recommendations.

The panel will draw up a preliminary report within 3 weeks of the review. The Department team will have an opportunity to respond to this report before it is finalised. The final review report will be completed within 8 weeks of the review.

The review report will be submitted to the University Education Committee which will determine follow-up action with reference to the panel's recommendations. The Department will then provide an action plan to address issues raised in the report for approval by the relevant Faculty Committee/Group and then sub-group of Education Committee. An update will be provided to the University Education Committee one year after the review event.

Should the Periodic Review report contain a '**requires improvement to meet UK and NU expectations**' judgement, the Periodic Review panel will identify

weaknesses or risks that need to be addressed.

The Department will be asked to produce a detailed action plan to address the review findings, which will be approved by the Education Committee. The actions will require to be completed within one year of the publication of the review report.

The Deputy Faculty Pro-Vice Chancellor and their Faculty Director of Quality Assurance will support the Department in implementing and monitoring the action plan with input from student representatives. Progress reports will be provided to the relevant Faculty Committee/Group. Should reports be received on time and demonstrate that progress has been made in dealing with the review findings, a sub-group of the Education Committee (two academic members, independent of the Department / Faculty being reviewed plus a Students' Union Sabbatical Officer) will review the completed action plan and evidence of achievement ('Stage 2 review'). They will recommend to the University Education Committee whether or not the judgement could be changed to 'meets UK and NU expectations'.

Should the University Education Committee decide not to change the judgement, either because of insufficient progress or because it does not agree with a recommendation to change the judgement, the Department will be required to take part in the next level of follow-up i.e.: that for a 'does not meet UK or NU expectations' judgement (see 3.4.14).

In the case of a review identifying '**not met**' judgements or a failure to retrieve a 'requires improvement judgement, the University Education Committee will require a further review to be undertaken.

This may be of all or part of the provision, depending on the number of 'not met' judgements and severity of the weaknesses / risks identified by the panel and highlighted in the review report. The process of completing the initial report and submitting to the Education Committee will be accelerated (achieved within 4 weeks) so that the University Education Committee can speedily identify both the nature of the review and when it should take place (no longer than a year after the original review).

The University Education Committee will approve the panel composition. Normally, with the exception of the Chair, the original panel members will be retained, subject to their availability. Should the provision still not achieve 'meets UK and NU expectations in any category' this will be reported to Academic Portfolio Group (APG). Given that non-compliance with quality processes has been evidenced, confirmed and not rectified, APG will need to consider whether to withdraw the provision / problem programmes. APG's decision and the final outcome would be reported to Academic Board.

3.5 The review panel

The review panel will be approved by Student, Library and Academic Services. The minimum composition will be:

- A Chair from an independent Faculty - the Panel Chair
- A Deputy Chair, a member of SLAS, a University Director of Learning and Teaching or equivalent
- An Internal Reviewer with some subject knowledge of the Department

under Review - referred to as the Faculty Internal Reviewer (Note: although this member of the Panel can in some circumstances come from outside the Faculty)

- Another Internal Reviewer from outside the Faculty - the Non-Faculty Internal Reviewer
- A subject specialist from outside the University - the External Reviewer
- A Students' Union nominee – the SU Reviewer (Note: normally the President or a Vice-President, who has not been a student in the Faculty which owns the Department being reviewed)

The review will be facilitated by QTE SLAS –Review team.

The internal panel member with some subject knowledge will usually be from the same Faculty as the Department under review, and his or her knowledge of the Department and its practices will facilitate the workings of the panel.

The size of the panel may be increased based on decision at the time of the preparatory meeting. If the provision is large and / or complex a second external specialist may be added. PSRB representatives may be added to the team, if appropriate.

Internal panel members will be drawn from a register of staff approved by University Education Committee. Faculties make nominations to this register to include:

- Experience of internal or external review, validation or approval
- Experience of PSRB, Ofsted or professional association activity
- External examining experience
- Involvement with Advance HE work

External panel members will be nominated and submitted to SLAS - Approvals and Review who will arrange for the Faculty approval. They will not normally have been external examiners, for the provision being reviewed, within the last five years.

The Students' Union nominee is included as a full panel member to provide a student voice in the review process. The Students' Union will indicate at the start of the year which of its Sabbatical Officers will undertake this responsibility and SLAS – Approvals and Review will provide training.

Internal and external reviewer nomination forms can be found on the Monitoring and Review webpage.

3.6 Timetable and responsibilities for Periodic Review

Date	Activity	Responsibility
Approx 6 months before review	Faculty provides completed Department programme information template. Preparatory meeting between Approvals and Review, Faculty Committee/Group Chair and Department staff to determine scope of review.	Faculty Registrar, Faculty Committee/Group, Director of Learning and Teaching or equivalent, Head of Department, Programme Directors, SLAS – Approvals and Review

Date	Activity	Responsibility
Approx 4 months before review	External panel member(s) nominated by Faculty and approved by SLAS. Internal panel members appointed from Register. Students' Union panel member agreed. Digest of information on key performance indicators to inform SED provided by Planning. Meeting of Panel Chair, Approvals and Review and Department staff to agree on any sampling of programmes.	Relevant Faculty/Group Chair, SLAS SLAS, SU Planning SLAS
Approx 3 months before review	Faculty to organise SWS; meeting to be facilitated by SU / SLAS – Approvals and Review	SLAS – Approvals and Review / SU
6 weeks before review	SED submitted and distributed to panel with SWS and other documentation.	Relevant Faculty Committee/Group Chair / SLAS – Approvals and Review
Period between submission of SED and review	Panel chair agrees distribution of workload with panel. Panel agree on any departures from standard pattern of meetings for review. Meetings scheduled - employers and students invited etc. Panel members call for additional information from Faculty, as required.	Panel Chair Faculty Registrar / Department staff SLAS – Approvals and Review to support
Review (normally 2 days)	Meetings held with Department staff, students, employers etc. Panel meet to agree preliminary findings.	Review panel, SLAS – Approvals and Review to support
3 weeks after review	Preliminary report using template sent to Department staff for response.	Panel Chair
5 weeks after review	Response from Department staff returned to panel	Department staff / Faculty Executive Dean / relevant Faculty Committee/Group Chair
8 weeks after review	Final report sent to Education Committee.	Panel Chair
Approx 14 weeks after review	Department action plan submitted to the relevant Faculty Committee/Group then University Education Committee	Department team / relevant Faculty Committee/Group

Date	Activity	Responsibility
Up to 1 year after Review	Chosen exemplary practice disseminated. Actions from review monitored by the relevant Faculty Committee/Group / Education Committee. Education Committee final sign off of action plan after one year.	Relevant Faculty Committee/Group Chair / Education Committee Department team

4 Professional Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB) Accreditation

4.1 Introduction

Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) are a very diverse group of professional and employer bodies, regulators, and those with statutory authority over a profession or group of professionals. PSRBs set the standards for, and regulate entry into, particular profession(s) and are authorised to accredit, approve or recognise specific programmes leading to the relevant professional qualification(s), for which they may have a statutory or regulatory responsibility.

Northumbria programmes are accredited by a large number of PSRBs. An accredited programme is defined as one which is recognised by an accrediting body and may confer membership, chartered status, partial exemption or license to practice. Accreditation may be any process of approval leading to assurance that a programme meets the standards required by a particular profession. This is an important aspect of NU provision, given the impact on student employment prospects. In some cases, it provides a licence to practice.

External review will use PSRB accreditation reports as part of the evidence base.

The following process for Faculty and University oversight of this activity will ensure that it is accurately reported internally and externally. This is particularly important for information on accreditation which contributes to data published on the Unistats website, i.e. for UG programmes with HESA recognised accreditation⁶.

4.2 Procedures for reporting programme accreditation

A range of methods and approaches are used to determine accreditation as specified by the particular PSRB. For the purpose of this procedure, any activity which has an impact on programme accreditation is described as a PSRB event.

When formal notification of the outcome of a PSRB event is received the Quality and Teaching Excellence team (PSRB) should complete the Reporting Proforma PSRB1⁷, and present it with the supporting documentation (e.g. the PSRB's letter,

⁶ A list of PSRBs recognised by HESA can be found at:
https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&task=show_file&mnl=16061&href=accreditation_list.html

⁷ Reporting Proforma PSRB1 available by request from the PSRB Team

certificate or report confirming accreditation of the Northumbria programme), to the relevant Faculty Committee/Group.

As well as informing University Education Committee of the outcome of the PSRB event, this will provide an opportunity for relevant Faculty Committee/Group approving proposals from discipline staff to address any issues arising and to ensure that accurate information on the accreditation is provided to Quality and Teaching Excellence for the preparation of internal and external returns and for reporting to University Education Committee.

The Quality and Teaching Excellence (PSRB) team then escalate the PSRB event details (using PSRB1 form) to University Education Committee, for them to note.

4.3 Actions for Quality and Teaching Excellence

SITS (CPA) pages to be updated with relevant data from the PSRB1 form.

Provide Education Committee with reports of PSRB activity via it's sub-committee(s).

Update and maintain University web pages (internal and external).

Manage annual checking / auditing process.

4.4 Documentation

Full documentation relating to a PSRB accreditation / recognition event should be retained within the Quality and Teaching Excellence team (PSRB) and will form part of the evidence base for internal Periodic Review, and may be required for external review which will be carried out by the DQB. The Records Retention Schedule outlines guidance on minimum periods for record retention

Summary information on accreditation and links to documentation relating to this process is available via the Staff Intranet⁸.

5 Student evaluation questionnaires

5.1 Introduction

Student evaluation questionnaires are used to obtain module feedback from students. It is expected that student feedback will be collected and responded to promptly. This will be monitored via CPPR and at Periodic Review.

5.2 Module feedback

Most final year undergraduate students are externally surveyed by Ipsos MORI for National Student Survey (NSS). The survey is carried out early in the calendar year and results published in the following July on the OfS website⁹. Satisfaction scores

⁸ See: <https://one.northumbria.ac.uk/service/ar/gsl/Pages/PSRBs.aspx>

⁹ See <https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/student-information-and-data/national-student-survey-nss/get-the-nss-data/>

(by category of question) are incorporated in CPPR statistics.

Modules (unless exempt) will be evaluated by MEQs every time they run. This evaluation will take place in the final 2 weeks of teaching regardless of particular delivery pattern subject to Bank Holiday and other vacation dates. Survey results are extracted to the Data Warehouse and disseminated via SQL Report Manager. Satisfaction scores, by category of question, are also incorporated in CPPR statistics.

5.3 Teaching Surveys

Modules are evaluated following each instance of delivery and usually within the last 2 weeks of teaching and are facilitated via a specific piece of software, Explorance Blue, managed by the Quality and Teaching Excellence team (Governance and Enhancement).

The agreed set of questions is approved by Education Committee in line with the Teaching Survey Policy.

Results of the approved question set and response to any issues raised are reported in CPPR and results retained by the Lead Module Tutor.

6. Appendices

6.1 Appendix 1 – Abbreviations / Acronyms

Acronym	Full Name
CPPR	Continuous Programme Performance Review
Department	The area of academic study for Periodic Review
DQB	Designated Quality Body
HESA	Higher Education Statistics Agency
MEQ	Module Evaluation Questionnaire
NSS	National Student Survey
OfS	Office for Students
PVC (E)	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education)
PSRB	Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) are a very diverse group of professional and employer bodies, regulators and those with statutory authority over a profession or group of professionals. PSRBs engage with higher education as regulators. (PSRB is also a Section of Student, Library and Academic Services (SLAS))
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency
QTE	Quality and Teaching Excellence (Section of Student, Library and Academic Services (SLAS))
Review	Review (Section of Student, Library and Academic Services (SLAS))
SED	Self-Evaluation Document
SITS	Student Records System
SWS	Student Written Submission
SU	Students' Union
SLAS	Student, Library and Academic Services
SPP	Strategic Planning and Performance

6.2 Appendix 2 – Schedule of inputs of Continuous Programme Performance Review

Date	Input	Comments
Period 1 - Sept/Oct	NSS	https://livenorthumbriaac.sharepoint.com/sites/NSS/Pages/NSS-2022.aspx
	GO	https://livenorthumbriaac.sharepoint.com/sites/Journey/Pages/Graduate-Outcomes-HomePage.aspx
	CR	https://livenorthumbriaac.sharepoint.com/sites/Journey/Pages/Graduate-Outcomes-HomePage.aspx
Period 2 - Feb/Mar (Sem 1)	Module and Programme Statistics	https://glenthampcampus.unn.ac.uk/Reports/report/Academic%20Staff/Module%20result%20statistics%20-%20Academics https://glenthampcampus.unn.ac.uk/Reports/report/Academic%20Staff/Module%20result%20statistics%20by%20programme%20-%20Academics
	MEQ results	Links for the remaining data sources are accessible via the appropriate Department CPPR share point page: https://livenorthumbriaac.sharepoint.com/sites/CPPR
	External Examiner feedback	
	Attendance Monitoring	
Period 3 - June/July (Sem 2/YL)	Module and Programme Statistics	https://glenthampcampus.unn.ac.uk/Reports/report/Academic%20Staff/Module%20result%20statistics%20-%20Academics https://glenthampcampus.unn.ac.uk/Reports/report/Academic%20Staff/Module%20result%20statistics%20by%20programme%20-%20Academics
	MEQ results	Links for the remaining data sources are accessible via the appropriate Department CPPR share point page: https://livenorthumbriaac.sharepoint.com/sites/CPPR
	External Examiner feedback	
	Attendance Monitoring	

6.3 Appendix 3 - Student written submission (SWS) for Periodic Review

A student written submission (SWS) is one of the inputs into the Periodic Review process. It is prepared independently of staff of the Department, at an open meeting with students from all programmes included in the review.

It should not be assumed that the submission will be formally representative of the student body as a whole; the report will constitute 'a' student voice, 'not the' student voice, and the review process will not necessarily seek to corroborate, with reference to other sources of evidence, comments made in the SWS.

The review panel, and the Department, will be expected to value critical comments made in a constructive spirit, and to acknowledge the contribution that such comments can make to the developmental aspects of the review process:

- A SWS meeting will be arranged by SLAS - Approvals and Review in consultation with the Students' Union and the Faculty, and will be promoted within the Faculty.
- Where a physical meeting is not possible, flexibility will be shown in using alternative and / or electronic means in agreement with the Students' Union to best collate student view from across all provision in scope.
- The meeting will be chaired by the Students' Union representative on the review panel wherever possible, supported by a member of staff SLAS – Approvals and Review, and attended by as many students from programmes covered by the review as is practicable. Notes of the meeting will be taken by a member of staff from SLAS – Approvals and Review. (Note: that this may need to occur in the preceding academic year, where an event is scheduled in early semester 1).
- The agenda / questions for this meeting is provided by the SWS template (available by request) which has been prepared by the University in consultation with the Students' Union. Students will be advised that the SWS should not include personal grievances, or any discussion of the competence of individual members of staff. They will also be advised that the SWS will not name or allow the identification of individual students.
- To conclude the meeting, the chair of the meeting will make an oral summary of a draft SWS as it emerges from the meeting, and attempt to secure the agreement of the students present.
- A draft of the submission will be produced by SLAS - Approvals and Review and agreed by the meeting chair. This will then be circulated to the students concerned. Any student disagreeing with the report will have the opportunity to submit additional comments to be appended (anonymously) to it.
- The SWS will then be forwarded to the Department staff team which will be given the opportunity to add its own comments on factual and contextual matters in advance of the SWS being sent to the review panel.
- It is expected that submissions will be open documents, shared with both staff and students of the Department, in order that they can be used in Periodic Review.

Version No.	Reviewer	Date	Changes
4.0	Governance and Enhancement Administrator	28/08/2024	Administrative changes to include updated cover sheet to be in line with Policy guidance and include a change log