Introduction

Periodic developmental reviews are an important means by which the University satisfies itself that departments, schools and collaborative partners are fulfilling the requirements for the maintenance of academic standards and teaching quality. It is intended that the process should be a positive and beneficial experience which, in opening up practices to wider scrutiny, should stimulate discussion and comparison, and encourage standardisation in those areas where the University might be expected to operate consistent and coherent policies. The promulgation of good practice and identification of possible enhancement opportunities should be a feature of the exercise.

Periodic developmental reviews are also the means by which the University meets the requirement of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education that an institution should review the continuing validity and relevance of its programmes of study (Chapter B8 Programme Monitoring and Review).

The Review will incorporate:

- the drafting by the Department or School of a Self-Evaluation Document (SED);
- review of documentary evidence to confirm the standard of the awards within the Department or School, the management of learning opportunities for students and the quality of the public information overseen by the Department/School;
- a review visit when the review panel will meet the Head of Department and a range of staff and students drawn from across the Department.

In addition it may include:

- a visit by panel members to observe a teaching session within the Department;
- Attendance by panel members at meeting with representatives of the student body, such as a Student/Staff Committee meeting.

During the review the Panel will compare departmental arrangements with best practice defined nationally through the UK Quality Code and at institutional level through Senate Regulations, Codes of Practice, and other procedural documents approved by Senate.

1. **Timescale for reviews**

   The Academic Policy Committee undertakes reviews on a rolling six year programme. The review schedule will be agreed before the start of each academic year. A department under review will be given at least a two terms’ notice regarding the approximate timing of the review and at least two months’ notice of the date of the review visit. Arrangements for the provision of documentation and the format for the review day will be agreed between the Review Secretary based in the Quality Office and the Head of the Department or School under review.
2. **Composition of Review Panel**

All periodic developmental reviews will be conducted by a panel which comprises the following:

- A Chair approved by the Academic Policy Committee
- An External Assessor (nominated by the Head of the Department under review, point 3 refers)
- The Academic Director of the College in which the Department is located or their nominee;
- An academic member of the Academic Policy Committee;
- A lay member of Council
- A member of the Students’ Union Sabbatical Team;
- A member of the University’s Quality Office will act as Secretary to the Review Panel.

3. **Nomination of an External Assessor**

The Head of the Department/School under review will be asked to nominate three potential external assessors to serve as a member of the review panel. The assessor should be a senior member of academic staff working in the subject area of the review in another university. The external assessor will be asked to focus specifically on the curriculum content and award standards of the Department’s provision. The following criteria should be considered in the nomination of an external assessor:

- knowledge and understanding of UK sector agreed reference points for the maintenance of academic standards and assurance and enhancement of quality
- standing and breadth of experience within the discipline
- an understanding and awareness of current developments in the design and delivery of curricula and of designing and operating assessment procedures
- fluency in English, and where programmes are delivered and assessed in languages other than English, fluency in the relevant language(s)

Where appropriate, an assessor from industry, commerce, or the public sector may be selected, but current and recent (i.e. within the last five years) external examiners may not serve. Where appropriate, more than one external assessor may be appointed.

Nominations should be made on the standard form (see Appendix A). Once nominations have been received from the Department, they will be reviewed by the Chair of the Academic Policy Committee, who will determine who should be invited to serve in this capacity. The Secretary to the review panel will be responsible for making all arrangements for the external assessor.

4. **Preparation of Review Documentation**

The Secretary will liaise with the Head of Department and their nominated representatives to agree a schedule for the production of documentation relating to the review. Some documentation can be provided by Student and Academic Services. A list of the documentation that is typically required for a review is given in Appendix C.

Documentation may be provided in the following ways:

- via a secure page on the departmental website or Blackboard site and access can be arranged for all panel members. The responsibility for creating and maintaining the webpage rests with the Department under review with support from Quality Office staff, who will be able to provide electronic versions of centrally provided information;
• all documentation can be provided on a USB Memory stick, providing an appropriate indexing system is incorporated with the files;

Exceptionally, if neither of the above options is possible, the documentation can be provided in hard copy format for reproduction for the Panel. Whichever option is selected, one full paper copy of all of the documentation should be provided to the Quality Office by a deadline which will be agreed in advance of the review.

As the purpose of the review is to examine the Department’s existing provision and its management of it, review panels do not require departments to produce significant amounts of new information for inclusion with the review documentation. Existing departmental and University documents should be used whenever possible.

Accordingly, the only new document that a department or school is required to produce is a Self-Evaluation Document, utilising the template and guidance published in Appendix B.

5. Self-Evaluation Document (SED)

One of the main aims of the Periodic Developmental Review process is for the Department under review to undertake honest self-reflection and evaluation of the provision under review.

Through the preparation of the Self-Evaluation Document (SED), the Department is given the opportunity to explore and identify areas for possible strategic growth and development of the curriculum and ways of improving its delivery, with a view to enhancing the quality of the student experience and learning and teaching opportunities offered, while assuring the standards of awards.

At the end of the SED, a summary of the suggested topics for discussion should be identified by the Department. Consideration of the SED will be a main focus for the Panel prior to the day of the Review and it will use this to identify questions and confirm topics for discussion. It is envisaged that the review will facilitate a dialogue between the Panel and the Department, which is supportive and developmental in nature, leading to a set of recommendations for improvement and enhancement as well as commendations for good practice.

6. Nomination of staff and students to attend meetings with the Panel

On the review day the Panel will meet a range of staff and students drawn from across the Department. In advance of the review day the Head of Department will be asked to nominate the following members of staff and students:

• Three members of staff heavily involved in undergraduate teaching*
• Three members of staff heavily involved in masters level teaching*
• Three members of staff responsible for supervising and supporting research students*
• Five to seven undergraduate students at different stages of their studies, drawn from across the Department’s programmes. Each year cohort should be represented. If the department offers any joint programmes, these should also be represented
• Four to five Masters level students drawn from across the Department’s postgraduate taught programmes
• Three doctoral students at different stages of their research
• Where the Department has distance learning provision, students will be invited to attend, however it is noted that this may not always be possible. Therefore, to ensure DL students have an opportunity to contribute to the review, feedback will be sought in questionnaire format by the Review secretary
* Within these categories, the Panel would expect to interview the Director of Learning and Teaching for the Department (or equivalent), the Director of Taught Postgraduate provision (or equivalent) the Director of Distance Learning (if appropriate) and the Postgraduate Research Tutor (or equivalent).

Professional services staff may be included where appropriate. The Quality Office will formally invite the students who are attending, and will therefore require the nominations from the Department a minimum of **two weeks before** the review date.

7. **Before the review day**

In the two weeks immediately preceding the review visit one or more members of the Review Panel may visit the Department to observe a teaching session, if the academic calendar permits. This will be organised between the Secretary and the Department under review. In addition, a member of the review Panel or the Secretary may attend a Student/Staff Committee meeting.

Shortly before the review visit the Panel member representing the Students’ Union and the Secretary will arrange to meet with the student representatives due to take part in the review in order to provide more detail about the process and identify in advance any issues for discussion.

Additionally, the Review Secretary will arrange to meet with the Chair of the Review Panel to discuss issues which may arise from the documentation or discussions with student representatives.

8. **Schedule for the Day**

The Review Secretary and Head of Department will liaise to agree a schedule of meetings for the day and a location for the review visit. If a suitable committee style room is available within the Department this will be the preferred location for the interviews.

A sample schedule is provided in Appendix D. Following an initial meeting with the Head of Department, the order in which the other sessions take place may be tailored to suit the particular provision within the Department.

An opportunity to meet with student representatives will be arranged, normally over the course of the lunch break for the Panel. This will be an informal opportunity for Panel members to meet with student representatives from all levels of the Department’s provision.

9. **Feedback and Reporting**

At the end of the review day the Chair and Secretary will provide feedback to the Department on the points of commendation and issues the Panel has identified for further consideration and action.

A written summary of these conclusions will be agreed by the Chair and circulated to the Department within a week. The full report of the Panel will be issued to the Department within 6 weeks and it will be given the opportunity to check it for factual accuracy.

10. **Departmental Response**

The report should be considered by the Departmental Learning and Teaching Committee (or equivalent) and any other relevant departmental committees. It is also good practice for the Department or School under review to share the report and, where appropriate, the departmental response with their students via the Student/Staff Committee.

The Department will be required to provide an initial response to the Academic Policy Committee addressing any issues raised in the report, normally 2 months after its publication. The full report and this initial response will then be considered by the Academic Policy Committee. This will normally also be considered by the relevant College Academic
Committee. One year after the publication of the report the Department will be required to provide a full report to the Academic Policy Committee detailing the actions taken.
Appendix A

Periodic Developmental Review: External Assessor Nomination Form

This form is designed to collect the information necessary to allow consideration of nominations for an external assessor for a periodic developmental review (PDR). It is intended for use with the University’s Code of Practice on Annual and Periodic Developmental Reviews, which can be found at: http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/sas2/quality/codes/documents/developmentalreview.pdf

Guidance about external assessor suitability and eligibility exclusions

Please consult the lists below before submitting any formal nominations or making informal approaches to nominees.

If you have any queries about the appointment process, or the suitability of a particular nominee, please contact your College Academic Advisor in the Quality Office, or PDR Panel Secretary if different, for guidance.

Suitability of the proposed external assessors

The criteria against which nominations for PDR external assessors are considered are as follows:

- knowledge and understanding of UK sector agreed reference points for the maintenance of academic standards and assurance and enhancement of quality;
- competence and experience in the fields covered by the provision under review, or parts thereof;
- sufficient standing, credibility and breadth of experience within the discipline to be able to command the respect of academic peers and, where appropriate, professional peers;
- familiarity with the standard to be expected of students to achieve the awards offered by the Department
- fluency in English, and where programmes are delivered and assessed in languages other than English, fluency in the relevant language(s)
- awareness of current developments in the design and delivery of relevant curricula;
- competence and experience relating to the enhancement of the student learning experience.

Eligibility of the proposed external assessors

Individuals in the following categories or circumstances will not normally be appointed as PDR external assessors:

- a member of the University’s Council or of the governing body of a partner institution, or a current employee of the University or one of its collaborative partners
- anyone with a close professional, contractual or personal relationship with a member of staff or student in the department under review
- anyone significantly involved in recent or current substantive collaborative research activities with a member of staff closely involved in the delivery, management or assessment of the programme(s) or modules in question;
- former staff, students or external examiners of the institution unless a period of five years has elapsed and all students taught and/or examined by or with the nominee have completed their programme(s);
- anyone who has previously served as a PDR external assessor for the University in the past six years
- a retired member of staff, unless there is sufficient evidence of continuing involvement in the academic area in question, and with current developments in higher education teaching, learning and assessment.
Completed forms should be returned to your PDR Panel Secretary.

### Review of [Department/School]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/School owned: (solely or as lead)</th>
<th>Complete list of programmes, including CPD modules/courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covered in this PDR Yes/No</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributed to by the Department/School:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covered in this PDR Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
- Identify any programmes with currently registered students but that have been formally and permanently withdrawn to new entrants;
- Provide review date(s) of any Department/School owned programmes covered by separate review.

### Proposed external assessor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept. preference ranking:</th>
<th>Choose an item.</th>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Click here to enter text.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First name(s)</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Family name</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of current post</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current employing institution</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address for correspondence</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Email address</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale for the nomination (include summary of recent career history and recent publications applicable to suitability)</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online academic profile</td>
<td><a href="http://Click">http://Click</a> here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify any previous contact with the University or members of the Department/School</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the nominee meet the suitability criteria above?</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
<td>Any comments: Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the nominee eligible to be an external assessor (see eligibility exclusion categories above)?</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
<td>Any comments: Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed external assessor:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. preference ranking:</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First name(s)</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Family name</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of current post</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current employing institution</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address for correspondence</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Email address</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale for the nomination (include summary of recent career history and recent publications applicable to suitability)</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online academic profile</td>
<td><a href="http://Click">http://Click</a> here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify any previous contact with the University or members of the Department/School</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the nominee meet the suitability criteria above?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any comments: Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the nominee eligible to be an external assessor (see eligibility exclusion categories above)?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any comments: Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify any previous contact with the University or members of the Department/School</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the nominee meet the suitability criteria above?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
<td>Any comments: Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the nominee eligible to be an external assessor (see eligibility exclusion categories above)?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
<td>Any comments: Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Head of Department/School approval of nominations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicated by signature here or by emailed return of completed nomination form directly by HoD/S.</th>
<th>Signed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print name: Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Office use only:

| College Academic Advisor/PDR Panel Secretary actions |
|---|---|---|
| Nomination received (date) | Nomination emailed by HoD/S if not signed above | Yes ☐ n/a (signed) ☐ |
| Nomination checked against appointment criteria and clarification sought where necessary | Yes ☐ | Any comments: |
| VC approval details | | |
Guidance Notes for writing the
Self-Evaluation Document (SED) for Periodic Developmental Review

The purpose of the Periodic Developmental Review (PDR) is to monitor the quality and standards of the programmes and awards offered by each department and to identify areas for development and for the dissemination of good practice in learning and teaching.

The Self Evaluation Document (SED) is the key document for a PDR. It enables the department under review to reflect upon its provision and the periodic review panel to set the agenda for the review visit.

The SED should be an evidenced evaluative and reflective document exploring what the Department believes is working well and what is working less. The SED should include appropriate reference to sources of information and data to support the analysis. You are not required to provide a detailed description of what you do. Some background information may be necessary to set the scene but the emphasis should be on the Department’s evaluation of the effectiveness of its provision and its management within the department.

The following guidelines should be used to structure your SED. Please highlight strengths and areas of good practice, including examples, as well as those areas you are working to improve or enhance. You need not reproduce in the SED detailed information available in another existing document; instead, you can either append that document or summarise the contents of the document and explain its relevance.

Word Length

There is no formal requirement for the length of the SED.

Structure

The SED should be structured around the following six sections

1. Strategic and Department Overview
2. Curriculum and Award Standards
3. Teaching Learning, and Assessment
4. Student Support, Development and Employability
5. Research
6. Topics for discussion

See Appendix 1 for style the cover sheet template to use.

See Appendix 2 for sources of internal and external information
1. **Strategic and Department Overview**
   This section should highlight the key challenges facing the Department and key strengths which enable it to meet its strategic challenges. The summary should also reference current, planned and/or future developments in the Department/School to support the University in meetings its strategic aims.

   Provide a summary of how the School/Department manages the following strategies:

   - Recruitment and Admissions Strategy
   - Learning and Teaching and Assessment strategy
   - Approach to eLearning
   - Approach to Curriculum Development
   - Collaborative Provision
   - Management of Learning Resources

   The overview should refer to the Department/Schools undergraduate and postgraduate taught provision and organisational structure to include staff and student numbers relevant to the scope of the Review. Where applicable it should include reference to collaborative provision for which the Department/School is responsible.

   The overview should list the UG and PGT programmes within the scope for the review including

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Award (including exit awards)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme Titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Study (FT/PT/CB/DL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners involved in the delivery and management of programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition or affiliation of a Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   a. **Maintenance of Standards and Enhancement of Quality**
   The SED should evaluate the effectiveness of the measures taken to enhance the quality and standards of provision; in particular this section should show how the Department enhances the quality of learning opportunities by building upon information or feedback from

   **External Sources**
   - External Examiners
   - External Bodies e.g. PSRB
   - NSS
   - Employers

   **Internal Sources**
   - University policies
   - Departmental committees
   - Student representatives
   - Evaluation of programmes and modules
   - Whether these mechanisms and student feedback are working effectively
   - Annual Developmental Review
   - Dissemination of good practice
   - Staff
     - Induction
     - Training (inc GTAs)
- Peer support of teaching
- Reward of good teaching
- Statistical information on admissions, progression and achievement

The SED should explain how statistical indicators are used for the evaluation of quality and standards, and to enhance provision.

b. Aims and Context
The SED should define the overall strategic aims of the Department/School, and explain how these relate to the wider University strategy. Comment on strengths and characteristics that define the Department/School. This may reference how students are enabled to develop their capacity to learn, how provision meets international; national; regional and local needs – including widening participation/access to education and employment and how provision prepares students for employment, further study or professional practice.

2. Curriculum and Award Standards
This section of the SED provides details of the programmes and awards offered. It is an opportunity to explain the vision and philosophy for the subject, highlighting not only the aims of the provision but also the skills students will be able to demonstrate on completion of their programmes and accessibility of the curriculum. Describe how intended learning outcomes are designed and reviewed, and how they meet/exceed the QAA Subject Benchmark Statements.

The SED should reflect on how the structure and content of the programmes are designed and developed appropriately, referring to

- Opportunities to achieve ILOs
- Opportunities for academic and intellectual progression
- Good practice in teaching and learning
- Feedback from External Examiners
- Subject Benchmark Statements
- Consider other topics relating to curricular planning and University consultations and reviews

a. Progression and Completion
Indicate how successful the Department is in supporting and monitoring students’ progression through their programmes, indicating the proportion of students who successfully complete their studies.

The SED should cover:

- Student retention and withdrawal and where appropriate review the effectiveness of strategies adopted to reduce or limit the rate of withdrawal
- Student achievement, identifying where action or support may be required at Departmental, College or University level
- Student complaints/appeals and any emerging themes

The SED should highlight what measures are in place to monitor graduate destinations and maintain links with alumni, including any significant trends in data resulting from the Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education Survey.
3. Teaching Learning, and Assessment

This section of the SED should include reflection on the Departments/School’s provision in respect of the following;

a. **Curriculum: Learning and Teaching**
   The effectiveness of the modes of delivery of teaching and learning, where the Department employs innovative teaching methods and opportunities for development of new teaching methods. This could include, for example, discussion on –
   - The range and appropriateness of teaching methods
   - The variety of ways in which student participation is encouraged and achieved
   - Opportunities for innovation
   - The effectiveness of team teaching, where appropriate

b. **Curriculum: Assessment**
   The effectiveness of student assessment in measuring achievement of the intended outcomes of courses and in particular in
   - The effectiveness of the assessments in promoting student learning (especially through formative assessment)
   - The range and variety of assessment methods used, evaluating their effectiveness in enabling students to demonstrate achievement

c. **Feedback Mechanisms (to and from students)**
   This section should include policies and practices for providing feedback to students and obtaining feedback from students.

   The SED should consider:
   - The mechanisms in place in the Department/School to ensure good feedback to students
   - How the department knows that mechanisms for student representation and feedback are functioning effectively
   - How students are engaged in decision making and curriculum development and how feedback is obtained from students and used to enhance and improve programmes and how feedback loops are closed

4. **Student Support, Development and Employability**

This section would normally include details on the operation of the personal tutor system, communication with students, the monitoring of progression, study skills, transferable skills and employability, and address any issues relating to widening participation, internationalisation and equality and diversity.

a. **Recruitment and Induction of Students**
   This section should outline Department/School arrangements for student recruitment and admission. It should also summarise what induction programmes take place and how the Department evaluate and develop them.

b. **Student Support**
   This section should review the effectiveness of strategies of academic support, and the extent to which they take account of entry profile of the student intake in relation to the aims of the programmes. The SED should articulate and evaluate the student
support systems in place for the whole student journey both within the Department and relationship with University services.

Demonstrate how the Department knows whether support for students is effective, and how it ensures it meets the needs of all students including:

- Identification of and action on any special learning needs
- Written guidance
- Academic advising
- Tutorial support
- Feedback to students on their progress
- Overall academic guidance and supervision

c. **Student Experience**
   Explain how the Department knows whether students and staff have a clear understanding of their respective responsibilities and whether they have a sense of belonging within the Department/College/University.

d. **Learning Resources**
   Explain the systems and strategies in place for ensuring the effectiveness of the deployment of learning resources in the Department, linked through to the discussion of the student learning environment provided, including:
   - availability of equipment and IT facilities for staff and students
   - availability of learning and teaching accommodation available, and to what extent the environments in which learning occurs are conducive to effective learning
   - accessibility of resources provided by the library
   - Effectiveness of technical and administrative support available

   Explain how effectively the Department feels the students use the learning resources available to them.

e. **Learning and Study Skills**
   The SED should:
   - Articulate how the Department identifies the study skills students require
   - Explain how the Department supports the development of study skills through curriculum and working with University central services
   - Identify opportunities for further development.

f. **Employability**
   The SED should include how the Department:
   - identifies the employability skills that are relevant to and needed by its students
   - supports the development of employability through curriculum and working with University central services
   - assesses the effectiveness of its employability strategies and its engagements of interactions with employers

g. **Work Placements**
   If work placements are provided as part of the Department’s provision the SED should explain how they are managed and evaluate their value to the student experience.
Indicate how work placements are monitored in relation to the Code of Practice on the University’s Procedures for managing HE provision with others.

h. **International Study**
The SED should explain what opportunities exist, if any, and articulate plans for developing international study opportunities and how study abroad opportunities are managed in relation to the Code of Practice on the University’s Procedures for managing HE provision with others.

5. **Research**
For reviews which include research degree provision, the following additional information should be included as part of the evaluation of this area of the Department’s work:

a. **Recruitment**
The SED should reflect on the quality and nature of the student intake and any specific factors which affect student recruitment.

b. **Studentships and awards**
The SED should explain the financial support available for research students in the Department, the success of your research students in obtaining awards and any action to increase the provision of financial support.

c. **Supervision arrangements**
The SED should indicate frequency of supervisions, arrangements for joint supervision, special arrangements for part-time students, dealing with study leave, change of supervisor arrangements and the distribution of students amongst supervisors.

d. **Special arrangements**
The SED should review special arrangements for support, induction and guidance including for overseas and part-time students.

e. **The research training course**
The SED should evaluate the research training including the skills which the research training course aims to develop, whether it is assessed and if it has Research Council recognition.

f. **Resources**
The SED should explain any systems and strategies in place for ensuring the effectiveness of the deployment of learning resources and the effectiveness of resources to support research students (e.g. Library, study or work space, IT, equipment, and funds for research travel and conference attendance).

g. **Student progress**
The SED should cover the mechanisms in place for monitoring and recording outcomes of probation review and dealing with unsatisfactory progress.

h. **Submission & completion rates**
The SED should include the Department’s Research Council submission rates (i.e. the proportion who submit within 12 months of the end of their award), for other research students (e.g. overseas, part-time, self-funding), proportion of students who successfully complete and employment rates.
i. **Graduate Teaching and Research Assistants**
The SED should explain the role of GTAs and GRAs play in supporting teaching or research including the general nature of their responsibilities, number employed in each category, maximum workloads, training and supporting research students (including graduate assistants) in respect of their work for the Department.

6. **Topics for discussion**
This section summarises issues raised in the SED and will often form the basis for opening discussions with the Panel and inform the agenda for the review visit. These will include identification of:

- Strengths and possible areas for improvement identified throughout the SED which the team would like to focus on during the Review day
- How any key areas for improvement and enhancement will fit into the future strategic plans of the Department

At the end of the review process Schools/Departments and the Review Panel should feel that the issues raised have been addressed either directly or indirectly.
## Appendix 1

### SED Cover Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Prepared by**

*Please include who wrote the SED (including position), consideration by Department/School Committees where appropriate and any student involvement (including UG/PG).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete list of programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Please list all courses for which the Department is the formal lead;*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributions to other joint degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Please list those joint degrees run by other Departments to which the Department contributes modules.*
Sources of Information

Further advice and guidance is available from your College Academic Advisor.

Internal Sources of Information

College Academic Advisor

The University Learning and Teaching Strategy
http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/sas2/quality/learnteach

External Sources of Information

Framework for Higher Education Qualifications
http://www.qaa.ac.uk/AssuringStandardsAndQuality/Qualifications/Pages/default.aspx

Subject benchmark statements
http://www.qaa.ac.uk/AssuringStandardsAndQuality/subject-guidance/Pages/Subject-benchmark-statements.aspx

QAA Code of Practice for the Assurance of Academic Quality and Standards in Higher Education
http://www.qaa.ac.uk/AssuringStandardsAndQuality/code-of-practice/Pages/default.aspx

Higher Education Academy
http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/
DEPARTMENTAL REVIEWS: REVIEW DOCUMENTATION

Documentation should be structured in line with the headings below. Where documents are available on the University’s website, links can be provided to the relevant document. The Department should discuss any alternative approaches to provision of documentation with the review secretary at an early stage in the preparation.

1. Processes for the Management and Enhancement of Academic Quality and the assurance of standards

Departmental Administration and Management
- Self Evaluation Document (see guidance and template)
- Most recent annual developmental reviews (last 3 years)
- Terms of reference and the minutes of each departmental management committee for the last 12 months (relevant to the management of quality and standards – review secretary will assist with identifying which committees are included)
- Plan of departmental committee structure

External and Student Views
- External examiners’ reports and departmental responses (last 3 years)
- Previous departmental PDR report and follow-up reports to APC
- Most recent accreditation reports by PSRBs
- Outcome of the National Student Survey for the Department
- Outcome of Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES)

2. Curriculum and Award Standards

Curriculum
- Programme specifications
- Module specifications
- Curriculum change rationales (for the last 12 months)
- QAA Subject benchmarking statements
- External professional body requirements for accreditation (where appropriate)

Statistical Profile (review secretary can assist with provision of data)
- Departmental Statistical Profile
- Current Registration figures
- Progression and completion rates including degree class outcomes (2 years UG and PGT)
- KISS Data Set
- Entry and exit qualifications for identifying ‘value added’

3. Teaching, Learning and Assessment

Management of Teaching and Learning
- Terms of reference and the minutes of the departmental Teaching and Learning Committee (or equivalent) for the last 12 months
- Copy of departmental schemes for peer observation of teaching and peer observation of marking
- Workload allocation model

Assessment
- Departmental guidelines issued to examiners on assessment and marking
- Procedures for the internal and external moderation of summative assessments
- Assessment and feedback mechanisms – include samples of feedback forms for providing assessment feedback
Feedback to and from Students

- Terms of reference and the minutes of all Student Staff Committee minutes for the last 2 years
- Module level feedback - include sample of questionnaire template
- Programme level feedback – include sample of questionnaire template

4. Student Support, Development and Employability

Induction (UG and PG)
- Induction Programmes

Study Support
- Handbooks
- Project advice/dissertation advice
- Support for fieldwork
- Distance learning student support arrangements

Placements and Exchanges
- Guidance and support to students for study abroad and/or work placements

Careers Guidance and Employability
- First destination information (as published by the Careers Service)
- Careers Development Service partnership agreement
- Schedule of departmental and programme specific careers events
- Support for internships

5. Research Students

- Postgraduate Research Student numbers
- Research students’ seminar programme
- Outcome of Postgraduate research Experience Survey (most recent)
- Completion rates
- Training for Research Supervisors
- Processes for and monitoring of research supervision
UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER

ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE

PERIODIC DEVELOPMENTAL REVIEW:
DATE, In x,xx Building
Draft Schedule of Interviews

08.45 – 09.30  Private session for Panel
For discussion of particular themes and issues each member may wish to address

09.30 – 10.30  Meeting with Head of School

10.30 – 10.40  Break

10.40 – 11.25  Meeting with undergraduate students
five to seven undergraduate students at different stages of their studies, drawn from across the department’s programmes.

11.25 – 12.10  Meeting with staff members responsible for undergraduate programmes

12.10 – 12.20  Break

12.20 – 13.00  Meeting with postgraduate and distance learning students
four to five Masters level students and six distance learning students drawn from across the department’s postgraduate taught programmes

13.00 - 13.30  Lunch for Panel members

13.30 – 13.45  Private session for Panel
For discussion of particular themes and issues arising from initial interviews

13.45 – 14.15  Meeting with staff members responsible for postgraduate taught programmes

14.15 – 14.45  Meeting with a sample of research students
three doctoral students at different stages of their research preferably including one student who has not yet undergone the APG/PhD upgrade process.

14.45 – 15.15  Meeting with research student supervisors
3 members of staff with specific responsibilities for the supervision, monitoring and training of research students

15.15 – 15.30  Break

15.30 – 16.00  Private session for Panel
For discussion of outcome of the review, and identification of points of commendation and points for action

16.00 – 16.30  Optional feedback session to Head of School (Panel Chair and Secretary only)

If appropriate — a session can be inserted to interview staff who have specific responsibility for DL provision. Depending on the scale of the Department’s DL provision this can be a 30 or 45 minute session, or this can be built into an extended PGT staff session