

Requirements for Periodic Collaborative Review of Validation Service collaborations

1. Periodic Collaborative Review Framework

1.1 Periodic Collaborative Review is a two-part process, which includes:

- a. Institutional Review.
- b. Course Review.

Institutional Review assesses the effectiveness of the Centre's organisational structure and processes for the management and enhancement of quality, standards and student learning opportunities. This process allows the University to establish whether the initial criteria for approval of a Validated Centre continue to be met.

1.2 Institutional review focuses upon three aspects:

- a. Aspect 1: Educational infrastructure;
- b. Aspect 2: Organisational structure;
- c. Aspect 3: Assurance of academic standards and quality.

1.3 These aspects are assessed through a number of methods:

- a. Consideration of the Centre's Reflective Analysis Document, produced by the Centre in preparation for the review.
- b. A commentary undertaken by CADQ prior to the event using evidence provided by the Centre in its electronic repository of information.
- c. Discussion with the Centre's senior management team during a review panel event which takes place at the Centre.

1.4 **Course Review** is based upon a range of criteria that are designed to ensure that the course remains current and operates effectively and that appropriate quality management takes place. This process allows the University to review the quality and standards of the course, beyond the routine monitoring which takes place through annual monitoring. It also allows the University to establish whether the initial criteria for approval continue to be met.

- 1.5 These criteria are assessed through a number of methods:
- a. consideration of the Course Reflective Analysis Document, produced by the course team in preparation for the review;
 - b. a commentary undertaken by CADQ prior to the event using evidence provided by the course team in an electronic repository of information;
 - c. discussion with students, and the course team during a review event which takes place at the Centre.

2. Review Criteria

- 2.1 **Institutional review** aims to establish whether broad criteria associated with the aspects under review have been met.
- 2.2 The following criteria and indicative factors are used by the review panel to determine outcomes. These are broadly aligned to the initial criteria for approval of a Validated Centre.

Aspect	Factors
1. Educational infrastructure	<p>The Centre's approach to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation and review of its strategies for higher education Monitoring the provision of resources for effective delivery of the courses Ensuring there is an appropriately qualified staff base for the delivery of the courses Staff development and research Monitoring support arrangements for students Handling extenuating circumstances, academic irregularities, complaints and appeals
2. Organisational structure	<p>The Centre's approach to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensuring that there is a shared awareness of the organisational structure across the institution Ensuring that there is an appropriate academic environment in which the quality of its courses and of student learning opportunities is assured Monitoring and review of changes to the organisational structure to ensure these are effective for the management of quality and standards

Ensuring responsibility for the design and operation of the course is located as close as possible to the teaching team

3. Assurance of academic standards and quality

The Centre's approach to:

Monitoring and reporting on institutional and course performance

Ensuring the comparability of quality management processes across delivery sites, where applicable

Involving students in quality management and decision-making

Sharing good practice across the Centre (and across delivery sites, where applicable)

Ensuring that information about courses for prospective and current students is fit for purpose, accessible and accurate (and is comparable across delivery sites, where applicable)

Monitoring and responding to national and international standards in the subject(s) it offers and in the delivery of higher education

Utilising external inputs to enhance its provision

2.3 **Course review** aims to establish whether broad criteria related to aspects under review have been met.

2.4 The following criteria and indicative factors are used by the review panel to determine outcomes. These are broadly aligned to initial criteria for approval of a course and to the University's own course review criteria.

Criteria	Factors
1. Strategic and business fit	<p>The course remains valid in terms of the Centre's mission and strategy</p> <p>Applications or conversions are as target</p> <p>Entry criteria remain appropriate and admissions processes are operating effectively</p>

2. Standards	The course continues to meet UK threshold standards as defined at approval
3. Currency and course health	Course aims and learning outcomes continue to be appropriate considering: a. developments in research, professional and industry practice and pedagogy b. changes in the external environment such as requirements of PSRBs c. subject benchmark(s)
4. Curriculum design	The design and organisation of the curriculum remains fit for purpose and meets the Centre's requirements The curriculum continues to meet the requirements for a UK award
5. Student outcomes	Student progression and achievement is good, benchmarked well to Centre and discipline expectations. Graduate outcomes have improved over the period and have been maintained at an appropriate level.
6. Learning and teaching	The collective expertise, experience and availability of the teaching team means that students experience a quality of teaching that enables them to meet learning outcomes Teaching staff have engaged in professional development, research and scholarship activity which has had an impact on the course Effective academic support arrangements continue to be in place
7. Assessment	The course assessment strategy enables students to demonstrate learning outcomes Processes for internal moderation of assessment are working effectively Feedback on assessment enables students to develop
8. Equality of opportunity	All students have equal opportunity in terms of learning and teaching,

regardless of protected group status,
mode of study, place of study,
admissions route

9. The wider student experience

Students are appropriately supported in their transition to Higher Education or new levels of study

Students have opportunities beyond the curriculum to enhance their personal and professional development

10. Quality management

Course committees (or equivalent) have taken place and are effective

Annual monitoring and reporting is effective and contributes to course development

Student feedback is sought and acted upon at the course level

Decision-making is informed by views from students and other external stakeholders

11. Accuracy and currency of information

The following information is current and correct:

- a. Course, module and where applicable, placement specifications and handbooks
- b. Information on the web site
- c. Information in promotional and publicity materials

3. Documentation for review

- 3.1 The Centre and Course Reflective Analysis Documents are central to the Periodic Collaborative Review process. These should be the only documents that are produced specifically for the review.
- 3.2 The Reflective Analysis Documents must first be agreed by the Centre's Academic Board or equivalent prior to submission to NTU.
- 3.3 The following sections set out the requirements for the Reflective Analysis Documents:

Centre Reflective Analysis Document

- The Centre Reflective Analysis Document's key role is to demonstrate to the panel how the Centre ensures that the criteria set out in the review framework are being met.

- It is important that the Centre Reflective Analysis Document is a genuinely self-evaluative document that provides a critical analysis of the review aspects.
- The Centre might find it helpful to structure the Reflective Analysis Document around the criteria and indicative factors set out in the section above.
- The document should be evidence-based. Claims made must be supported by evidence provided in the electronic repository. Where reference is made to evidence in the repository, this needs to be clearly identified.
- A final role of the Reflective Analysis Document is to provide information about good practice. When considering the evidence being used to support the claims being made, the Centre should ensure that examples of particularly good, or innovative practice are included.
- In the review year, the Centre Reflective Analysis Document will replace the Validated Centre Standards and Quality Report (if one is produced).

Course Reflective Analysis Document

- The Course Reflective Analysis Document is intended to provide evidence to the University that the course remains current, operates effectively and is appropriately quality managed.
 - The document has a dual purpose; it allows the course team to reflect upon the course and to demonstrate to the panel how the criteria set out in the review framework are being met.
 - It is important that the Course Reflective Analysis Document is a genuinely self-evaluative document that provides a critical analysis of the review criteria.
 - The course team might find it helpful to structure the Reflective Analysis Document around the criteria and indicative factors set out in the section above.
 - The document should be evidence-based. Claims made must be supported by evidence provided in the electronic repository. Where reference is made to evidence in the repository, this needs to be clearly identified.
- 3.4 The Centre is required to submit electronic repositories as part of the review documentation. These repositories will be used to support claims made in the Centre and Course Reflective Analysis Documents and will inform the CADQ commentary that will be provided to the review panel.
- 3.5 A separate repository is required for the Institutional Review and for each Course Review.
- 3.6 The following documents are indicative of what might be included in each of the repositories. These should represent current plans and strategies. Where reports

and committee papers are required, these should include the last full three years of documentation. Please note, not all of these will be applicable - where this is the case documents are not required to be submitted.

Centre Repository

Folder	Subfolders/documents
A. Centre's Reflective Analysis Document	A1. Centre's Reflective Analysis Document
B. Reports	B1. Validated Centre Standards and Quality Reports B2. Updated Centre Document including any updated strategies
C. Governance committees	C1. Academic Board minutes (or equivalent) Any other applicable meetings
D. Staff Development	D1. Staff development events D2. Staff research D3. Key outcomes from teaching / peer observation D4. Staff induction Any other staff development activity
E. Student surveys	E1. Student surveys and associated action planning
F. Data	F1. Admissions data F2. Progression data (from level to level) F3. Achievement data F4. Academic irregularities and appeals data F5. Widening participation data

Course Repository

Folder	Subfolders/documents
A. Course Reflective Analysis Document	A1. Course Reflective Analysis Document
B. Course Documentation	B1: Course Specification B2: Module Specifications B3. Course operational document and Rationale Document B4. Course Handbook B5. Module Handbooks

	<p>B6. Evidence of changes made to the course over the approval period, where applicable</p> <p>B7. Placement handbooks (where applicable)</p>
C. Reports	<p>C1. Course Standards and Quality Reports</p> <p>C2. External Examiner Reports</p> <p>C3. Academic liaison tutor Reports</p> <p>C4. Other stakeholder feedback</p>
D. Committees	<p>D1. Course Committee (or equivalent)</p> <p>D2: Staff-Student Liaison Committee (if applicable)</p> <p>D3: Board of Examiners meetings</p> <p>Any other meetings</p>
E. External critical perspectives	<p>E1. Evidence of consultation with industry and other relevant external bodies, with actions taken in response.</p> <p>E2. Evidence of ensuring continuing alignment with relevant external benchmarks</p> <p>E3. Outcomes of national review or PSRB accreditation where applicable and action taken in response</p>
F. Assessment	<p>F1. Assessment briefs (if not already included in module handbooks)</p> <p>F2. Assessment feedback templates</p> <p>F3. Marking criteria</p> <p>F4. Evidence of moderation</p>
G. Data	<p>G1. Admissions data</p> <p>G2. Progression data (from level to level)</p> <p>G3. Achievement data</p> <p>G4. Academic irregularities and appeals data</p> <p>G5. Widening participation data</p>

4. Institutional review process

- 4.1 **Tour of facilities:** The Centre should arrange a tour of the teaching and learning resources that are utilised by the students on the course(s). This would normally take place before the meetings with staff from the Centre. The purpose of this is to establish whether these continue to be appropriate for the operation of the NTU awarded provision.
- 4.2 **Meeting with the Senior Management of the Centre:** This session has a strategic focus and is intended to establish whether the Centre's structures, quality management and enhancement processes are operating effectively, to ensure that the University's criteria for centre approval are being satisfied.

5. Course review process

- 5.1 **Meeting with students:** who have studied or are studying on the course(s) under review. The purpose of this meeting is to allow students to express their views of the course(s). The meeting is a private meeting with DAG members, and the confidentiality of student feedback is maintained.
- 5.2 **Meeting with the course team(s):** The Centre should arrange for the panel to meet with representatives from the course team(s). This session will consider course health and currency, and the operation of the course.

6. Review panel constituency

- 6.1 Review panel membership is as follows:
- review Chair;
 - an experienced NTU academic;
 - the current or previous academic liaison tutor;
 - one or two external panel members;
 - a CADQ senior standards and quality officer.
- 6.2 On occasions where the Periodic Collaborative Review is considering an extensive range of courses, the review panel may be expanded accordingly.

7. Outcomes

- 7.1 The review panel will make a decision about outcomes based on the extent to which the aspects of review and therefore the University's criteria for approval of a Validated Centre and its courses, have been met.
- 7.2 The review panel makes the following decisions about institutional review:
- whether the Centre satisfies the review criteria and therefore continues to satisfy the approval criteria;
 - the period for which further approval is given (between one and five years, based on risk indicated by the business evaluation, and the findings of the review event);
 - required actions;
 - timescale for production of an action plan to address required actions;
 - recommendations;
 - commendations;
 - affirmations.
- 7.3 The review panel makes the following decisions about the outcomes of the review of the operation of the collaboration:
- whether the review criteria are satisfied and therefore whether the approval criteria continue to be satisfied;

- b. the period for which re-approval is given (this must be consistent with the period of institutional approval as a maximum);
- c. required actions;
- d. timescale for production of an action plan to address any required actions;
- e. recommendations;
- f. commendations;
- g. affirmations.

Policy owner
CADQ

Change history			
<i>Version:</i>	<i>Approval date:</i>	<i>Implementation date:</i>	<i>Nature of significant revisions:</i>
Sept 2016	30.09.16	01.10.16	Change from VS9 to VS10 Wording of review criteria changed to align more closely with initial approval criteria
Sept 2017	12.09.17	01.10.17	Changes to outcomes of periodic collaborative review
Sept 2018	12.09.18	01.10.18	None

Equality Impact Assessment		
<i>Version:</i>	<i>EIA date:</i>	<i>Completed by:</i>
Sept 2016	04.09.2016	CADQ