

# Requirements for Periodic Course Review and Course Development Plan template

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 Periodic Course Review (PCR) is the mechanism by which course teams periodically reflect on the validity, currency, and the academic quality of the provision. This is a face-to-face discussion with external stakeholders and students centring on key data sets provided in advance of the meeting to enable appropriate consideration of the current and future quality and standards of the course.

## 2. Specific aspects of operation

- 2.1 Periodic Course Review is a face-to-face meeting with key internal and external stakeholders.
- 2.2 Accuracy of public information and compliance with University quality requirements is also checked at this point.
- 2.3 If, as a result of the review, changes to the course are required, then the normal development and approval processes apply (see Quality Handbook Supplement 5B).

## 3. Timeframe

- 3.1 Schools agree a timeframe which ensures that all courses are reviewed once every three years.
- 3.2 Review meetings can take place at any time, but Schools should be mindful of the availability of data at various points in the academic year. If the review meeting takes place mid-year, compliance checking may be more appropriately carried out at the end of the year in time for the next academic cycle.
- 3.3 Where a course is required to undertake a periodic review by a Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB), and / or is subject to a Periodic Collaborative Review, the timeframe for the University periodic review should take this into account to avoid duplication of effort.
- 3.4 The timeframe should take account of specific School structures; it may be sensible for instance, to review more than one course at one meeting if there is significant overlap of the curriculum. Care should be taken, however, to ensure that the identity of individual courses is preserved.

## 4. Attendees

- 4.1 Colleagues in the following roles are required at the meeting (additional roles may be included subject to specific School requirements):
- a. Head of Department (chair of meeting)
  - b. Course Leader
  - c. Course Coordinator (for collaborative arrangements, and if different from Course Leader)
  - d. Course Administrator
  - e. Representative members of the course team
  - f. Student representatives
  - g. School Standards and Quality Manager
  - h. Learning and Teaching Manager
  - i. Deputy Dean and / or experienced School Academic Standards and Quality Committee (SASQC) member
  - j. Employability Manager
  - k. External member (someone who can provide an external critical perspective, for example placement provider; employer; partner; collaborative course leader)

## 5. Agenda

- 5.1 There is no set agenda for the meeting. The following areas of focus should be included:
- a. Standards
  - b. Strategic and business fit
  - c. Currency and course health
  - d. Student outcomes (progression, achievement, employability)
  - e. Learning and teaching, including the effective use of learning spaces
  - f. Assessment
  - g. Equality of opportunity
  - h. The wider student experience
  - j. Quality management
  - k. Collaborative arrangements (where applicable)

## 6. Evidence

- 6.1 A range of evidence needs to be made available in advance of the meeting. Schools or course teams may want to extend this list to meet specific requirements. As a minimum, the evidence should include:
- a. Course specification
  - b. Table showing course structure
  - c. Latest interim course report
  - d. Current Course Development Plan
  - e. Latest external examiner report(s) and course team response
  - f. Latest PSRB report (where applicable)
  - g. Current prospectus entry
  - h. Data for last three years, including:
    - Progression, failure and achievement
    - Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education (DLHE)
    - Notification of Extenuating Circumstances (NEC), Academic Appeals, Academic irregularities
    - National Student Survey (NSS)/Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES), course surveys
    - Course-aggregated EvaSys analysis
    - Appropriate data benchmarks
    - Course Quality Metrics accessed via Cognos (where available)
  - i. Key outcomes from teaching or peer observation
  - j. Staff : student ratio
  - k. Student learning hours on average per week
  - l. Class sizes for key teaching and learning activities
  - m. Who is doing the teaching (e.g. Higher Education Academy (HEA) accredited staff; postgraduate students, early career staff)
  - n. Staff development record for the last three years
  - o. Assessment strategy
  - p. Assessment and feedback plan
  - q. Current subject benchmark statement(s)
  - r. Summary of changes made over the last three years

## 7. Outcome

- 7.1 The key outcome of the review is a three-year Course Development Plan. This should be articulated as a set of objectives with clear time frames and responsibilities (see below). The Plan is formally reviewed on an interim basis at

the end of each academic cycle as part of the Interim Course Reporting process.  
Any further actions required should be added at this point.

## **8. Review of process**

- 8.1 Periodic School Review (PSR) will assess the effectiveness of the School's management of Periodic Course Reviews as part of the PSR framework.

### Course Development Plan

<b>Course:</b>	BA Kite Flying	<b>Date of Periodic Course Review</b>	1 July 2016	
<b>Area of activity:</b>	Assessment			
<b>Context (include when and where objective identified e.g. ICR 17-18):</b> Data reviewed at PCR 2016 suggested that the poster assessments for the final year modules 'Wind and Rain' and 'Advanced Kite Making' are not as discriminatory as other final year modules.				
<b>Overall objective</b>	<b>Specific actions</b>	<b>Who is leading</b>	<b>How achievement will be judged</b>	<b>Intended completion date</b>
To increase the discriminatory power of the assessments for 'W&R' and 'AKM'	W&R: Design essay-based task	Module Leader: A. Sky	Review of student outcomes after summer board 2017	September 2018 (to include in A&F plan for 2016/17)
	AKM: Design practical assessment task	Module Leader: V. High	Review of student outcomes after summer board 2017	September 2018 (to include in A&F plan for 2016/17)
<b>Progress:</b>	A greater spread of grades for both modules was recorded after the final board. Students also talked positively about the assessments at the course committee in May.			
<b>Date progress recorded:</b>	31 July 2017			
<b>Area of activity:</b>				
<b>Context (include when and where objective identified e.g. ICR 17-18):</b>				
<b>Overall objective</b>	<b>Specific actions</b>	<b>Who is leading</b>	<b>How achievement will be judged</b>	<b>Intended completion date</b>
<b>Progress:</b>				

Nottingham Trent University Quality Handbook Supplement  
Requirements for Periodic Course Review

<b>Policy owner</b>
CADQ

<b>Change history</b>			
<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	N/A
Sept 2017	12.09.17	01.10.17	Requirement to reflect on data from student surveys made more explicit Requirement to ensure alignment with Periodic Collaborative Review
March 2018	17.04.18	17.04.18	Addition of Course Development Plan template

<b>Equality Impact Assessment</b>		
<i>Version:</i>	<i>EIA date:</i>	<i>Completed by:</i>
Sept 2016	20.07.16	CADQ