1. **Introduction**

Internal periodic review is the system that the University operates to review the quality and standards of the clinical and non-clinical undergraduate provision and postgraduate modular programmes and awards offered by departments and schools, including MRes programmes, online programmes delivered in partnership with Laureate Online Education, programmes delivered at the London campus and at the University of Liverpool in Singapore, and all accredited CPD and Continuing Education provision, by considering the following aspects of provision:

a) the curriculum,
b) the learning environment,
c) support for students,
d) staffing, and
e) quality management and enhancement.

2. **Principles of Periodic Review**

The principles for the periodic review process are as follows:

a) **The process is inclusive of students and is student-focused.** All students, including those on the online programmes and those studying in London or Singapore, are expected to have the opportunity to play a key role in the preparation for a periodic review of their subject area. They should be engaged in the development of the Self Evaluation Document (SED) and have the opportunity to comment on it; and students should be invited to participate in the periodic review meetings. Students should also be involved in drawing up the action plan in response to the outcome of their periodic review. The timing of the stages of the review should therefore respect the constraints, such as exams and vacation periods, on student availability for contributing to the documentation and for attending the review meetings. The five review strands listed above should be explored in light of the impact they have on the student experience and the extent to which they meet students’ needs and expectations.

b) **Periodic review is a constructive process to promote enhancement and identify and disseminate good and/or effective practice.** The periodic review process should facilitate constructive discussion and reflection that will raise awareness of successes and identify areas
for enhancement and development: the process thus enables the sharing of good practice and experience across the University.

c) **External input is integral to the periodic review process.** An essential aspect of the periodic review process is the role of externals, namely the subject expert from another UK higher education institution who is a member of the review Panel, and the consideration and review of reports from external examiners and any professional bodies, where these are relevant.

d) **Periodic review makes effective use of management data to gain an institutional understanding of performance.** The periodic review process enables the University to gain a sound knowledge and awareness of how it is performing in each subject area, and equally important, the process ensures that appropriate action plans and responses are developed to address issues highlighted and that these are communicated to staff and students.

3. **The Periodic Review Process**

Each department, level 1 school, or subject/discipline will undergo periodic review every six years. Where possible, periodic reviews will be scheduled taking into account accreditation events by professional or regulatory bodies.

3.1 **The Level for Conducting Periodic Reviews**

Generally, periodic reviews will be conducted at departmental level (level 1); this is to ensure that all programmes in a cognate discipline or subject area are covered in the same review, and Appendix 1 shows the level at which periodic review would be undertaken according to the current structure within each Faculty. However, it is recognised that in some areas it may be more appropriate to conduct periodic reviews against a different structure to that represented by the departments and schools. Where this is required, negotiations should be held between AQSD and the representatives from the relevant areas to agree the best way to organise the structure for periodic review, ensuring that all provision will be covered by a review. The PVC for Education will be responsible for giving final approval on the proposed structure for review resulting from the negotiations.

3.2 **The Periodic Review Panel**

The periodic review of an area will be undertaken by a Panel which should be constituted as follows:

a) **A Chair**
   The Chair will be the PVC for Education or one of the APVCs and will be identified in the early stages of Advance Planning.

b) **A member of academic staff from another school within the same faculty**
   For the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Science and Engineering, this means a member of academic staff from one of the other level 2 schools in the faculty, but not from the same school within which the area under review is located.

   For the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, this means selecting a member of academic staff from another level 1 school or department in the faculty, but not from the same Institute within which the area under review is located.

c) **A Representative from the Faculty Academic Quality and Standards Committee or the Faculty Education Committee**
   This should not be someone who is from the area under review. If it proves impossible to select a representative from outside the area of review, then a suitable alternative should be proposed for approval by the PVC (Education).
d) A member of academic staff from a different faculty in the University

e) A Sabbatical Officer of the Liverpool Guild of Students

f) A member of academic staff with relevant subject expertise from another UK higher education institute

Where the area under review covers more than one subject or discipline, it may be necessary to have more than one external subject expert on the Panel; this will be subject to the approval of the Chair of the Panel.

g) A representative from Professional Services

Plus, in order to support the process:

h) A professional services manager/officer from the Faculty will be appointed as Secretary to the Panel, to provide administrative support for the review process and to prepare the agenda and papers for meetings.

i) A representative from AQSD will be appointed as the Minute Secretary to take minutes for the meetings and to draft a report of the review, to be agreed by the Chair and the review panel; in addition they will provide advice, guidance and support during the planning, preparation and conduct of the review.

Examples of how the review Panels would be constituted are shown in Appendix 2 to this paper.

It is the responsibility of the Faculty Director of Operations to establish and confirm the membership of each review Panel.

3.3 Summary of the Process

The purpose of periodic review is to monitor the quality and standards of all the undergraduate and modular postgraduate programmes and awards offered by each level 1 department or school and to confirm validation of all such provision. This includes online programmes and programmes delivered in London or at the Trumann Bodden Law School or at the University of Liverpool in Singapore. The process enables the University to check the academic health of its provision, to identify areas for development and to identify and disseminate good and/or effective practice in learning and teaching.

Modifications to programmes since initial validation, the introduction of new programmes or withdrawal of programmes since the last periodic review, should be outlined by the review area to enable the review Panel to re-confirm the academic standards of the programmes, to affirm that the current programmes remain up to date with developments in the sector and remain fit for purpose and to validate the programmes.

For each programme covered by the review, the outcome of the review should confirm one of the following:

a) that the programme is validated; or

b) that the programme is validated and there are some recommendations for review and/or modification (these will be for the programme team to consider, but it will not be mandatory that the recommendations are adopted); or

c) that the programme is validated subject to conditions that must be met; or
d) that the programme is not validated and should be withdrawn. This would only be agreed by the Panel where there was clear evidence that the programme was not fit for purpose and should not continue to recruit; this decision would include a requirement to establish robust provision for teaching out existing students.

The process for validating the programmes will be based on how recently each programme was subject to review, either as a newly approved programme, a modified programme, or through a PSRB accreditation process. These programmes will be reviewed with a lighter touch than those that have not gone through a recent approval process. (See Appendix 15 for further guidance.)

To prepare for the review the level 1 area will analyse data including NSS and PTES results, student evaluations of their modules and programmes, external examiners’ reports, professional or regulatory body reports if relevant, data on admissions, retention, student progression and achievement, complaints, appeals and disciplinary actions, graduate employment, widening participation, and equality and diversity (see also section 5.2 below).

The review area then prepares a Self-Evaluation Document, which students from the review area are invited to contribute to and provide a brief commentary on the final draft. The SED and the Student Commentary are used by the Panel to structure the discussions it will have with the review area staff and with students on the programmes. Other documentation will be available to the Panel such as programme specifications, annual programme or subject monitoring reports, student handbooks, minutes of Staff-Student Liaison Committees (SSLC) and student engagement focus groups, etc. Having reviewed the documentation the review Panel will meet with various staff and with students over two or three consecutive days and will subsequently produce a report on its findings which will then be presented to the Head of the review area so that an action plan can be drawn up. The report and action plan will be considered at the relevant SSLC(s) and then progress to Faculty and University Committees.

Review areas may decide to offer incentives to students who participate in or contribute to the periodic review process; this should be decided and paid for at the local level. Guidance on possible incentive methods are contained in Appendix 16.

4. Roles and Responsibilities

The **review area School Manager:**
- coordinates the activity of the professional support staff in preparing for and supporting the review process

The **review area professional support staff:**
- collates the data sets required to inform the production of the SED
- collates the additional background reports, sets of minutes and programme documentation for the Panel, e.g. in SharePoint
- recruits, with the aid of the Faculty Student Voice Coordinator, the student representatives who will contribute to the writing of the SED and those who will write the commentary on the SED, and makes the SED available to the students
- identifies a representative sample of students from all programmes and groups of students, contacts those students selected to meet the Panel and ensures the students are invited to the appropriate meetings
- confirms with the Panel Secretary the list of student attendees
- arranges briefing sessions for review area staff or students by AQSD
- forwards the appropriate number of copies of the SED and the students’ commentary, together with other relevant documentation to the Chair and Secretary of the Panel
- makes the arrangements for hospitality for the review Panel throughout the review event
• attends meetings during and after the event as requested by the Head of the review area

The **review area academic staff:**
• reviews and analyses the data sets
• assists the Head of the review area in the production of the SED prior to the event
• assists the Head of the review area in the production of the action plan after the event
• attends meetings during and after the event as directed by the Head of the review area

The **Head of the review area** is responsible for:
• ensuring that the data to underpin the self-evaluation document and the review process has been provided by the professional support staff
• ensuring that an effective plan is developed and implemented to explain the review process to as many students as possible, inclusive of the diversity of protected characteristics, and to engage actively with the students during the process, for example through existing student forums, focus groups and special events. The Faculty Student Voice Coordinator should be consulted on the plan.
• agreeing with the review area the good practice theme to explore
• the production of the self-evaluation document in consultation with academic colleagues and students
• proposing the potential candidate(s) for the external reviewer(s) and verifying their availability for the proposed review dates
• selecting the staff to attend the meetings with the Panel
• the production of the action plan in consultation with academic colleagues and students
• ensuring that the action plan on the review report is ready for submission by the Chair of the Panel to the relevant Faculty Academic Quality and Standards Committee within the period allowed
• reporting progress on the Action Plan to the Faculty Academic Quality and Standards Committee six months after the review date

The **Faculty Director of Operations** is responsible for:
• ensuring that all those involved in the review in the Faculty are meeting their obligations and responsibilities
• resolving issues that may arise in the Faculty’s preparation for and follow-up of periodic reviews
• liaising with the review area to identify a potential date for the periodic review, in accordance with the agreed schedule and in recognition of the constraints on students’ availability imposed by term dates and the dates of examination periods
• liaising with the review area to agree the number of external Panel members required, not normally more than one, and to agree potential candidates
• appointing the Panel Chair and Secretary
• ensuring that the external reviewer has been invited to take part in the review by the Chair of the Panel
• liaising with the Chair of the Review Panel to identify potential Panel members and subsequently confirming the Panel membership and the dates of the review with AQSD

The **Chair of the Periodic Review Panel** is responsible for:
• liaising with the Head of the review area to identify the Panel members and to agree the review area’s proposed themes to explore good practice
• once agreed with the Director of Operations, inviting the external reviewer(s) to take part in the event
• organising the event in accordance with these guidelines and for managing the work of the review team by assigning aspects of the review area’s provision to Panel members
- chairing the preliminary meeting with the Head of the review area, approximately one week before the review
- co-ordinating the Panel members’ contributions to the Periodic Review Report and approving the final draft on behalf of the Panel
- chairing the opening and closing meetings of the review and ensuring that all meetings in the review are conducted in a professional, constructive and supportive manner
- chairing the private Panel meetings held during the review event
- chairing the post-review meeting to discuss the review report and action plan
- submitting the review report and action plan to the relevant Faculty Academic Standards Committee within the period allowed

The Secretary to the Review Panel is responsible for:
- checking the documentation and the schedule for the review with AQSD prior to dispatch to the Panel members
- arranging any pre- and post- review meetings between the Chair of the Panel, the Head of the review area, the PVC (Education) and AQSD as required
- arranging any briefing sessions for Panel members by AQSD
- liaising with AQSD as necessary
- supporting the Chair in his/her role and ensuring that all preparations are timely. The Panel Secretary is not required to attend the meetings during the review event other than the private meetings of the Panel if requested by the Chair.

The Panel members are responsible for:
- scrutinising all the documentation received, in particular the documentation relating to the aspects of provision allocated to them for the review
- sending any requests for additional information to the Secretary to the Panel to forward to the Chair
- sending preliminary comments on the review documentation to the Minute Secretary five working days before the event
- contributing to the agenda settings for the meetings and to the discussions during the review
- chairing or co-chairing one of the meetings, taking the lead in asking questions and providing any summary notes to the Minute Secretary for incorporation into the final Review Report. It is normal practice for the Guild Representative to chair the meeting with the students.
- commenting specifically on the level of student engagement in the review process based on the evidence provided in the supporting documentation and on the students’ attendance and contribution to the meeting during the review event
- the external reviewer is responsible for confirming the standards of the provision under review and its relationship to the relevant Subject Benchmark Statement(s) and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications
- the Guild Representative is also invited to liaise with the relevant Staff Student Liaison Committee and/or student representatives from the review area in advance of the periodic review meetings to determine if there are any additional issues or areas of good practice that should be explored during the periodic review

The students from the review area have the opportunity to participate in the review by:
- helping to identify the issues that should be addressed in the SED
- contributing to the production of the SED
- commenting on the final version of the SED
- attending the meeting with the review Panel
- contributing to the action plan and commenting on the final version of the action plan through their SSLC
The Faculty Student Voice Coordinator:

- supports the review area professional support staff in the active recruitment of students for the different stages of the periodic review process
- liaises with the Head of the review area to support the development and implementation of the plan for communicating and engaging with students in relation to the periodic review process. Note: the Head of the review area has primary responsibility for the plan and its implementation.
- coordinates the AQSD briefing sessions for student participants
- liaises between the students and the review area as appropriate
- supports the student participants in the production of the Student Commentary on the SED

AQSD supports the review by:

- offering briefing sessions with the following groups to explain the periodic review process and to answer any questions
  - the Chair and Secretary
  - the Panel members
  - staff from the academic area under review
  - the students from the review area
- liaising with the Chair, the Panel Secretary and the review area to ensure that appropriate preparations are being made for the review and to advise as necessary
- approximately five working days before the event, requesting initial comments on the SED from the Panel Members and collating these for the Chair
- maintaining notes of each of the review meetings such that summaries can be provided, if requested by the Chair, at the start or end of sessions
- drafting a report on the review for approval by the Chair and review panel members

5. Periodic Review Documentation

5.1 The Self Evaluation Document (SED)

The SED should be an evaluative and reflective document which explores the review area’s strengths and weaknesses in respect of:

a) the curriculum;

b) the learning environment; and

c) support for students, staffing, and quality management and enhancement.

These should be explored in respect of all the review area’s programmes, including on-line provision, provision at the London campus, provision at the Truman Bodden Law School and provision at the University of Liverpool in Singapore, for which the review area is responsible. The on-line, London-based and off-campus cohorts should be considered both discretely and in comparison to their Liverpool counterparts.

The theme(s) selected by the review area should be covered in the SED either under these headings or as a separate section(s) of the document. A template for the SED is at Appendix 6.

5.2 Supporting Documentation for Periodic Review

In addition to the SED other supporting documentation that should be available for the review Panel includes:

a) The plan for communicating and engaging with students in the review process
b) Copies of the current programme specifications for all the programmes under review (including on-line programmes delivered in partnership with Laureate Online Education and programmes delivered in London, Singapore or at TBLS, where applicable) with details of all changes made to each programme since its commencement or the last periodic review (whichever is the later), and if there have been no changes to a programme, this should be stated. This information will generally be found in FAQSC minutes, the Faculty report to QAPRG and APM/ASR reports.

c) The appropriate QAA Subject Benchmark Statement(s) (available from the QAA website)

d) The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (available from the QAA website)

e) Student handbooks

f) Departmental guidance documents for staff

g) Diagram of the committee structure in the review area

h) Staff list and profile (giving main teaching/research interests and administrative responsibilities)

i) A full list of staff development activities undertaken by staff over the last three years.

j) The peer review of teaching schedule for the subject area for the last three years with an anonymised overview of generic outcomes

k) NSS and PTES results and the review area’s responses to them

l) Student evaluations of their modules and programmes and the review area’s responses to them

m) External examiners reports and responses to them for each programme for the last three years

n) Professional or regulatory body reports if relevant

o) The data set used to inform the SED:
   - admissions
   - retention
   - student progression and achievement,
   - formal complaints, appeals and disciplinary cases for the last three years (this information can be obtained from the Academic Compliance Team in SAS)
   - graduate employment (data from Careers and Employability Service (DLHE, engagement with CES, reflective commentary on the graduate job market with subject-specific content)
   - widening participation
   - equality and diversity

p) The Annual Programme Monitoring Reports and Annual Subject Review Reports from the last three years

q) Minutes of the Staff/Student Liaison Committee from the current and previous academic sessions
6. **Preparation for Periodic Review: Key Dates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advance planning</td>
<td>Negotiation of the level of review, where this is requested</td>
<td><strong>Head of Level 2 School</strong> for initiating the request, negotiations to be held between representatives from the School and AQSD with Faculty and the Level 1 area as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential dates for the review identified</td>
<td><strong>Faculty Director of Operations</strong> with review area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential external Panel member(s) identified and their availability checked</td>
<td><strong>Faculty Director of Operations</strong> with <strong>Head of review area</strong> (and Chair of Panel if more than one external reviewer needs to be appointed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appoint Chair and Secretary for the review</td>
<td><strong>Faculty Director of Operations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Briefing of Chair and Secretary if required</td>
<td>AQSO with Chair of Panel and Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirm dates of review with AQSD</td>
<td><strong>Faculty Director of Operations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commence collation of data sets to support the SED and the review</td>
<td><strong>School Manager</strong> with relevant professional services departments and <strong>Head of review area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NSS and PTES results / student evaluations;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intake standards, conversion rates on applications, data on clearing etc.;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student numbers;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Progression data including retention rates, final degree results;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Employment data;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Widening participation/diversity and equality data;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• External Examiner reports from the previous three years;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SSLC minutes from the current and previous academic session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual monitoring reports/annual subject reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Programme specifications and information on modifications, new programmes and programme withdrawals since the previous periodic review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Feedback from alumni and/or employers; <strong>but only</strong> where this is applicable and available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft a plan for engaging students in preparation for the review (e.g.</td>
<td><strong>Review area with Faculty Student Voice Coordinator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>drafting or reviewing the SED), participation during the review and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>giving feedback to students during and after the review, setting this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the context of the timing and schedule for the review. This</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>should include ways to involve and include Honours Select students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>studying a 25% or 50% subject component from the review area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Three–six months before</td>
<td>Guidance on this is at Appendix 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the review)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review the history of review and approval for each programme and</td>
<td><strong>Head of review area (or nominee) with AQSD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identify those that require most focus for re-validation purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance on this is at Appendix 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree and implement the student communication and engagement plan.</td>
<td><strong>Head of review area in liaison with the Faculty Student Voice Coordinator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance on this is at Appendix 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make data sets available to the review area team to inform the</td>
<td><strong>School Manager with relevant professional services departments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preparation of the SED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify at least one good practice theme which could be explored in</td>
<td><strong>Head of review area with review area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify potential candidates for the remaining Panel membership.</td>
<td><strong>The Faculty Director of Operations, in liaison with the Chair of the Panel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AQSD should be advised if any of the Panel members being considered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have training requirements for periodic review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Briefing of review area academic staff by AQSD</td>
<td><strong>AQSO with Head of review area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Briefing of students from the review area. If this includes students</td>
<td>**AQSO with Faculty Student Voice Coordinator (with the assistance of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from London, Singapore or the online programmes a Skype or video</td>
<td>review area for students on online programmes)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conferenced briefing may be used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Three months before the</td>
<td>Invitation to the proposed external reviewer(s) to invite him/her to</td>
<td><strong>Chair of the Panel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>review)</td>
<td>take part in the periodic review, if this has not already been done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A suggested letter is set out in Appendix 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Two months before the</td>
<td>Completed SED made available to the students, including students in</td>
<td><strong>Review area with Faculty Student Voice Coordinator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>review)</td>
<td>London, Singapore and on the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Internal Periodic Review of Taught Programmes: Guidelines 2017-18*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>online programmes where relevant, for commentary (template available at appendix 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmation of the full membership of the review Panel with the Chair, the review area and AQSD</td>
<td>Faculty Director of Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-two months before the review</td>
<td>Students invited to attend the student meeting.</td>
<td>Review area and relevant professional support services staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supply list of students to Chair and Secretary to the Panel</td>
<td>Review area and relevant professional support services staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmation to Chair and Secretary that the students attending the meetings are representative of all the programmes and all the students as outlined in 7.2 below</td>
<td>Review area and relevant professional support services staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One month before the review</td>
<td>Forward the appropriate number of copies of the SED and the students' commentary, together with other relevant documentation and statistics (see below) to the Chair of the Panel</td>
<td>Review area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check the documentation with AQSD before despatching it to members of the review Panel at least three weeks before the review</td>
<td>Secretary to the Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assign responsibility for scrutiny of one or two aspects of provision to each Panel member</td>
<td>Chair of the Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liaise with the review area to agree the timetable of meetings for the review, venues and any other requirements. This should include arrangements for online student representatives to participate in the student meeting(s).</td>
<td>Chair of the Panel with review area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circulate the draft timetable, the SED, the student commentary on the SED and other associated documentation to the Panel</td>
<td>Secretary to the Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two weeks before the review</td>
<td>Forward any preliminary comments on the documentation, including specific requests for further information, to the Chair of the Panel.</td>
<td>Panel members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inform the Chair of any issues raised by student representatives from the review area that are</td>
<td>The Panel member from the Liverpool Guild of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relevant to the periodic review that are additional to those made in</td>
<td>Chair of Panel with Head of review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the students’ commentary on the SED</td>
<td>area, Secretary to the Panel and AQSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one week before</td>
<td>Preliminary meeting to finalise the arrangements for the review. An</td>
<td>Minute Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the review</td>
<td>agenda for this meeting is available at Appendix 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five working days before</td>
<td>Initial comments on the SED from the Panel members collated for the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the review</td>
<td>Chair of the review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the preparations the representative from AQSD should liaise closely with the Chair, Secretary to the Panel and the review area to ensure appropriate preparations are being made for the review and to advise as necessary.

A flow chart to show activity to prepare for periodic review is at Appendix 5 to the paper.
7 The Periodic Review Event

7.1 Timetable

The periodic review meetings should take place over four consecutive half days. The timetable below is based on this.

Session 1

- The review Panel meets to agree the agenda
- The review Panel meets with a wide selection of students from the review area
- The review Panel is given a tour of the subject area learning environment by the Head of the review area or their nominee
- The review Panel reconvenes to finalise the agenda for the subsequent meetings with staff in the light of the meeting with the students.

Session 2

- The session starts with a very brief meeting of the review Panel with all the staff of the review area; the purpose is to introduce the Panel to the review area and for the Chair to explain the proceedings
- Meeting of the Panel with the programme team(s): for each programme covered by the review, modifications and curriculum changes since the last review or initial validation should be explored to enable the Panel to confirm that the current programme provision is up to date with developments in the sector and fit for purpose.
- Meeting with the programme team: the learning environment
- Private meeting to summarise findings and to review the agendas for the next sessions

Session 3

- Panel has a brief recap on the issues and agendas for subsequent meetings
- Meeting with programme team: student support
- Meeting with programme team: staff development
- Private meeting to summarise findings and to review the agendas for the next sessions

Session 4

- Meeting with the subject management team: quality enhancement and management
- Private meeting of the Panel
- Meeting of the review Panel with all staff from the review area to provide initial feedback and to outline the next stages of the review process

The Head of the review area and the Chair of the Panel should have agreed in advance the finer details of this timetable.

7.2 The Periodic Review Meetings

The first session of the review should commence with the preliminary meeting of the review Panel. This provides the team with an opportunity to discuss the Self Evaluation Document to identify areas for focus in the review and for the Chair to establish how s/he wishes to conduct the review. A suggested agenda for this meeting is attached at Appendix 7.

This will be followed by a meeting with students from the review area, including students from online programmes and students in London or Singapore as required. Ideally and wherever practicable this
should be the same meeting but if separate meetings are required, they should take place during the event and be attended by the full Panel. Meetings with students in remote locations can be conducted through telephone or video conference.

The meeting(s) with students is (are) private, attended by students and the Panel members only; members of staff from the subject department/school under review should not be present. During the meeting, the review team will seek the views of students on all aspects of the review area’s provision. The level 1 department/school is responsible for inviting students to the meeting, and should ensure that there is representation from all years of all programmes at both undergraduate and postgraduate level. Undergraduate students from single honours, joint and combined honours (if any) programmes and students from joint, major and minor subject components in Honours Select (in the Faculty of HSS) should be represented. Postgraduate taught students, including MRes and students from the online programmes, should be represented. Part-time students, mature students and international students should also be invited to participate if such groups are represented in the review area’s student profile. Departments/schools should encourage as many students as possible to attend this meeting, beyond and in addition to Course Representatives and those who provided the Student Commentary. This meeting should be conducted as a single meeting, (i.e. the students should not be split into small groups), to allow for the views of students to be heard by all Panel members and for comprehensive minutes to be taken by the Secretary. A list of suggested questions to ask students is attached at Appendix 8.

After the meeting with students there should be a tour of the review area learning environment and a further private meeting of the Panel to finalise the agenda for the review, adjusting it as necessary in the light of discussions with the students.

The second session of the review should start with an open but very brief meeting between the staff of the department/level 1 school and the members of the review Panel. This will enable the Chair to outline the purpose and expectations from the review event and staff to meet the review team and ask any questions they might have about the review process. It also enables the Panel to ask any general questions they might have about the review area and its provision. The remaining sessions will be for meetings between the Panel and appropriate academic and professional support staff as selected by the Head of the review area.

Suggested questions and points for discussion in these meetings are attached at Appendix 9. In addition, if a theme has been identified for the review team to explore, this should be incorporated into the review schedule as appropriate.

For all private meetings of the Panel, the meeting with students, the open meeting with staff and the review meetings the AQSD representative will be in attendance. The Panel Secretary will not be in attendance at these meetings, other than private meetings of the Panel if required by the Chair of the Panel.
8. **After the Periodic Review Event: Key Dates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within one week of the review event</td>
<td>Draft report on the review event provided to the Chair for initial comment.</td>
<td>AQSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overview of the review and comments on the periodic review process itself. The external(s) should also comment specifically on the standards of the provision under review and its relationship to the relevant Subject Benchmark Statement(s) and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications. A template for the external reviewer’s comments is attached at Appendix 14.</td>
<td>External Panel member(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within three weeks of the review event</td>
<td>A full report on the review should be produced and circulated to the Chair of the Panel and the Panel members for comment before it is finalised. The report should contain points for commendation as well as areas for development. The report should also include a recommendations section, in response to which the review area can produce an action plan. A template for the periodic review report is attached at Appendix 10 and a template for the action plan is attached at Appendix 11.</td>
<td>AQSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within four weeks of review event</td>
<td>Full Periodic Review Report made available to Head of review area to enable an action plan to be prepared. Review Report and proposed action plan discussed at SSLC or with a group of student representatives from the subject area, to allow students in the subject area to be consulted on the action plan prior to it being finalised. Review the student communication and engagement plan in light of the report and action plan to ensure effective methods are in place to provide feedback to students. See Appendix 16 for guidance.</td>
<td>Chair of Panel and Head of review area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within six weeks of the review event</td>
<td>Final review report and action plan discussed at the post-IPR meeting chaired by the review Panel Chair and serviced by the Panel Secretary. Present at the meeting</td>
<td>Chair and Secretary of Panel with Head of review area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>should be AQSO, Head of review area and other staff from review area and level 2 as appropriate to discuss the recommendations and the action plan. The purpose of the meeting is to enable any matters of relevance to level 2, the Faculty and the University to be elicited and progressed at the earliest opportunity. The meeting should also result in agreed methods and responsibilities for providing feedback on the review and the action plan to relevant areas (both staff and students).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within eight weeks of the review event</td>
<td>The report and action plan should be submitted to the University Academic Quality and Standards Committee (AQSC) via the Faculty AQSC for endorsement of the report and action plan and to provide a response to any institutional issues raised. The cover report from FAQSC to AQSC should indicate how actions for the School or Faculty are being addressed and/or if they have been completed. The University AQSC is responsible for maintaining an overview of periodic review activity and ensuring it has been carried out satisfactorily. Once the report and action plan are approved by the University AQSC, feedback to staff and students should be provided in accordance with agreed communication plans and methods. Guidance on this is at Appendix 16</td>
<td>Head of review area with FAQSC, and AQSC via AQSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months after the post-IPR meeting</td>
<td>The Faculty Management Group should confirm that actions for the School and/or Faculty have been addressed or responded to. A progress report should be submitted from the Head of the review area via the Faculty AQSC to the University AQSC, which will approve the progress report, or approve the report subject to certain conditions or points for clarification, or request that a</td>
<td>Faculty Director of Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head of review area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>second progress report be submitted after a further six months (or such other timeframe as determined by AQSC). After the progress report has been considered by AQSC, feedback on the action plan should be provided to staff and students in accordance with agreed communication plans and methods. A template for the progress report is attached at Appendix 12 and guidance on communication and feedback is at Appendix 16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **Schedule of Periodic Reviews**

A schedule of periodic reviews for 2015/16 to 2020/21 is attached at Appendix 13.

10. **The Costs of Periodic Reviews**

A (taxable) fee of £200 should be paid to the external Panel member and subsistence, accommodation to a good standard and travel expenses should also be reimbursed. These costs should be paid by the Faculty within which the periodic review is undertaken.

11. **Appendices**

A number of appendices have been prepared to support this document:

- Appendix 1 Level of review
- Appendix 2 Constitution of review Panels
- Appendix 3 Suggested letter of invitation to externals to act as reviewers in a periodic review
- Appendix 4 Agenda for Chair of the Panel and Head of Department's/School's Preliminary Meeting
- Appendix 5 Preparation for Periodic Review Flow Chart
- Appendix 6 Guidelines for producing the SED for periodic review/Template for student commentary on SED
- Appendix 7 Agenda for Preparatory Team and Review Agenda-setting Meeting
- Appendix 8 Questions for the student meeting
- Appendix 9 Aide memoire for periodic review
- Appendix 10 Template for the Report on Periodic Review
- Appendix 11 Template Action Plan
- Appendix 12 Template Progress Report
- Appendix 13 Schedule of periodic reviews
- Appendix 14 Template for the external reviewer’s comments
- Appendix 15 Guidelines for programme re-validation
- Appendix 16 Guidelines for engaging students in the process and for communications and feedback to staff and students