



University of Sussex

# **School Periodic Review Handbook**

**Covering the AY2020/21 Academic Year**

This handbook is published by the Academic Development and Quality Enhancement (ADQE) Office.

If you have any queries or comments please contact:

Claire Brennan  
Academic Development and Quality Enhancement Manager (Curriculum)

Tel: 01273 678837

Email: [c.m.brennan@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:c.m.brennan@sussex.ac.uk)

Or

Oliver Craig  
Academic Development and Quality Enhancement Manager (Curriculum)

Tel: 01273 877421

Email: [o.craig@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:o.craig@sussex.ac.uk)

## Contents

1.	Introduction.....	4
1.1.	<i>Purpose of School Periodic Review</i> .....	4
1.2.	<i>Aims of School Periodic Review</i> .....	5
1.3.	<i>Authority for School Periodic Review</i> .....	6
2.	Terms of Reference of the School Periodic Review Panel.....	6
3.	Principles of School Periodic Review.....	7
3.1.	<i>Context</i> .....	7
3.2.	<i>Principles</i> .....	8
4.	Scope and Format of School Periodic Review.....	9
4.1.	<i>Scope of the Review</i> .....	9
4.2.	<i>Format of the Review</i> .....	10
4.3.	<i>Programme of events</i> .....	111
5.	Participants.....	122
5.1.	<i>Composition and Role of the Periodic Review Panel</i> .....	122
5.2.	<i>Composition and Role of the School Team for each event</i> .....	144
6.	Periodic Review Supporting Documentation.....	155
6.1.	<i>Documentation to be provided by School for the Progress and Development Review Event</i> .....	155
6.2.	<i>Documentation to be coordinated by ADQE Office for the Progress and Development Review Event</i> .....	155
6.3.	<i>Documentation to be provided by School for the Periodic Review Event</i> .....	166
6.4.	<i>Documentation to be coordinated by ADQE Office for the Periodic Review Event</i> 176	
7.	School Self-evaluation Document.....	177
7.1.	<i>Scope of Document</i> .....	177
7.2.	<i>Structure of the Document</i> .....	177
8.	Outcomes.....	187
8.1	<i>Outcomes at the conclusion of each event</i> .....	187
8.2	<i>Actions to be taken following the conclusion of Periodic Review</i> .....	188
9	Contacts.....	19

## 1. Introduction

The purpose of this Handbook is to inform University staff in Schools and Professional Services of the procedures for the conduct of School Periodic Review. This Handbook will also provide information on the reasons for undertaking the Review process, the principles that underpin the process, and the outputs that are produced as a result.

### 1.1. *Purpose of School Periodic Review*

1.1.1. The University's Strategic Framework, A Better University for a Better World, articulates the following ambitions in relation to 'Learn to Teach':

- "we will provide [...] cutting-edge and creative innovations in educational pedagogy."
- "...our curriculum [...] will inspire students to be disruptive thinkers"
- "Students will routinely participate as partners in the development of their learning, in the discovery of new knowledge, and in the big decisions that shape the University..."
- "...Our students will be equipped with enviable levels of digital literacy and competencies in a wide variety of leading-edge technologies..."
- "...Our students will have the opportunity to develop their knowledge, skills and competencies through active engagement with the pressing research questions and challenges of our time."

1.1.2. School Periodic Review supports the University's drive to achieve these ambitions by:

- providing an opportunity for the institution to review the quality and standards of a School's educational provision over time, in collaboration with external contributors and members of the wider University community;
- enabling the University to audit the implementation of its policies and strategies for enhancing the student experience;
- facilitating holistic consideration of a School's portfolio, to ensure that the curriculum is aligned to both strategy and policy.

1.1.3. School Periodic Review is a cornerstone of the University's quality assurance mechanism which, together with Annual Course Review, the external examining system, and the University's curriculum development processes, allows the University to have confidence in the quality of its teaching and learning provision. Furthermore, the Review process helps ensure that the University can confidently demonstrate to external stakeholders that the University's academic offer is of an appropriate quality.

## 1.2. *Aims of School Periodic Review*

1.2.1. School Periodic Review is an institutional process, involving external participants of high calibre who possess academic or professional credibility. School Periodic Review assesses the continuing validity and relevance of courses, with particular scrutiny given to:

- the effect on national metrics, of changes to the design and operation of the course, including those which are cumulative and those made over time;
- the continuing availability of staff and physical resources;
- current research and practice in the application of knowledge in the relevant discipline(s), technological advances, and developments in teaching and learning;
- changes to external points of reference, such as subject benchmark statements, relevant Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements;
- changes in student demand, employer expectations and employment opportunities;

1.2.2. Crucially, the Review process also presents an opportunity to identify areas for enhancement. These can pertain to a course, the operation of the School, or to the operation of the institution.

1.2.3. Together with Annual Course Review, School Periodic Review facilitates continuous evaluation and enhancement of the School's academic provision. The aims of the process are:

- to ensure that School provision remains current and valid in light of developing knowledge in the discipline, and practice in its application;
- to evaluate the overall student experience, with particular focus on inclusivity and support for students with a specific disability;
- to evaluate the attainment and continuing effectiveness of the curriculum in relation to the intended learning outcomes and Graduate destinations;
- to ensure that recommendations for appropriate actions are followed up to remedy any identified shortcomings.
- to evaluate the School's performance against institutional KPIs, as outlined in the Learn to Transform strategy.

### 1.3. *Authority for School Periodic Review*

- 1.3.1. The authority for this process derives from University Education Committee (UEC). During the 2011/12 Academic Year, all Schools underwent a process of Portfolio Review. Following the commendation of this process by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), following its Institutional Review of the University in 2013, future School Periodic Reviews will follow a similar format.
- 1.3.2. A review of each School will take place every five years, following a schedule agreed by UEC. Once the cycle of reviews has been concluded, UEC will agree a new schedule. The current schedule is available in Appendix A of this Handbook.
- 1.3.3. Reviews will be administrated by the Academic Development and Quality Enhancement (ADQE) Office, which will:
  - publish timetables agreed in consultation with Heads of Schools and approved by UEC;
  - provide professional support for reviews in the form of review secretaries who will support the event;
  - provide a central information point to support those engaged in the review process

## 2. **Terms of Reference of the School Periodic Review Panel**

- 2.1. The Terms of Reference for the Periodic Review Panel are aligned to four main themes, to ensure that the Review process is conducted in a way that enables external stakeholders to have confidence that key issues are directly addressed. These are indicated below in bold with the relevant terms of reference listed beneath each theme.

### ***Theme 1: The setting and/or maintenance of academic standards***

- To consider the appropriateness of intended course aims and learning outcomes with reference to relevant external reference points (e.g. the QAA *Framework for Higher Education Qualifications* and national subject-level benchmarks).
- To assess actual levels of student progress and attainment in relation to the intended course aims and outcomes, and consider the effectiveness of assessment strategies.
- To ascertain whether the courses remain current and valid in the light of:
  - Developing knowledge in the discipline and developments in teaching, learning and research (including technological advances);
  - Changes in student demand, employer expectations and employer opportunities (as appropriate).
- To examine the effectiveness of school-level quality assurance.

- To recommend actions to remedy any shortcomings.

### ***Theme 2: The quality of students' learning opportunities***

- To assess the quality of the student experience on the course(s) under review (with particular reference to: curriculum, teaching, learning, assessment, staff development, resources to support learning, student guidance and supervision; equality of opportunity and widening participation).
- To recommend whether the courses of study under review should continue, subject to certain conditions or be discontinued from a specified date.
- To evaluate whether there are effective links between student learning and discipline-based research in the School.

### ***Theme 3: The quality of the information provided to students***

- To assess the quality and accuracy of the information provided to students through the following media:
  - Prospectuses
  - Course handbooks
  - Study Direct
  - Other School publications

### ***Theme 4: The enhancement of students' learning opportunities***

- To advise on how the quality of the educational provision and student learning experience might be further enhanced.
- To identify any aspect of the provision that is innovative or represents good practice for wider dissemination.

### ***Outcomes of the Review***

- To report its findings to the University.

## **3. Principles of School Periodic Review**

### **3.1. Context**

- 3.1.1. The School Periodic Review process has been designed to meet the QAA's expectations that HE institutions will undertake a periodic review of their academic provision, as expressed in the Agency's UK Quality Code for Higher Education. The Code includes the following specific expectations:

*"The Provider [shall] review its core practices for standards regularly and uses the outcomes to drive improvement and enhancement."*

*"The Provider engages students individually and collectively in the development, assurance and enhancement of the quality of their educational experience."*

Participants in the Review process will be able to ensure that they assist the University in meeting these expectations by adhering to the set of principles detailed in Section 3.2..

### 3.2. *Principles*

#### ***Principle 1: Articulation with University strategy, policy and process***

School Periodic Review takes place under the aegis of the University's Strategic Framework, Learn to Transform Strategy, Academic Framework, and Examination and Assessment Regulations. Compliance with these is an essential part of securing the standards of the academic provision of Schools.

#### ***Principle 2: Peer review and externality***

School Periodic Review will benefit from the expertise of high calibre academic peers both internal and external to the University through their inclusion on the Review Panel. This academic expertise is supported with guidance from appropriate staff in the University' Professional Services and, where appropriate, from external stakeholders.

The University's use of reference points and expertise from outside those individuals directly involved with the course is considered sound practice in both the development of new courses and the review of the existing curriculum. The former is achieved by the validation process. The latter is achieved when curriculum change and development proposals are the product of reflection that is cognisant of external examiner reports and periodic review activities.

### ***Principle 3: Student Engagement***

The involvement of students in the Review process provides obvious benefits both to the University and to the student body. The experience of students who have taken the courses offered by the School will be in a unique position to comment on their effectiveness and also on opportunities to enhance the provision.

### ***Principle 4: Enhancement***

Whilst a central function of School Periodic Review is to assure the quality of the School's academic provision, it is equally important for there to be a focus on identifying opportunities for enhancing this provision. The Review process explicitly facilitates this by allowing the Panel to scrutinise documentary evidence and question School representatives.

### ***Principle 5: Efficiency and sustainability***

The University must be able to satisfy itself that the academic provision of a School is being delivered as efficiently as possible and is sustainable in the long-term. School Periodic Review provides an opportunity for the institution to receive assurance that all courses offered by the School are appropriately resourced and deliver value for money.

### ***Principle 6: Inclusivity***

During the Review process, the Panel will work to ensure that the educational provision of the School is as inclusive as possible, ensuring accessibility for all students. The School will be asked during the final meeting of the Review to make explicit the practices in place to ensure this happens.

## **4. Scope and Format of School Periodic Review**

### ***4.1. Scope of the Review***

- 4.1.1. School Periodic Review considers the appropriateness of all courses of study within the School, including courses delivered by an external partner for which the school has cognate responsibility. Courses validated by the University for delivery at partner institutions undergo revalidation every 3-5 years (co-ordinated by the Partnership Team in the ADQE Office) and are therefore not within the scope of the School Periodic Review process. University Education Committee has the authority to approve validations and re-validations of this type.
- 4.1.2. The Review considers undergraduate taught and postgraduate taught and research courses together. The appropriateness and success of major/minor and joint combinations will be evaluated, in addition to single honours provision. Schools which provide Minor or Joint components of courses owned by other Schools should include review of the minor or joint provision for which they are responsible.

- 4.1.3. Schools should also include a review of any 60- or 90-credit pathways for which they have ownership.
- 4.1.4. Where there is accreditation by a relevant professional or statutory body, the Review will examine the criteria for, and requirements arising from accreditation. This will include not only assuring the appropriateness of the curriculum in relation to any accreditation requirements, but may also consider those areas where the curriculum is constrained in its development by the existence of those requirements.

#### 4.2. *Format of the Review*

- 4.2.1. The Review process is broken down into two distinct events. The first of these is a **Progress and Development Review** meeting which provides the School with the opportunity to offer reflections on the School's academic activities during the period under review, and to outline their vision for the School's future academic offer. This outline can include plans to amend existing courses, add new courses or pathways, or withdraw existing courses or pathways. The School will be expected to address how the proposals will enhance the student experience.
- 4.2.2. This meeting also serves as an introduction to the Review process, allowing an opportunity for the School to ask the Panel members present for clarification and guidance.

As part of Periodic Review, the School may wish to undertake significant curriculum development across the School, in order to address some of the themes or issues identified, in line with published deadlines for such changes.

The School should discuss and consider these at a meeting of STLC. An ADQE Curriculum Manager will attend the Committee to provide guidance and will also be available prior to the meeting for consultation on curriculum development matters.

The School should determine if any of these matters, for reasons of scale or complexity, warrant the attention of the Review Panel. Should this be the case, the School will provide an appendix to their Self-Evaluation Document, exploring the rationale for these changes and seeking the input of the Review Panel. The appendix will link the proposed changes to the themes identified for particular attention during the Review, and how these changes will address them.

- 4.2.3. There will then be a meeting between the Panel and a selection of the School's student representative body, in order to discuss any of the themes raised during the Progress and Development Review meeting. **The School is not required to attend this meeting.** The Panel will take this opportunity to discover which elements of the School's academic provision the students consider to be the most positive, as well as identifying any areas where there is the potential for improvement. The below are indicative topics explored during the lunchtime meeting:

- What physical resources or space are available to students within the School (at all levels of study?)

- Is there sufficient support from faculty and professional services staff for students on a general basis and also if a student has a particular concern?
- What opportunities are there for students to give feedback and how regular are these? What means does the School have of addressing such feedback?
- How does the School practise research-led teaching across all levels of the curriculum?
- How does the curriculum help to develop your digital, communication and employability skills?
- How does the School engage with Sussex Choice? How are opportunities for study abroad and professional or industrial placements actively advertised?
- What were your expectations of getting feedback on your work and how did this differ to the reality?
- Does the School employ Student Mentors?
- How does the School involve students in the design and development of the curriculum?
- What extra-curricular opportunities does the School offer (e.g. masterclasses, careers events, socials)?
- How does the School ensure that postgraduate research students have an opportunity to develop transferable skills alongside key research skills?

4.2.4. Finally, a one-day **Periodic Review** event is held to facilitate in-depth scrutiny of the School's academic offer, with particular attention paid to four themes identified in collaboration with the School at the **Progress and Development Review** meeting.

4.2.5. The event will begin with an initial presentation from the School. This presentation should not rehearse the information already provided within the Self-Evaluation Document. The presentation should instead allow the School to explain their current Strategy, giving an overview of what they have achieved since the previous review. Following on from this, the School should address its aspirations for the next five years, highlighting any challenges that the School is still seeking to address.

4.2.6. The event will then continue with a series of sessions focusing upon the identified themes. Under each theme, a series of issues will be addressed by the Panel through open questions, with the School expected to provide further information.

4.2.7. Any new course validations will usually take place the day after the Periodic Review Event. Validation of new courses may only take place following agreement by Portfolio Approval Committee.

#### 4.3. *Programme of events*

4.3.1. The programme of events will normally be as follows:

### Event 1: Progress and Development Review

A two hour meeting involving the following participants:

**Panel attendees:** PVC (Chair), two internal academic assessors, Students' Union Undergraduate Education Officer/Students' Union Postgraduate Education Officer, Associate Director (Academic Services), ADQE Curriculum Manager (Secretary)

**School attendees:** Head of School, Director of Teaching and Learning, Director of Student Experience, Heads of Department, School Administrator

The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

1. Introduction from the Chair.
2. Review of the School's written submission, detailing their assessment of the School's performance in response to institutional KPIs (30 minutes).
3. Discussion to enable identification of themes for investigation and discussion at the Periodic Review meeting (90 minutes).

### Event 2: Periodic Review

A one-day meeting involving the full Review Panel and all relevant School participants.

1. Private meeting of Panel
2. Presentation from School regarding its current status and future direction
3. Meeting A
4. Meeting B
5. Private meeting
6. Meeting C
7. Lunch
8. Meeting D: or tour of facilities
9. Meeting E: follow-up on issues raised by students at lunch
10. Private meeting of the Panel
11. Feedback to School

4.3.2. These meetings should occur within approximately a single four-month period. This will ensure that the momentum of the process is not lost through excessive gaps in between events. A further advantage is that Schools will be able to embark on enhancement activities as quickly as possible, thus ensuring that the earliest cohort possible is able to benefit from these improvements.

## 5. Participants

### 5.1. *Composition and Role of the Periodic Review Panel*

5.1.1. The Review Panel will consist of internal and external assessors who are sufficiently independent from the educational provision under review. The student body will be represented by the Students' Union Education Officer and a selection of student

representatives. Professional Services staff will provide additional scrutiny where appropriate.

5.1.2. The School should also suggest external stakeholders from industry or other relevant organisations, who will be able to add value to the Review in terms of evaluating how well the courses offered by the School prepare students for employment, research or further study.

5.1.3. The full Panel will be invited to the final Periodic Review event. For the first event, a subset of the Panel will attend, comprising:

- Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) (Chair)
- Two internal academic assessors
- Students' Union Undergraduate or Postgraduate Education Officers
- Associate Director (Academic Services)
- ADQE Curriculum Manager (Secretary)

This will ensure that the process does not become onerous for external and student participants, allowing them to focus their energies on the final review meeting, which is a substantial undertaking in itself.

5.1.4. Members of the review panel will consider the documentation and provide the Chair of the panel with brief feedback including a list of key points they believe need to be focused on during the review visit. The proposed programme for the visit, including staff attendance, will be included in the documentation sent to the Panel at least 2 weeks prior to the review visit. The Chair may propose changes to the programme, including changes to the length of certain meetings or adding new meetings, and request for additional staff to attend specific meetings in the light of feedback and consultation with the panel once the documentation has been circulated.

5.1.5. The full membership of the Review Panel will be as follows:

(Please refer to following page)

<b>Role</b>	<b>Eligibility</b>	<b>Description of role<sup>1</sup></b>
Panel Chair	Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education and Students)	Will oversee the Periodic Review and ensure that all elements of the process have been adhered to.
Independent Academics (one per discipline)	Appropriately qualified senior academics from peer institutions. <sup>2</sup>	Will provide both high-level professional scrutiny and externality, ensuring that the Panel has objectivity.
University of Sussex Academic(s)	Two senior academics from other Schools, preferably from a cognate area. Ideally, at least one of these should be a Director of Teaching and Learning.	Will provide professional scrutiny and fulfil the peer review function, bringing the perspective of someone familiar with the University.
Independent Stakeholder(s)	Where appropriate, external stakeholders may be included on the panel to represent the needs of employer organisations or targeted recruitment groups.	Will provide commentary on the likely employability of students on the proposed course and will be invited to comment on other areas.
Student Panel Members	Current elected student representative for undergraduate, taught postgraduate, and postgraduate research.	Will provide feedback and comments from a student perspective on all areas under discussion.
Student Sabbatical Officers	The Undergraduate and Postgraduate Education Officer of the Students' Union.	Will comment on all aspects of the Review, particularly those pertaining to student experience and engagement.
Representatives from the Professional Services	One or more senior members of Professional Services, selected from the following, to attend sessions as required:  ADQE Office, Doctoral School/Postgraduate Research Administration, Library, Careers and Employability Centre, Technology Enhanced Learning.	Will provide specialist commentary depending upon the session attended.
Associate Director (Academic Services)	The Associate Director for Academic Services, who provides oversight of all quality assurance and enhancement processes at the University.	Will provide commentary across all sessions.
Secretary	A Curriculum Manager from the ADQE Office	Will be responsible for the operation and organisation of the event.

## 5.2. *Composition and Role of the School Team for each event*

5.2.1. For the first event, the following members of the School will be invited to attend:

<sup>1</sup> All panel members are entitled to comment on any aspect under consideration during the Review. The role descriptors are provided to provide guidance and focus for those joining the Panel.

<sup>2</sup> Proposing Schools will normally be invited to recommend a minimum of four possible academics. Independent academics will not normally be the same person as the external examiner for the course and will not have held a position in connection with the University of Sussex for the previous three academic years.

- Head of School
- Director of Teaching and Learning
- Director of Student Experience
- Heads of Department
- School Administrator

- 5.2.2. For the final event, the School should identify who will attend on behalf of the School for each of the sessions. It is usual for the Director of Teaching and Learning to be present for each session. The Head of School, Heads of Department, School Directors and key members of faculty and professional services will also be likely to attend the sessions as appropriate.
- 5.2.3. The School also has responsibility for organising the attendance of student representatives for the lunchtime meeting of the final event. Aside from this particular session, the number of School representatives should not exceed six.
- 5.2.4. The School should advise the ADQE Office of the names of all members of staff and student representatives who will be attending each meeting at the time of submitting the documentation required for the final event.
- 5.2.5. For all events, the School representatives should come prepared to speak to the topic under discussion, in response to questions from the Review Panel.

## **6. Periodic Review Supporting Documentation**

School Periodic Review can only be carried out effectively if sufficient relevant documentation is available to the Review Panel for scrutiny. The ADQE Office will coordinate the provision of institutional-level and external documentation. The School will be asked to provide certain documents, in electronic format, to the ADQE Office no later than four weeks prior to each event.

- 6.1. *Documentation to be provided by School for the Progress and Development Review Event*
- A written reflection (no longer than four pages) on the School's performance in relation to institutional KPIs, including the NSS, Employability, Innovation, the Attainment Gap and anything else the School wishes to address. The submission should also contain a section dedicated to celebrating School's successes during the time covered by the Periodic Review.
- 6.2. *Documentation to be coordinated by ADQE Office for the Progress and Development Review Event*
- National Student Survey<sup>\*3</sup>
  - Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES)
  - Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES)
  - End of semester survey

---

<sup>3</sup> \*Criteria assessed as part of TEF, both the current institutional-level exercise and the forthcoming subject-level version.

- Student admissions
- Non-continuation data\*
- Teaching intensity\*
- UG and PGT Degree outcomes
- PGR Submission, Viva and Completion data
- Graduate Outcomes

The data set will be made available to all participants at least four weeks before the meeting. Participants will be asked to review the data and come to the meeting with suggestions for themes to be focused upon and reviewed in the later part of the process.

The meeting itself will still consist of a presentation from the School but this will now be informed by the expanded data set. This will be followed by a discussion of the presentation and data set, with a focus on identifying mutually agreed key themes for review.

### 6.3. *Documentation to be provided by School for the Periodic Review Event*

- Self-evaluation Document (SED)
- A full list of staff members and their School roles;
- The most recent approved School five-year Strategic Plan;
- Web links to all promotional materials including information on careers and employability;
- Annual Course Review reports for the previous three academic years;
- Reports of external examiners for taught courses for the previous three academic years together with the School's responses to these;
- The most recent reports (where appropriate to the courses of study) from a Professional, Statutory or Regulatory body (PSRB), together with the School's response;
- Relevant student feedback collected by the School, other than through the National Student Survey (NSS) and Module Evaluation Questionnaires (MEQs)
- Minutes of the following School committees for the previous three academic years:
  - School Education Committee
  - School Student Experience Group
  - School Research Degree Committee
- Course specifications
- Module specifications
- Mapping of course and module learning outcomes for each course
- Assessment schedule for each course
- Teaching methods schedule for each course

#### 6.4. *Documentation to be coordinated by ADQE Office for the Periodic Review Event*

- Prospectus entries for both taught and research courses
- A list of relevant QAA subject benchmark statements
- Statistical data for UG & PGT provision for the previous five academic years<sup>4</sup>;
  - Student numbers, entry qualifications, progression and completion rates;
  - Degree classification and first employment destinations;
  - NSS and MEQ data for the previous three academic years.
  - Staff-student ratios
- Statistical data for PGR provision for the previous three academic years:
  - Submission and completion rates;
  - Viva outcomes

### **7. School Self-evaluation Document**

#### 7.1. *Scope of Document*

- 7.1.1. For the final event of the Review process, the School will need to produce a critically reflective self-evaluation of its educational offer. This document should be written as a high-level overview not normally exceeding 10 pages of A4 (excluding appendices).
- 7.1.2. The Self-evaluation Document (SED) should focus on explaining to the Review Panel how the School ensures that its educational offer is of high quality together with an explanation of how it seeks to further enhance the quality of its provision. The SED should refer to past performance but be clearly focused on appraising the changes made to the School's education provision in the period since the previous Review. The SED should not reproduce the evidence but cross-reference existing documents (see section 6 for details). It is good practice to have the SED approved by the School Education Committee (SEC), subject to availability, which may be best dealt with by correspondence. The document will include specific sections highlighting both best practice and areas for development.

#### 7.2. *Structure of the Document*

- 7.2.1. The SED should contain four sections, dealing with the main themes to be addressed at the final Periodic Review event. Each section should critically reflect on the specific themes identified at the first meeting.
- 7.3. The document may include an appendix concerning major curriculum development.

---

<sup>4</sup> In light of the emerging new quality assurance landscape in Higher Education, in particular the Teaching Excellence Framework, the scope of the data produced to support the Periodic Review may change. The ADQE Office will notify the School of any changes of this nature.

## 8. Outcomes

### 8.1 *Outcomes at the conclusion of each event*

- 8.1.1. Following the **Progress and Development Review** event, a brief report of the meeting will be produced. There are no formal outcomes.
- 8.1.2. Following the **Periodic Review** event, a report recording any commendations, conditions or recommendations will be produced.

The report will address the following issues:

- Where the Panel has perceived that there are opportunities for the School to enhance its educational provision;
- Whether the Panel has identified areas of innovation and good practice that are to be commended, in order that this can be shared across the University and/or subject discipline.
- Whether there are any recommendations in relation to institutional policies and practice that should be brought to the attention of the University. The Chair of the panel will be asked to determine the initial action holder of any such recommendations. Action holders identified will be contacted by ADQE and asked to complete an action plan, working to the same time scales as the School (i.e. 2 months from the circulation of the report). The completed action plan will be presented to the University Education Committee for consideration.

### 8.2 *Actions to be taken following the conclusion of Periodic Review*

- 8.2.1 If it considers it necessary to do so, the Panel may also ask for further documentation or for further Review meetings to be arranged.
- 8.2.2 The Secretary to the Panel will prepare a draft report and send this to the Chair for approval within one week of completion of the final meeting. Once approved, the report will then be sent to all members of the Panel and to the Head of School to be checked for factual accuracy. Following confirmation of approval or notification of any proposed revisions, the report will be sent to the Chair for final approval. Once approved, the final version of the report will be distributed to the following parties no later than four weeks following completion of the final meeting:
  - The Head of School, Heads of Department, Directors (Teaching and Learning, Student Experience, Doctoral Studies).
  - Members of the Review Panel
  - The Secretary of UEC
  - The Secretary of Doctoral Studies Committee (DSC)
- 8.2.3 The Head of School will arrange for the Panel's final report to be considered by their School Executive and also by all appropriate School committees, within three months of receipt.
- 8.2.4 In cases where courses of study are approved to continue subject to conditions, the School will be required to submit a one-year follow-up report to UEC commenting on the implementation and progress of actions taken to satisfy any conditions set to allow for the continuation of courses.

- 8.2.5 The School's action plan, addressing any recommendations and conditions set by the Panel, should be produced within two months of receipt of the final version of the report.
- 8.2.6 UEC and/or the DSC will determine whether the actions taken by the School have proven satisfactory or unsatisfactory. If the report is unsatisfactory, the UEC or DSC may, in cases involving failure to meet set conditions, recommend that the courses concerned be discontinued.
- 8.2.7 An updated action plan will be submitted by the School (through SEC) to UEC one year after the original plan.
- 8.2.8 A University-level action plan will be updated after each review. Updates to the existing action plan will be provided along the same timescale as above for Schools.

## 9 Contacts

The Academic Development and Quality Enhancement Office (ADQE) Office has responsibility for maintaining this handbook. ADQE staff can also be contacted for further information regarding the processes described above.

Name	Post	Email	Tel. No.
<b>Claire Brennan</b>	ADQE Manager (Curriculum)	c.m.brennan@sussex.ac.uk	01273 678837
<b>Oliver Craig</b>	ADQE Manager (Curriculum)	o.craig@sussex.ac.uk	01273 877421

An electronic version of this handbook can be found on the ADQE Office website at <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/adqe/curriculum/periodicreview>

## Schedule of School Periodic Reviews

---

The schedule of School Periodic Reviews for this cycle is as follows:

### Academic Year 2018/19

Term 1: School of Business, Management and Economics  
Department of Medical Education

### Academic Year 2019/20

Semester 1: School of Engineering and Informatics  
School of Life Sciences

### Academic Year 2020/21

Semester 2: Brighton and Sussex Medical School (BM,BS)  
School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences

### Academic Year 2021/22

Semester 2: School of Global Studies  
Central Foundation Years  
School of Psychology;

### Academic Year 2022/23

Semester 2: School of Education and Social Work  
School of Humanities (new, merged School)  
School of Law, Politics and Sociology

All Reviews will take place in the Spring Semester, concluding by June.

A new schedule will be published in the Autumn Term of AY2022/23, to commence in the Autumn Term of AY2023/24.

