**Periodic Review of Taught Provision Policy**

Introduction

The Scottish Funding Council (SFC) and Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) requires all Higher Education Institutions to monitoring and review on a periodic (normally within 6 years) basis any credit bearing taught provision. This process is expected to provide robust, comprehensive, and credible evidence that provision is of high quality, and meets expectations set out in the UK Quality Code.

Part A

1.0 Overview

Periodic Review (PR) is a systematic review conducted normally every six years to evaluate the quality and validity of taught provision leading to University of Dundee qualifications. It serves as both a formal approval process for taught degree provision and a developmental initiative aimed at enhancing teaching quality. The objectives of PR include:

* Evaluating the effectiveness and appropriateness of recent teaching provision.
* Reflecting on areas for improvement and implementing necessary changes.

2.0 Aim

The aim of the periodic review is to:

* Ensure compliance  with the University’s [Quality Assurance processes](https://www.dundee.ac.uk/quality-framework/standards/quality-assurance), as well as regulatory requirements outlined by the [Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA)](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/advice-and-guidance) through the [UK Quality Code for Higher Education](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/quality-code/revised-uk-quality-code-for-higher-education.pdf?sfvrsn=4c19f781_8), and the [Scottish Funding Council (SFC)](https://www.sfc.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/SFC-Guidance-on-Quality-for-Colleges-and-Universities-2024-25-to-2030-31-1.pdf);
* Recommend to the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee the formal re-approval of the programme(s) of study for a set period, normally 5 to 6 years;
* Identify and promote the sharing of good practice that could be relevant to other programmes in the University; and
* Enhance the student experience and support staff involved in teaching.

3.0 Scope

The periodic review encompasses:

* all credit-bearing provision below SCQF Level 11;
* programmes or awards delivered in Partnership
* sustainability of the programme(s);
* enhancement of the curriculum;
* enhancement of the student learning experience, including pastoral and extra-curricular aspects of the student experience;
* enhancement of teaching and assessment;
* enhancement of the organisation and management of the programme(s);
* enhancement of learning resources and the learning environment; and
* academic standards.

Part B

1.0 Schedule

1.1 Reviews will normally be conducted every 5-6 years, covering the previous 5-6 years or the period since the last Periodic Review, as determined by Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee.

1.2 Taught programmes may undergo interim reviews if significant issues arise during annual or periodic reviews or if there are substantial changes in programme structure or delivery.

1.3 The School, in co-ordination with the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee, is responsible for planning and organising the review.

2.0 Reflective Analysis

2.1 The Reflective Analysis is typically prepared by the programme lead. For multiple programmes within the same School under review, the School designates a lead coordinator for the Programmes Review Team. For programmes across multiple Schools under review, the Director of Quality and Academic Standards (or nominee) will, in consultation with the Schools Associate Dean of Quality Assurance and Enhancement nominate a lead coordinator for the Programmes Review Team. The Programme Review Team will consist of the most appropriate individuals from the programme(s) being reviewed decided by the School.

2.2 The Reflective Analysis evaluates the operation and performance of the School's programmes over the defined review period and outlines a plan for ongoing enhancement. It includes commentary on good practices and identifies areas for development. The Policy Guidance outlines key areas to be covered within the Reflective Analysis:

* Contextual information
* Enhancement of the curriculum
* Enhancement of the student LEARNING experience, including pastoral and extra-curricular aspects of the student experience
* Enhancement of teaching and assessment
* Enhancement of the organisation and management of the programme(s)
* Enhancement of learning resources and the learning environment
* Academic standards
	+ a Convener (Nominated Associate Dean of Quality Assurance and Enhancement a different School).

2.3 Specific and standardised reports on student data, graduate outcomes, national student survey results are provided by the Strategic Planning department, and they should accompany the Reflective Analysis. The School Review team will provide commentary on these reports within the Reflective Analysis. Additional reports can be included within the supporting documentation.

2.4 For undergraduate programmes, the [TESTA](https://www.dundee.ac.uk/academic-skills/staff) (Transforming the Experience of Students through Assessment) process is mandatory. The full TESTA report must be submitted along with the Reflective Analysis. The Programme Review team must provide commentary on this report within the Reflective Analysis. For taught postgraduate programmes, the TESTA process is optional.

2.5 For programmes delivered jointly, a mandatory site visit will be conducted by selected members of the Periodic Review Board. For smaller joint programme arrangements that do not have substantial numbers of students, online meetings with partnership delivery staff and students can be conducted as a proportionate alternative to the site visit.

3.0 Periodic Review Board Membership

3.1 Board members should possess knowledge of the review's scope. Recommended membership includes:

* normally two experienced academic staff members from different Schools.
* normally, two external subject specialists from outside the University and not from the same institution
* representation from at least three senior staff members from Professional Services (including one from External Relations, one from the Library and at least one from the ASC/Careers/EIS Hub).
* a member of the Quality and Academic Standards team.
* a student representative (DUSA).
* PSRB members (where applicable).

For collaborative programmes with Joint Education Institutes or those delivered solely at a partner site, the Periodic Review will be conducted at the partner site. The composition of the Periodic Review Board Membership will be adjusted as necessary to suit the requirements of the review process, with final approval required from the Director of Quality and Academic Standards (or their nominee).

3.2 The Programme Review Team, in agreement with the Director of Quality and Academic (or their nominee), will appoint Periodic Review Board members, excluding the Convener and the Quality and Academic Standards member.

3.3 Very small, niche programmes may elect to have a single external subject specialist with agreement from Director of Quality and Academic (or their nominee).

3.4 The Quality and Academic Standards team member will be a full member of the Periodic Review Board and will also assist the Convener, co-ordinating the collection and distribution of observations and finalising the Periodic Review Outcome Report.

4.0 Appointment of External Subject Experts

4.1 External subject experts should be recruited from other UK higher education institutions, with sound knowledge and experience of UK quality standards and responsibility for teaching delivery or senior management in relevant disciplines.

4.2 When more than one external subject expert has been appointed to the Periodic Review Board, they should not be from the same institution.

4.3 External subject experts must not have been involved in delivering or externally examining these programmes within the last five years.

4.4 The Programme Review Team usually approaches proposed external experts informally to gauge their willingness to serve as member of the Review Board.

4.5 Formal approval of suitable nominees as External Subject Experts rests with the Director of Quality and Academic Standards (or their nominee).

5.0 Critical Friend

5.1 The School appoints a Critical Friend to support the Programme Review team through the periodic review process and act as a liaison between the Periodic Review Board and the School.

5.2 The Critical Friend will typically meet with representatives from the programme(s) and the School to offer feedback on the themes and issues deliberated during the preliminary meeting of the Review Board.

6.0 Periodic Review Event

6.1 The length of the Periodic Review will be determined by the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee but typically expected to occur over a day. A preliminary meeting of the Periodic Review Board members will precede the Review Event to finalise the agenda and themes for exploration, with exceptions made for complex degree provisions or small programme populations.

6.2 During the review event, the Periodic Review Board will meet with three separate School panels:

1. Current students and graduates;
2. Teaching team and Academic Support within the School, other stakeholders where applicable; and
3. the School Executive Group.

6.3 The School determines the membership of these panels. School Panel (a) comprises current students and graduates exclusively, while School Panel (b) excludes members of School Panel (c) and vice versa. The School's Module and Programme Lead(s) should typically participate in School Panel (b).

6.4 The meeting with the School Executive Group should include key stakeholders such as the Dean, Associate Deans, and School Manager, ensuring representation from collaborative partnerships if applicable.

6.5 All costs associated with the Periodic Review Board and event are borne by the relevant School. With external members of Periodic Review Boards from outside the University compensated for their time and contribution, with reimbursement for reasonable expenses according to University policy:

* recommended fee is £500

6.6 Student and graduate panel members should be reimbursed for expenses incurred solely for participating in the event, with the School covering these costs.

6.7 Costs related to the Periodic Review, including the production of the Reflective Analysis and facilitation of site visits, are the responsibility of the School and should be considered in collaborative arrangements.

6.8 The Review Event is typically conducted in-person, although provisions are made for online attendance by students and graduates if necessary. All University staff members and External Subject Specialists are expected to attend in-person.

In the case of Joint Education Institutes and programmes conducted entirely at partner sites and with the Review Event taking place at the partner site, the School will engage in discussions with the Director of Quality and Academic Standards (or their nominee) to determine the most suitable format for conducting the review event, whether it be in-person or hybrid approach.

6.9 The School may designate a member of the administrative support team to take formal notes during meetings between the Review Board and the School Panels.

7.0 Periodic Review Outcome

7.1 Following the School Panel meetings, the Periodic Review Board will reach formal recommendation of:

* the ‘re-approval’ of the programme(s) to Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee;
* the ‘re-approval’ of the programme(s) with ‘areas for development’ to Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee;
* the re-approval of the programme(s) with ‘suggestions’ to Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee; or
* the programme(s) should not be ‘re-approved’ due to significant concerns raised during the review to Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee.

The Periodic Review Board will also consider ‘areas of good practice’. Should there be any delays in reaching a formal conclusion, the School will be promptly informed.

7.2 Periodic Review Boards may assign recommendation outcomes to teams beyond the School if appropriate.

7.3 The formal conclusion is documented in the Periodic Review Outcome Report.

7.4 Within 6 weeks of the Periodic Review Event the School will compose an Action Plan detailing how it will address any ‘recommendations’ made by the Periodic Review Board.

The School Board (or equivalent) should endorse the Action Plan before being considered at the next meeting of the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee.

7.5 Within one year of the Periodic Review Event the School will complete a Year-on Response detailing how it addressed the ‘recommendations’ made by the Periodic Review Board. This Year-on Response should be provided to the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee for approval.

The School Board (or equivalent) should endorse the Year-on Response before being considered at the next meeting of the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee.

The School Associate Dean (QAE) should provide a brief update of the Year-on Response to Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee.

7.6 Reports should be discussed at School Boards (or designated subcommittees). Reports are also considered by the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee, where the formal approval of the Schools provision re-approval takes place. The reports will inform the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee annual report to the Scottish Funding Council.