QH Supplement 7B: Periodic Review Guidance for Panel Members

1. Introduction

1.1 Each Periodic Review event is managed by a Review Manager working in the Academic Quality Team in the Centre for Academic Development and Quality (CADQ) part of the centralised NTU Professional Services.

1.2 The Review Manager supports the process and the panel, providing quality assurance insights to the Review. The Review Manager is also the main point of contact for the School during the review process.

1.3 The role of the panel is to provide a collegiate and supportive forum in which the School can:

a. identify and openly discuss challenges in order to mitigate any potential negative impact on the student experience or student outcomes as framed by the OfS' B Conditions of Registration; and

b. share areas of excellence.

1.4 It is the panel's responsibility to be a "critical friend", undertaking discussions in a constructive, appropriately detailed and collaborative manner.

1.5 Prior to the Review, each panel member is asked to focus on one or more of the OfS' B conditions, but this does not preclude any panel member from engaging with the other conditions.

1.6 All panel members will be required to contribute to the draft and approve the final report, including its associated required actions, prior to publication. Therefore, panel members need to ensure that they set aside time to contribute to the preparation of the report in the weeks after the event.

2. The Review Chair

2.1 The Review Chair, a member of the NTU Senior Executive Team, works closely with the Review Manager to maintain oversight of the process.

September 2024

2.2 Specifically, the role chairs both the agenda-setting and review event meetings, ensuring that agendas are set within the spirit of the event; colleagues are able to discuss openly and honestly; the event runs to time; and appropriate outcomes are reached, including any required actions.

2.3 The Review Chair also:

a. provides feedback on the draft review report and approves the final report and required actions.

b. chairs the follow-up meeting where the School reports on progress on required actions (date to be agreed with the School, taking into account the specific actions required).

3. The External Panel Member

3.1 The External panel member provides an external perspective on the School's quality management processes as well as subject knowledge and expertise aligned to the disciplines of the School.

3.2 The External panel member attends both the agenda-setting meeting and review day. In addition to a fee, the University will reimburse travel expenses and can arrange and pay for overnight accommodation and subsistence where necessary.

3.3 The External panel member must undertake a Right to Work check, prior to commencing any review work.

4. Student panel member

4.1 Including a Student panel member in the Review is one of the ways in which the University engages students with quality processes. Normally appointed from the Student's Union, the Student panel member provides a student perspective on the effectiveness of the School's processes for engaging students about the quality and enhancement of their courses.

4.2 CADQ works with the Student panel member to support their preparation and contribution to the Periodic Review process.

5. Timeline

5.1 Prior to taking part in the review, panel members are asked to familiarise themselves with NTU's Periodic Review policy and guidance. An understanding of the OfS' B conditions of registration is also required. All relevant documentation will be provided by Quality Team staff.

Three weeks in advance of the review day: Receipt of review documents

5.2 The panel will receive the following set of documents prior to the agenda-setting meeting (see below):

a. Course reports prepared by members of CADQ which summarise findings of desk-based reviews which have focused on a sample set of courses identified

for deep dive review. These reports will consider the course-level evidence that contribute to the demonstration of alignment with the relevant OfS' B conditions of registration.

b. A single School report that considers School-level oversight of quality and standards in regard to the University's expectations and the B conditions.

c. A data profile of the School including number of departments, courses and student numbers.

d. The School's current 'Success for All' plan which sets out the Schools priorities for addressing progression and award gaps between groups of students.

e. The School's current Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS) action plan.

5.3 In advance of the agenda-setting meeting, the panel are expected to have considered these documents, particularly in relation to areas of challenge identified by the School and/or the desk-based review and areas of excellence. Panel members are asked to focus on the particular aspects of the B conditions of registration that they have been assigned. The criteria and evidence used for the review is provided in appendix A.

Usually one or two weeks in advance of the review day: Agenda-setting meeting

5.4 The purpose of this meeting is to determine the areas for discussion at the review day. The panel will also consider the appropriateness of the proposed attendees. In circumstances where the panel raises a serious concern, further evidence may be requested from the School prior to the review date or attendees requested for the Review event.

5.5 The CADQ colleagues who have produced the desk-based review reports will briefly present their course reports and recommended themes for discussion and will respond, to the best of their ability, to any questions from the panel. Led by the Review Chair, the panel will then decide which themes and areas for discussion should be addressed at the Review event.

Between agenda-setting and review

5.6 Panel members are asked to reflect on the agreed areas of discussion and prepare appropriate questions, and / or discussion-starters in advance of the review day.

Review day

5.7 The day consists of an introductory presentation by the School setting out its priority areas, challenges and features of excellence and good practice. The panel participates in three review meetings: one with senior School colleagues; one with students and one with School staff. Between these meetings, the panel will meet privately to reflect and discuss findings from the previous meeting and plan the next.

Usually 15 working days after the review day: Preparation of the outcomes report

5.8 The Review Manager will draft the report usually 15 working days after the Review day, subject to their working pattern and any University closure days. Panel members may be asked for specific contributions where necessary.

5.9 The report summarises the main observations made by the panel and any actions required by the School. It also provides a narrative of the panel's reflections on the

efficacy of the School's quality and standards management systems, and how it seeks to ensure good outcomes (academic and professional) for all students.

5.10 All panel members will be required to agree the final report, and any required actions, prior to publication.

6. Being an effective panel member

6.1 NTU regards review panel membership as an important opportunity for professional development. Not only does it afford the opportunity to discover different approaches taken by different subject areas, but panel members have also commented that the experience usefully prompts reflection on one's own practice. The role of the panel member is to be inquisitive and supportive. This is the School's opportunity to talk openly and honestly about the student experience that they provide – where they are most proud and where they feel they would benefit from external observers who may be able to support them in determining alternative courses of action.

6.2 Through effective questioning the School will be supported in identifying areas of improvement and excellence. This will include drafting effective questions following the reading of the desk-based review, re-formulating questions after speaking to other panel and School members and asking follow-up questions during the day.

6.3 We are aware that some School colleagues may feel uncomfortable in a review situation. It is important that panel members strive to take the role of 'critical friend'. There is no judgement associated with this review, and as such, for it to be properly effective, all colleagues must feel that the event is supportive and collaborative. Any emerging areas of concern will be openly expressed as the day progresses, in order that the panel and School together can better understand the issue.

6.4 In planning areas for discussion and the associated questions, panel members are asked to take a coaching-style approach. They should be aware that if School members appear not to be able to provide a response which appropriately addresses a concern, this may be for several reasons: the colleague may not themselves have the correct information; they may not have understood the question; or they were worried about the judgement of responding honestly.

6.5 Follow-up questions should therefore provide an opportunity for colleagues to identify whether someone else is better placed to respond to a query, provide clarification and/or provide an explanation of why the question is being asked.

6.6 The following coaching-style questions may be effective in prompting a colleague for more information:

   a. What do you think we might be missing to fully understand the situation?

   b. What is the real challenge here?

   c. What do you do well here?

   d. What would you need to do better?

   e. What is important to you right now regarding [topic of discussion]?

   f. Where would you like to see change?

6.7 On the day of the review, the private panel meetings tend to be fast-paced and cover a lot of ground. In addition to making use of the overview questions set out in the Appendix, panel members might also consider the following:

g. Which documentation was referred to most often (and which was perhaps not discussed)?

h. Which individuals appear most informed regarding School activities?

i. Did colleagues seem to be broadly aware of the Schools strategies (notably those addressing student satisfaction, Success for All and employability)? If not, what were the common principles or value expressed by colleagues?

j. Which evidence was referred to in justifying quality management approaches?

k. Which activities did colleagues appear most hesitant to describe?

l. Which activities did colleagues seem most proud of?

7. Appendix

OfS B condition	Overarching question(s) for review	Desk-based review will examine School-level activity that achieves:	Desk-based review will examine how this 'runs to ground' at course level by looking at evidence of:
B1	How does the School and University know that courses are up-to-date, provides educational challenge, are coherent, are effectively delivered, requires students to develop relevant skills? 1. Are the quality management processes that the School has in place providing effective assurance of the academic experience? 2. Does activity at course level reflect the School and University expectations with respect to ensuring a high quality academic experience.	Oversight of plans to support a high quality academic experience (for example S4A, employability, NSS) Oversight of teaching observation policy and impact Oversight of external examiner feedback Oversight of course changes Oversight of Periodic course review and periodic collaborative review Oversight of employer engagement Oversight of the course design and approval process	Actions taking place with respect to NSS, S4A, GOS plans PCRs taking place with the right people and the right evidence (in relation to quality of experience) Team engagement with external examiners Engagement with employers and collaborative partners (where appropriate)
B2	How does the School and University know that students receive the right kinds of resources and support to ensure success during and beyond their course? How does the School and University know that students are effectively engaged in decisions about their course and their experience?	Oversight of NSS, S4A, GOS plans Oversight of WLE Oversight of staff development within the	Periodic course reviews and collaborative reviews (where applicable) taking place with the right people and the right evidence (in relation to resources and support) Actions taking place with respect to NSS, S4A, GOS plans

OfS B condition	Overarching question(s) for review	Desk-based review will examine School-level activity that achieves:	Desk-based review will examine how this 'runs to ground' at course level by looking at evidence of:
	1. Are the quality management processes that the School has in place providing effective assurance of (a) provisions of resources and support and (b) student engagement? 2. Does activity at course level reflect the School and University expectations with respect to ensuring (a) students receive appropriate resources and support and (b) students are appropriately engaged?	School and at partners (where applicable) Oversight of PCRs (in relation to resources and support) Oversight of student feedback on courses Oversight or student support to prevent academic misconduct Oversight of careers support Oversight of personal tutoring	Staff development engagement (course level) Support for students in careers, academic misconduct, academic skills etc Use of student reps Use of module evaluation
B4	How does the School and University know that students are assessed effectively and that assessment is valid and reliable? 1. Are the quality management processes that the School has in place providing effective assurance of assessment? 2. Does activity at course level reflect the School and University expectations with respect to assessment?	Oversight of moderation practice Oversight of assessment and feedback practice Oversight of staff training/induction on the NTU assessment framework Oversight of external examiner feedback on assessment Oversight of academic misconduct outcomes Oversight of student feedback about assessment	Moderation practice Assessment and feedback practice External examiner engagement with course team and partner (for collaborative courses)

OfS B condition	Overarching question(s) for review	Desk-based review will examine School-level activity that achieves:	Desk-based review will examine how this 'runs to ground' at course level by looking at evidence of:
B5	How does the School and University know that courses are designed at an appropriate sector-recognised standard and the awards reflect these standards? 1. Are the quality management processes that the School has in place providing effective assurance of standards? 2. Does activity at course level reflect the School and University expectations with respect to standards?	Oversight of external examiner feedback on standards Oversight of operation of examination boards Oversight of academic misconduct outcomes	Alignment to benchmarks and PSRB requirements Operation of examination boards

Policy owner
CADQ

Change history			
Version:	Approval date:	Implementation date:	Nature of significant revisions:
Feb 2023	08.02.23	14.02.23	New policy
Sept 2023	14.09.23	01.10.23	Addition of second internal panel member and data profile in review documents.
Sept 2024	19.09.24	01.10.24	General review of the supplement's consistency with the model. This included a re-wording of panel member descriptions for ease of comprehension.

Equality Impact Analysis		
Version:	EIA date:	Completed by: