



## College Provision Review Policy

Reference	
Status:	Final
Document Title:	College Provision Review Policy
Version:	4.1
Date:	July 2020
Previous Version/Date:	4.0
Next Review:	July 2021
Classification:	External
Approve By:	Academic Board
Prepared By:	Quality Assurance
Received By:	BoD/COB
External Referents:	<i>UKSCQA/ UKQC Core Practice-S1, S2, S3, Q2, Q5, Q9.  Advice and Guidance- Monitoring and Evaluation (11/18)</i>

### Contents

<b>1. Aim</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. Policy</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. Procedures</b> .....	<b>3</b>
3.1. Rationale .....	3
3.2. Subject by Subject Review.....	3
3.3. Review Arrangements.....	3
3.4. Key Documentation .....	4
3.5. Implementation of the Outcomes .....	4



## **1. Aim**

- 1.1. This policy describes the review processes of the College for its academic provision to assure itself that it is discharging its responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards, assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities for students and ensuring all academic provision including programmes, modules and units and underpinning resources (technical and physical) are up to date and fit for the purpose.
- 1.2. The Policy highlights clearly its main features including clear procedures for implementation.

## **2. Policy**

- 2.1. To provide assurance to the Academic Board that it can have confidence in the academic standards and quality of subject-by-subject provision.
- 2.2. The College will undergo a subject review every five years.
- 2.3. The subject review will cover all programmes
- 2.4. Subjects will be reviewed in ONE substantial review with implementation of outcomes realistically taking a maximum of three years.
- 2.5. The policy also acknowledges that the College's awarding bodies, such as Pearson, will undertake their own re-accreditation and programme reviews, typically every five years.
- 2.6. The College recognises that subjects can only retain a certain amount of shelf life and quality of provision and require regular review and updating with some elements potentially discarded and new elements added.
- 2.7. The College also recognizes the importance of externality in making informed judgments about its academic provision in its pursuit of 'good practice'.
- 2.8. The College will produce a range of academic documents for a review panel to scrutinise that enable it to critically review its provision and make meaningful judgements standards, quality and currency of learning opportunities in the subject.
- 2.9. An academic reviewer covering each subject discipline will be selected to a maximum of three
- 2.10. The culmination of the review will specify a written report highlighting where improvements to provision are possible in order to enhance student-learning opportunities.
- 2.11. The review will also encourage the development of more inclusive approaches to learning, teaching and assessment.
- 2.12. The review panel will fundamentally draw on information provided by College Annual Monitoring Reports (CAMR) which are produced following the end of each academic year and have themselves drawn on Programme Annual Monitoring Reports (PAMR).
- 2.13. The review panel will review a range of documentation drawn together to provide informed quantitative and qualitative data of the 'Subject' and the subject review will take place over a two-day period.



### 3. Procedures

#### 3.1. Rationale

- 3.1.1. The College prepares documentation for institutional reviews by its awarding bodies, as well as reviews and monitoring visits by the QAA. The aim of the review of College provision is to add value to these formal reviews in the quality assurance and enhancement of LCC provision by reviewing and evaluating the academic currency and health of its subject provision. Furthermore, it is to provide assurance to the College Oversight Board (COB) and Academic Board as well as in the public domain that it can have confidence in the academic standards and quality of subject-by-subject provision. Each subject review gives the College an additional assurance that it meets the UKQC expectations in discharging the College's responsibilities for maintaining academic standards, assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities and providing adequate and reliable information to the stakeholders.
- 3.1.2. The concept of College provision covers the totality of programmes on offer *within* a subject holding and its delivery across awarding bodies. This aims to give assurance of the quality of integrated subject provision across the College and/or guidance on further integration can be achieved. Furthermore, it prepares LCC for greater autonomy over its provision.

#### 3.2. Subject by Subject Review

- 3.2.1. Each subject review will focus on how the College achieves the following:
- 3.2.2. The setting and/or maintenance of academic standards at subject level,
- 3.2.3. The enhancement of the quality of students' learning opportunities at subject level
- 3.2.4. The currency of subject, programme, unit and module materials and academic content.
- 3.2.5. Implementation of external verification of the subject offer
- 3.2.6. Implementing information from data from all internal monitoring evaluation and review processes.
- 3.2.7. Effective usage of resources underpinning subjects
- 3.2.8. An overall critical analysis of the subject and recommendations of 'good practice' improvement and amendment, where appropriate.

#### 3.3. Review Arrangements

- 3.3.1. **Review Cycle:** ONE full review every five years
- 3.3.2. **Reviewers:** A panel made up of a maximum of THREE external peer reviewers; TWO members of the Principal's Executive Group (PEG) members (**One to Chair**); THREE Student representatives, ONE from each subject discipline; THREE Academic Tutors, one from each subject discipline; Secretary; QAO Officer/or Registrar. The constitution of the panel must ensure that every subject discipline is effectively reviewed.



- 3.3.3. **Input:** A set of prescribed papers sent to the panel FOUR WEEKS minimum before the review
- 3.3.4. **Output:** Subject Review Report produced within FOUR weeks of the review.
- 3.3.5. **Intended for:** Academic Board review and COB evaluation and sign-off
- 3.3.6. **Oversight of process:** Registrar reporting to PEG delivering a timetable of a subject review from inception to completion
- 3.3.7. **Selection of external reviewer:** Registrar and PEG
- 3.3.8. **Timeframe for panel review:** Minimum TWO DAYS to maximum THREE DAYS
- 3.3.9. The Subject Review forms one element of a range of processes designed to sustain and develop academic quality. The review allows for a broader and more holistic consideration of the extent to which the College meets the expectations of the UK Quality Code. It ensures continuous improvement of all LCC subjects.
- 3.3.10. The delivery of the College provision is supported by a range of resources e.g. IT, Library, VLE, Administration, Technical support etc which all fall under the scope of review

### **3.4. Key Documentation**

- 3.4.1. Documentation for subject review will contain the following
  - 3.4.1.1. College Annual Monitoring Reports (CAMR) for the subject provision
  - 3.4.1.2. Syllabus and Reading Lists (annually updated) for the subject provision
  - 3.4.1.3. Quantitative information on academic performance (eg. pass rate, completion rate and achievement rate) for the subject provision;
  - 3.4.1.4. Information on application, admission, induction, retention and dropout;
  - 3.4.1.5. Student profile information (gender, nationality, entry qualification);
  - 3.4.1.6. External examiner reports wherever applicable (considering quality and standards);
  - 3.4.1.7. Formal student feedback;
  - 3.4.1.8. Minutes of Programme Committees and Assessment and Progress Board
  - 3.4.1.9. Lecturers' CVs
  - 3.4.1.10. College Academic Structure
  - 3.4.1.11. Resource reports
  - 3.4.1.12. Statement of learning resources to support the provision;
  - 3.4.1.13. QAA HER and Annual Monitoring Reports
  - 3.4.1.14. Awarding Body Annual Monitoring Reports

### **3.5. Implementation of the Outcomes**



- 3.5.1. On production of the draft report by the Chair, the Registrar will disseminate it to the review panel for draft amendment.
- 3.5.2. On approval of the report by the panel, the Registrar will present it to the PEG.
- 3.5.3. The PEG will determine actions to be taken across the subject and begin the implementation process with respective internal stakeholders. The Registrar will forward the report and PEG actions to the Academic Board.
- 3.5.4. The Academic Board will monitor progress on a termly basis reporting to the COB. The PEG is accountable to the Academic Board that actions have been taken and this will be scrutinized annually.
- 3.5.5. The COB will provide advice thereby holding the Academic Board accountable and determine to its satisfaction when all outcomes have been fully implemented.



## MONITORING AND EVALUATION PROCESS FLOWCHART

