# periodic review evidence grid:

# a working document for periodic review and revalidation Panel members

#### **Introduction**

#### SGUL’s detailed procedures for the review/revalidation of programmes of study are set out in the [Quality Manual](https://www.sgul.ac.uk/about/our-professional-services/quality-and-partnerships-directorate/quality-assurance-at-st-georges/quality-manual). The approval criteria for Periodic Review and Revalidation Panels are set out in paragraphs 30-31 of Section C.

#### The purpose of this document is to:

#### provide guidance to panel members on using evidence,

#### identify queries to follow up in discussion with the teaching teams,

#### request additional documents or evidence related to each area

#### **Process**

#### Panel members are asked to begin to complete the grid as they commence their review of the evidence. **We advise panel members to begin the evidence review as soon as they receive the initial documents.**

#### Panel members will be asked to submit the grid to the panel secretary five working days before the date of the review. Grids will be circulated to the panel Chair and to the academic lead for the review/revalidation. At this stage, it is used to:

#### give the course team an indication of the likely lines of enquiry the panel will take. This does not preclude the panel from exploring other themes that arise during the course of the event;

#### trigger requests for documents that have not already been provided;

#### enable the Chair to structure the panel’s first private meeting and allocate responsibilities for reviewing the evidence basis for the review.

#### 

#### Panel members are encouraged to contact the secretary of the review if further guidance is needed at any stage.

## 

# approval criteria

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Domain for evaluation** | **Comments and Queries** |
| There is a demand for the programme, |  |
| The arrangements for the recruitment, selection and admission of students are fair, clear and explicit, |  |
| The aims of the programme are clearly expressed, |  |
| The intended learning outcomes for the programme are clearly specified, consistent with its aims and ensure an educational challenge appropriate for the subject and level being taught, |  |
| There is an appropriate balance between delivery methods, for example lectures, seminars, group work or practical study, as well as an appropriate balance between directed and independent study or research, |  |
| The curriculum is coherent for example in relation to its academic elements, the acquisition of practical skills and personal and professional development, |  |
| The curriculum is well-structured for example in terms of progression, the balance between core and optional elements and breadth and depth, |  |
| The curriculum is up to date, taking current research into account and, if appropriate, the requirements of professional and regulatory bodies, |  |
| The curriculum is inclusive and takes account of the needs of all students including those in protected characteristic groups, |  |
| The strategy for assessing the intended learning outcomes is suitable, |  |
| Opportunities for students to receive feedback on their assessments and feedforward to help them prepare for future assessments are built into the assessment strategy. |  |
| The opportunities available to graduates from the programme have been considered, |  |
| The necessary resources are available to support the programme, |  |
| The programme is co-ordinated with other activities and programmes within SGUL, |  |
| Stakeholders (e.g. patients, service users and carers; employers or employer groups) have been appropriately involved in the development of the programme, |  |
| Information about the course is accurate and accessible. It assists students in making informed decisions before applying and ensures that they understand their responsibilities in respect of their learning (see also Section G: Student Information), |  |
| Arrangements are in place for evaluating the quality of the programme that allow students to comment on their experience as learners and understand how their feedback will be used to enhance the programme. |  |
| the contribution of research, staff development and the professional activity and scholarship of staff (as teachers and subject specialists) to the development of the programme; |  |
| the use made of reports from professional or statutory bodies; |  |
| the analysis of entry, progression (retention) and completion data; |  |
| the thoroughness of the responses to issues raised in External Examiner reports; |  |
| the collection and use of feedback from students; |  |
| the use of feedback from placement providers, employers and others; |  |
| DLHE and Graduate Outcomes data, where relevant. |  |
| The suitability of the team’s future plans to build on the strengths of the programme and remedy any weaknesses. |  |
| **Additional comments or queries:** |  |