

Periodic Review and Revalidation Policy (Taught Programmes)

POLICY DETAILS:

Date of approval	March 2026
Approving body	Academic Council
Supersedes	Periodic Review and Revalidation Policy, October 2022
Date of EIA	April 2020 (updated from July 2017)
Date of next review	<i>October 2026</i>
Author	Academic Quality Office
Responsible Executive Group area	Registrar and Secretary
Related policies and documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Self-Evaluation Report pro forma• Periodic Review – Information for Students
Benchmarking	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education (2024),• University of Glasgow, Periodic Subject Review Guidance

-
- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SFC's Tertiary Quality Enhancement Framework |
|--|--|
-

THE GLASGOW SCHOOL OF ART

PERIODIC REVIEW AND REVALIDATION POLICY

CONTEXT AND GENERAL APPROACH

Periodic review of academic subjects is one of the main ways in which Glasgow School of Art (GSA) assures itself of the quality of the student experience and of the provision delivered by its Academic Schools. The Scottish Funding Council (SFC) expects institutions to ensure that all academic subjects and aspects of provision are included in institution-led review activities over a cycle of not more than 6 years.

Boards of Studies, Education Committee and Academic Council account for the GSA stages of a detailed academic consideration of Periodic Review. Revalidation of programmes is incorporated within Periodic Review.

GSA demonstrates its commitment to diversity and promoting equality by ensuring that due regard is given to the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 in the implementation and application of this policy.

Precepts 1.3 to 1.7 below have a substantial overlap, but there is an expectation that GSA is explicit regarding these points.

1. PRECEPTS

- 1.1 The Academic Council shall be responsible for Periodic Review in terms of academic matters. Delegated authority is provided to Boards of Studies and Education Committee. The Senior Leadership Group may also require assurance regarding academic and non-academic matters.
- 1.2 Relevant parties shall engage with the Academic Quality Office (AQO) at an early stage in the process should the need for clarification or assistance in determining any part of the process arise.
- 1.3 Periodic Review shall cover the following aspects:
 - The School's strategic approach to enhancing learning and teaching and how this links to GSA's Strategic Plan, the Education Strategy and any other relevant GSA strategies;
 - Enhancing and supporting the student learning experience;
 - Quality assurance and maintaining and reviewing academic standards;
 - Academic management;
 - Collaborative provision;
 - Research and resources as they relate to teaching, learning and assessment;
 - Approaches to identifying and sharing good practice.
- 1.4 Periodic Reviews:
 - a. Establish that procedures, processes and practices apply that enable the School and GSA to ensure that responsibilities for academic standards and quality are discharged effectively.

- b. Establish that procedures, processes and practices apply that foster creativity and encourage a culture of continuous enhancement of provision, with particular regard to the effectiveness of the learning experience of students.
 - c. Shall take full account of the academic infrastructure of Scottish and UK higher education, including [Subject Benchmark](#) and [Characteristic Statements](#), the [Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework](#), and the [UK Quality Code for Higher Education \(2024\)](#) and of the [SFC Tertiary Quality Enhancement Framework](#).
 - d. Shall take full account of student feedback, and include procedures, processes and practices to obtain student views of the provision being reviewed and to provide feedback on outcomes.
 - e. Shall provide an objective review of the provision based on an understanding of national and international good practice.
 - f. Shall consider the effectiveness of the School Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting (PMAR) arrangements and the follow-up actions taken for programmes covered by the review.
- 1.5 External School and Departments which contribute courses to programmes under review (e.g. cross-GSA courses) will have this provision assessed as part of Periodic Review and as such will be included in the Periodic Review submission.
- 1.6 As part of or in addition to the requirements above, the Periodic Review aims to provide an evaluation of:
- a. The relevance of programme aims and intended learning outcomes for each programme to each other and to the overall aims of the provision.
 - b. The effectiveness of teaching, learning and assessment methods in meeting the intended learning outcomes for each programme.
 - c. The correlation of provision with the relevant QAA Subject Benchmark and Characteristic Statements, the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework, the UK Quality Code for Higher Education and the SFC Tertiary Quality Enhancement Framework, and that the value of qualifications awarded to students at the point of qualification and over time is in line with sector-recognised standards and expectations.
 - d. The currency and validity of each programme in the light of developing knowledge within the discipline, and the application of that knowledge in practice.
 - e. The effectiveness of the measures in place to assure the quality of provision and maintain standards, taking into account changing circumstances, demands and pedagogical developments.
 - f. Recent and proposed enhancements to the quality of the student learning experience in taught provision.
 - g. The effectiveness of how the School engages students in developing teaching, learning and assessment practice.

- 1.7 Periodic Review shall include a discussion with the School Senior staff, staff, and students on:
- a. The quality of teaching, learning and assessment, and learning resources.
 - b. The School's approach to the enhancement of provision, including recent developments and future plans.
 - c. The quality of the student learning experience, and ways in which it might be enhanced.
 - d. Ways of promoting student motivation, creating communities of practice and effective learning.
- 1.8 Periodic Review shall inform new Equality Impact Assessments of the School's taught provision.

2. FREQUENCY AND TIMING OF REVIEWS

- 2.1 All provision shall be reviewed on a cycle of no more than 6 years.
- 2.2 A six-year fixed review schedule is approved, in consultation with the Registrar and Secretary, Heads of Schools and the University of Glasgow's Academic Collaborations Office.
- 2.3 Reviews are not normally held at the beginning or end of the academic session. Reviews are typically held from December to March when students are available to meet with the Review Panel. The AQO will consult and liaise with the Academic Schools regarding possible dates.
- 2.4 In advance of the review, the AQO will arrange a brief meeting with the Head of School and the Deputy Head of the School (if applicable) to discuss the arrangements for the review and documentation expected to be submitted. The AQO will continue to liaise on a regular basis with the Academic School thereafter.

3. REVIEW PANEL

- 3.1 The Review Panel will normally comprise at a minimum:
- a. The Deputy Director Academic or nominee;
 - b. an external subject specialist from another HE institution, normally in the UK, with expertise in the subjects under review;
 - c. a student representative (this is normally the President of the Students' Association, who shall not be a current or former student of the Academic School undergoing Periodic Review). If the President of the Students' Association is a current or former student of the School undergoing Periodic Review, an additional student representative from outside that School would be co-opted to the panel;
 - d. a Programme Leader from another School;
 - e. the Head of Learning and Teaching;
 - f. the Head of Academic Development

- g. the Academic Registrar
 - h. one academic-related professional support departmental Head; (Input from specialist academic-related support departments forms a core contribution to the review and enhancement of programmes. This will include either: the Head of Student Support and Development, Learning Resources, or Technical Support, and they shall be invited to act as a member of the Review Panel.
 - i. a nominee of the University of Glasgow. In cases where the provision under review includes a joint collaboration with the University of Glasgow, two representatives from the University should be invited to attend.
- 3.2 The Convener of the Panel is the Deputy Director and Vice- Principal (Academic) or nominee. All other members of the Panel have equal status and are expected to take part in all aspects of the review.
- 3.3 A member of the AQO shall act as Secretary to the Review Panel.
- 3.4 The Head of the School will be asked to suggest external subject specialists for the consideration of the Convenor of the Review Panel. Supporting background information must be provided for each person, particularly regarding their relevant, current experience in learning and teaching. A statement should also be included indicating whether or not the person has had any previous involvement with the School or programmes. Previous involvement will not normally exclude a person from acting as an external member (the information is requested mainly for the benefit of the Convenor and the other Panel members). Exceptions to this are: where the suggested person has been a member of staff or a student of GSA in the three years prior to the review or is the current External Examiner. Where the external member has been an External Examiner at GSA, their nomination will only normally be considered if their appointment has ended at least three years prior to the review. The Convenor will appoint the external subject specialist. External subject specialists will receive a fee plus reimbursement of expenses.
- 3.5 The AQO shall propose Review Panel members to the Convenor, who is responsible for approving the Review Panel.

4 DOCUMENTATION FOR REVIEW

Self-Evaluation Report

- 4.1 As part of the Periodic Review, the School shall submit a Self-Evaluation Report (SER), using the template provided by the AQO. The SER should demonstrate the Academic School's approach to enhancement and provide a sense of the student learning experience. It offers an opportunity for greater reflection on areas relevant to the School's position in relation to learning, teaching and assessment enhancements and a chance to reflect on strategy for future development.
- 4.2 The School shall form a School Team to prepare the Self-Evaluation Report (SER). The School Team will include the Head of School (Lead), Deputy Head (if applicable) and the Programme Leader of each programme that is part of the Periodic Review. Other members may be added at the discretion of the Head of School. One member of the School Team, selected by the Head of School, shall have overall responsibility for the SER. Schools are encouraged to establish a working group to inform the development of the SER and produce a document that

demonstrates critical reflection and discourse among staff and students. The process by which it is developed should be detailed in the SER as evidence that it was a collaborative evaluation. Schools are encouraged to plan the development of the SER so that time is allowed to share drafts with students and staff before final submission.

4.3 The SER evaluates the following aspects:

- a. Outline of the process used to develop the SER;
- b. School context and engagement with GSA's Strategies - the School's context and vision and linkage with GSA's Strategic Plan, the Education Strategy and any other GSA strategies relevant to the School;
- c. Academic standards and the use of Data and Evidence in Supporting Student Success - the School's approach to quality assurance and arrangements for ensuring student attainment of the appropriate academic standards;
- d. Enhancing the student experience - the School's engagement with students in their learning, teaching and assessment and the support mechanisms provided at all stages of the wider student experience;
- e. Enhancement in learning, teaching and assessment practice;
- f. Collaborative activity (with partners in the UK and Overseas, including student exchange);
- g. Summary of Strengths and areas for improvement.

4.4 Steps should be taken to obtain the student view of the provision being reviewed, and to consult with students specifically during the development of the SER. Staff Student Consultative Committees (SSCCs) and/or focus groups could be utilised to elicit input to the reflection on the School's provision and establish whether or not it reflects the student experience of the School. The final document should present a picture that the students recognise and can identify with.

4.5 Given that the Periodic Review process encompasses revalidation of programmes, the School should ensure that, in completing the SER, explicit and frequent reference to individual programme provision is made. Examples should be offered throughout.

4.6 Support for preparing for Periodic Review is available from both the Learning and Teaching team and the AQO.

Supporting Documentation

4.7 Documentation should be provided for:

- All programmes and courses under review, including any joint degree programmes with other institutions where GSA is the administering institution and/or collaborative arrangements;
- Service teaching provided for another Academic School within GSA;
- New programmes or courses that are about to be introduced (the SER should include an explanation of the rationale behind their development, and programme specifications/draft handbooks should be provided where available).

4.8 The following is a list of the documentation to be provided by the **School**, required in addition to the SER:

School Information
Details of School organisation, management, administration and staff workload, e.g. organisational chart and workload model with FTE and staff responsibilities.
Membership and remits of any School committees concerned with learning, teaching and assessment activities.
Details of grade profiles and degree classifications since the time of the last review
Programme Information
Subject information provided for students for the current session, for example, handbooks for course/programme.
Quality Enhancement and Assurance Information
Details of School quality enhancement and assurance procedures other than GSA (if any).
Summary reports of programme level equality impact assessment undertaken during the review period for each programme under review.
Most recent reports of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory bodies (if appropriate).
Committee minutes
Copies of all SSCC Action Trackers for the current and previous two sessions.
Minutes of the Board of Studies (re items dealing with learning, teaching and assessment) for the current and previous two sessions.

4.9 The School may also provide any other data it routinely collects in regard to teaching and learning activities which have been referred to in the SER.

4.10 Documents cited in the SER must all be available to the Review Panel before their visit.

4.11 Schools shall submit the SER and supporting documentation to the AQO at least **six** weeks in advance of the review date. The AQO is responsible for sharing the documentation with the Review Panel.

4.12 In addition to the documentation listed above, the AQO will make the following documentation available to the Review Panel and will share copies with the School six weeks prior to the submission of the SER:

School Information	Provided by
Total number of academic and support staff with data anonymised and differentiated by full-time, part-time, grade and protected characteristic (as defined in the Equality Act 2010).	Human Resources

Student numbers in the current and previous five complete sessions (headcount and FTEs) for all UG and PGT programmes under review, including data anonymised and differentiated by the protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010.	Data and Insights Team
Student progression and degree classifications in the previous five complete sessions (headcount and FTEs) for all UG and PGT programmes under review, including data differentiated and anonymised by the protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010.	Data and Insights Team
Most recent Graduate Outcomes data	Data and Insights team
Programme Information	Provided by
Programme specifications for all undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes for which the School is responsible.	Academic Quality Office
Quality Enhancement and Assurance Information	Provided by
Annual Programme Reports, including Quality Enhancement Action Plans (QEAPs), for the previous three complete sessions for all undergraduate taught courses and taught postgraduate programmes.	Academic Quality Office
School Summary Reports, including Quality Enhancement Action Plans (QEAPs), for the previous three complete sessions.	Academic Quality Office
External Examiner's reports and related correspondence including the School/Subject's response to any issues raised in those reports for the previous three complete sessions.	Academic Quality Office
NSS, PTES and SES results for the previous three complete sessions (if available).	Learning and Teaching Team

4.13 Where the review will involve a particularly large volume of documentation, the AQO will work with the School to select a representative sample to be made available to the Panel. Panel members may request to see any documents not selected.

4.14 Requests for other documentation may be made by the Review Team in advance of, or on the day of the review, or post-review.

5 REVIEW OF DOCUMENTATION

5.1 Each Panel member is asked to scrutinise the SER and consider the extent to which the SER is reflective, evaluative, and constructively self-critical and discuss the School's strengths and weaknesses. Review Panel Members will also consider how staff and students within the School have contributed to its development.

5.2 Each Panel member is assigned an area of documentation to review.

- Internal panel members focus on the robustness of the School's procedures and mechanisms for assuring quality and its plans for enhancement, particularly plans related to GSA's Education Strategy.

- External subject specialists have a key role in programme review aspects, in particular:
 - Reviewing the programmes in light of relevant national subject benchmark statements and other external reference points, including the requirements of any relevant Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies;
 - The appropriateness of the School's mechanisms for assuring the standards of awards.
 - The student representative's focus is on student-related matters, in particular:
 - The usefulness of student handbooks and other key information;
 - The opportunities for students to engage in curriculum, teaching, learning and assessment development and innovation;
 - The effectiveness of mechanisms for obtaining and responding to student feedback.
- 5.3 Each Panel member will provide the AQO with a summary of any topics for exploration or areas of concern using the 'Topics for Exploration' pro forma available from the AQO.
- 5.4 The Review Panel normally meets prior to the Review visit to determine the agenda for the Review. Following this meeting, the Convenor of the Review Panel shall provide the Head of School, normally one week before the Review visit, with details of the main areas the Panel wishes to explore during the visit. Where the Panel wishes clarification on minor points, it may make an explicit request for a response before the visit.
- 5.5 The School is not expected to respond in advance of the visit to the items identified and shared by the Convenor of the Review Panel.
- 5.6 The Panel may explore some topics in more than one meeting and will not be restricted from exploring others as they arise during the review event. The Panel may also decide not to raise all of the topics it originally identified.

6 PANEL VISIT

- 6.1 Reviews normally last two days to allow Review Panels time for reflection between meetings with senior School Staff, academic staff and students.
- 6.2 The Panel will visit and meet with individuals and groups of staff and students from the programmes under review. The normal pattern of the visit is:
- A meeting with the Head of School, who may be accompanied by one or two members of senior staff who have delegated responsibility for aspects of the Schools learning, teaching and assessment;
 - Separate meetings with undergraduate and postgraduate students on taught programmes;
 - A meeting with academic staff and others who have pivotal roles in teaching and supporting students or staff (normally without the Head of School). This should include Programme Leaders and up to three additional members of academic staff, technical staff or visiting lecturers who might not otherwise meet with the Review Panel;
 - A meeting with the Head of School to discuss matters that have arisen during the course of the day and to highlight main areas likely to be included in the report. Issues highlighted in this meeting may be shared with colleagues immediately after the Panel visit.

- 6.3 The meetings with the students are held before the meetings with academic staff to allow students' views to be discussed with staff. Panels will not formally review students' work or observe teaching.
- 6.4 The AQO will ask the School to assist in approaching students to participate in the review and meet with the Review Panel. The School will be asked to take steps to ensure that students attending the meetings include representatives from as many sections of the student body as possible. For example:
- Undergraduate student meeting: up to 10 students from across the School and at a variety of levels, and should include class representatives, international and mature students and students on joint programmes (if applicable);
 - Postgraduate student meeting: up to 10 students from across the School, and should include class representatives, international students and students on joint programmes (if applicable).
- 6.5 To facilitate discussion with the students, the meetings may be conducted by splitting the students into smaller groups (maintaining a representative selection as far as possible), led by one or more Panel members. Requirements will be passed to the School in advance of the visit. The Panel may request other meetings.
- 6.6 The Panel may also undertake a tour of the School's accommodation and facilities. These matters will be decided following consultation with the Head of School, Convenor of the Review Panel and the Registrar and Secretary. Any tour should not usually exceed 30 minutes. It should be limited to showing specific areas referred to in the Self-Evaluation Report, contrasting different standards of facilities, or providing an opportunity to view student learning and teaching work. Consideration may be given to conducting a tour on the day before the Review visit if the external member(s) plan to arrive early.
- 6.7 The AQO is responsible for the organisation of the Review visit and for liaising between the School and Convenor over the timetable for the visit. It will liaise with the School regarding suitable accommodation for the review and will organise catering.

7 ENGAGING STUDENTS WITH THE PERIODIC REVIEW PROCESS

- 7.1 Engagement with and the participation of students are vital components of the Periodic Review process.
- 7.2 Student engagement takes place before the review, during the review and following the review. There is also indirect engagement with students' views and feedback through the documentation submitted for the review.

Before the Review

- Schools should inform students about the review at an early opportunity. Consideration should then be given to how and when feedback should be obtained to ensure that the student experience is evaluated and captured meaningfully in the completion of the SER (e.g. via Staff Student Consultative Committees, representative class groups or focus groups). A Periodic Review information sheet for students is available from the AQO .

- The author(s) of the SER should endeavour to liaise with the wider student body on an early draft and later, to seek endorsement prior to submission. To reach beyond class representatives, the School should consider posting a draft of the SER on Canvas so that all undergraduate and taught postgraduate students have the opportunity to comment.
- Student feedback obtained via routine quality mechanisms will also inform the Panel, for example, Staff Student Consultative Committee minutes, NSS feedback, Annual Programme Reports, etc.

During the Review

- The Review Panel includes a student member, which facilitates greater focus on the student experience and provides an additional perspective on other issues from the student point of view.
- Undergraduate and taught postgraduate students are invited to meet with the Review Panel to:
 - share their views on learning, teaching and assessment;
 - comment on their engagement with developments in learning, teaching and assessment;
 - and comment on their wider experience as students at GSA.

After the Review

- It is also important for the Academic School to feedback to students after the review. Following the approval of the Review report by the Academic Council, the AQO will prepare and circulate a summary report to the School. This report is aimed at students and should be provided for consideration at Staff Student Consultative Committees and for posting onto School webpages and/or Canvas.
- The Academic School will be asked to report to the Academic Council on the steps it has taken to provide feedback to students on the outcomes of the review and on the actions undertaken.

8 REVIEW REPORT AND FOLLOW-UP

- 8.1 Following the visit, the Review Panel will produce a full report identifying the key strengths and achievements of the School, along with conclusions and recommendations for enhancement or change.
- 8.2 The Review Report normally follows the structure of the SER. It provides a commentary on the extent to which the Review Panel has been able to verify the School's evaluative statements.
- 8.3 The Convenor of the Panel is responsible for the production of the Review Report, supported by the AQO and in consultation with Panel members.
- 8.4 The Review Report shall contain:
 - a. An evaluation of the quality of the provision under review.
 - b. An evaluation of the School and programme procedures for assuring the academic standards of awards and the quality of provision.

- c. An evaluation of the School and programme approaches to the enhancement of the student learning experience in taught provision.
 - d. An evaluation of how effectively the School and its programmes engage with students in developing teaching, learning and assessment practice, including preparation for the Periodic Review process.
 - e. The identification of good practice for dissemination across GSA, as appropriate.
 - f. Recommendations for action to address any identified weaknesses and to further strengthen provision and thereby further enhance the provision of teaching, learning and assessment.
- 8.5 Normally, the Review Report also addresses the revalidation of individual programmes. The Review Panel will ensure that the Review Report sufficiently addresses scrutiny of individual programme provision and the student experience therein to warrant revalidation. The Review Report shall make specific recommendations for revalidation regarding each programme and may include conditions and recommendations regarding individual programme revalidation.
- 8.6 Revalidation requires approval by the Academic Council. For programmes administered by GSA and delivered jointly with the University of Glasgow, revalidation requires approval from both the Academic Council and the University's Academic Standards Committee. Reporting regarding this shall be managed by the AQO.
- 8.7 The final draft report will normally be made available to the Head of School for the correction of factual inaccuracies or misunderstandings within six weeks of the Review visit. The School will have two weeks to provide comments on factual accuracy. The draft will be sent to the Head of School to be discussed with colleagues, but not to be widely circulated. Any suggested changes to the draft report will be subject to the approval of the Convenor of the Review Panel.
- 8.8 The report is submitted to the Academic Council (via Education Committee) for consideration. The Report is then forwarded to the School and others named in the recommendations for action. The Education Committee will refer to the Academic Council any issues of educational policy that impact beyond the School. The Academic Council, the Senior Leadership Group and the Board of Governors will be advised, as necessary, of recommendations that have more serious academic or resource implications.
- 8.9 Should it prove necessary, the Review Panel may produce a confidential annex to the main report, which is for internal use only by the Directorate. This annex is produced only if there is information that the Panel considers sensitive and inappropriate for the main report e.g. information relating to individuals or interpersonal relations, etc. It might also include specific recommendations relating to the distribution of resources within a School. It is anticipated that the need for a confidential annex will be exceptional. On the occasion that a confidential annex is required, the AQO will notify both the Education Committee and Academic Council as part of its reporting on the outcomes of the review.
- 8.10 As highlighted in paragraph 7.2, the AQO on behalf of the Review Panel will also produce a Periodic Review Student Summary Report in addition to the full Review Report. The Student Summary Report is primarily for a student audience, to be posted on Canvas and considered at Staff Student Consultative Committees in the School being reviewed.

- 8.11 The School will normally, within one month after the Academic Council meeting which approves the Review Report, provide a brief Action Plan explaining how and the deadline by which any conditions and recommendations set by the Review Team have been, or will be, met.
- 8.12 Where conditions and recommendations have a deadline outwith the one-month period following the Academic Council meeting, the School shall submit an update to the Action Plan reporting on these conditions and recommendations within the timescale detailed within the Review Report. The Action Plan will be submitted to the appropriate Academic Council (via Education Committee) for consideration.
- 8.13 The updated Action Plans addressing the recommendations of the Review should be submitted to each Education Committee and Academic Council meeting of the subsequent session until all conditions and recommendations are completed.
- 8.14 The School should also report on the steps it has taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the Review and on the actions taken. This would include how key issues or strengths relating to an individual programme have been monitored and informed by the various methods of student feedback.
- 8.15 The Convenor of the Panel will review the Actions Plans to ensure that the recommendations have been adequately addressed and reported, including evidence of dissemination of these completed conditions and recommendations to students.
- 8.16 A Final Progress Report made in addressing the conditions and recommendations of the Review will be submitted to Academic Council (via Education Committee) approximately one year from the date that the Committee received the Panel's Report.
- 8.17 In addition to reporting to Academic Council, Schools should comment in the next set of Programme Annual Monitoring Reports on the impact of the Periodic Review on the provision.
- 8.18 The Academic Council may request further follow-up reports in certain circumstances, e.g. where progress with conditions and recommendations has been limited or delayed.
- 8.19 In addition to the Action Plan, the School shall undertake new Equality Impact Assessments (EIA) for its taught provision following receipt of the Periodic Review Report, these should be submitted at the same time as the School Action Plan.
- 8.20 Following completion of the Periodic Review Report, the AQO will seek feedback from both members of the Review Panel and also colleagues in the Academic School being reviewed (via a short questionnaire) regarding their experience of the Periodic Review Process. This will enable the AQO to continue enhancing the process ahead of future deliveries.

9 ANNUAL AND THEMATIC REPORTING OF GSA's ILR PROCESSES

- 9.1 The Academic Council will be responsible for maintaining a thematic overview of the outcomes of its Institutional-Led Review Processes (Periodic Review and Revalidation and Student-Facing Professional Services Review). The AQO office will provide the Academic Council with regular updates on the outcomes of individual Periodic Reviews and SFPS Review events, and also provide an annual thematic report to the Periodic Review and Revalidation and SFPS Review reports during the Review Cycle to Education Committee in the spring of each session, which considers key themes, conditions and recommendations, areas of good practice, and areas for

further enhancement. Progress should be reported to the University of Glasgow's Academic Standards Committee via a copy of the relevant extract of the Academic Council minute.

10 EXTERNAL ACCESS TO REPORTS

10.1 Periodic Review Reports, recommendation responses and overview reports are made available to the QAA for annual engagement meetings and Enhancement-led Institutional Review. An annual report is also made to the Scottish Funding Council on the progress with the schedule for and the outcomes of Periodic Reviews.

11 SUMMARY OF THE REVIEW PROCESS AND FOLLOW-UP

Please see the table located in Appendix 1.

Associated Documentation: Self-Evaluation Report Pro forma
Periodic Review: Information for Students

Appendix 1: SUMMARY OF THE REVIEW PROCESS AND FOLLOW-UP

Timescale	Action	By
<i>A six-year cycle of periodic review is created by the Academic Quality Office</i>		
July/Aug prior to review	The Academic Quality Office to hold a briefing meeting with Head and other relevant staff from the School to discuss arrangements for the review and documentation. This includes identifying specific dates for the Review visit.	Academic Quality Office /Head of School
At least 6 months prior to the review	The Academic Quality Office to identify Convenor and internal Review Panel members	Academic Quality Office
At least 3 months prior to the review	School to nominate external subject specialist(s)	Head of School
	School to prepare Self-Evaluation Report (SER) and gather supporting documentation and data	Head/Deputy Head of School
At least 2 months prior to the review	Approval of SER by relevant Board of Studies	Head/Deputy Head of School
No later than 6 weeks prior to the review	School to submit SER and supporting documentation to the Academic Quality Office.	Head/Deputy Head of School
	Academic Quality Office to provide supporting data listed in 4.12 to School	Academic Quality Office
	Circulate documentation to Review Panel	Academic Quality Office
	Review of the SER and documentation by the Review Panel (some further information may be sought at this stage).	Review Panel
4 weeks prior to the visit	The Academic Quality Office to liaise with School to establish a suitable timetable for the Review visit.	Academic Quality Office/Deputy Head of School
	Agree students to attend meeting with the Review Panel and a final list should be provided to Academic Quality Office at least one week before the Review visit (to include name, programme and year of study)	Head/Deputy Head of School
1 week prior to the visit	Review Panel members to provide a report to the Academic Quality Office on any topics for exploration or areas of concern.	Review Panel
	The Convenor of the Review Panel to provide the Head of School with details of the main areas that the Panel wishes to explore during the visit.	Convenor of the Review Panel/Academic Quality Office
Visit	The Review Panel meets with the Head of School, staff and students over two days.	
	At the final meeting, the Convenor will highlight to the Head of School main areas likely to be included in the report.	

Timescale	Action	By
Within six weeks of the visit	Draft report is provided to the Head of School to check for factual accuracy. Any feedback received from the School is subject to approval by the Convenor.	Academic Quality Office
April Education Committee	The report is submitted to the next meeting of Education Committee for consideration.	Academic Quality Office
May Academic Council	The report is submitted to the next meeting of Academic Council for approval.	Academic Quality Office
May University of Glasgow Academic Standards Committee	The report is submitted to the next meeting of Academic Standards Committee for consideration, or for approval for programmes delivered jointly with the University.	Academic Quality Office
Following University of Glasgow Academic Standards Committee	The report is provided to the School for consideration and wider circulation.	Head/Deputy Head of School
Summer	Preparation of Action Plan	Head/Deputy Head of School
	A Student Summary Report to be provided for Staff Student Consultative Committees.	Academic Quality Office
September Education Committee (with progress reports provided to each subsequent meeting of Education Committee)	Consideration of the Action Plan (and any subsequent progress reports).	Head/Deputy Head of School
September Academic Council (with progress reports provided to each subsequent meeting of Academic Council)	Consideration of the Action Plan (and any subsequent progress reports).	Head/Deputy Head of School
May University of Glasgow Academic Standards Committee	Final Progress Report submitted to the next meeting of Academic Standards Committee for consideration	Academic Quality Office