

## Summary of key stages

Activity - what	Lead responsibility - who	Timescale - when
Schedule the faculty review cycle for a six year period	<b>Head of Department of Academic Quality</b> in consultation with Deans and senior faculty staff	At the start of each six year cycle, with interim review of the schedule after three years
Identify subject teams with a nominated leader for each subject group to be reviewed	<b>Head of Department/School</b> in consultation with the Dean and senior faculty staff	In the spring term of the session before the review is scheduled to take place
Briefing meeting	<b>Quality Officer (Review and Improvement)</b> to initiate	In the spring term of the session before the review is scheduled to take place
Evaluate the provision and draft a Self-Evaluation Document (SED)	<b>Subject contact</b> with Learning and Teaching Senior Adviser support as well as input from the faculty Head of Quality	Commence this process at least six months before the review
Nominate the review panel	<b>Subject contact</b> and <b>DAQ</b> representatives (externals to be approved by <b>faculty Head of Quality and/or Dean</b> prior to presentation to appointments sub-committee)	Panel members suggested at briefing meeting
Fix date for the review and confirm panel	<b>Quality Officer (Review and Improvement)</b> in consultation with faculty staff and panel members	Once externals nominated and approved
Fix date for the preliminary meeting with the chair	<b>Faculty administrator</b> in consultation with subject contact and panel	Once administrative arrangements have been handed over
Collate supporting information	<b>Subject contact</b> working with faculty administrator	Commence this at least three months before the review
SED forwarded to faculty Head of Quality and Dean for approval and briefing statement	<b>Subject contact, faculty Head of Quality and Dean</b>	Approximately ten weeks before the review
SED forwarded to students for commentary	<b>Subject contact</b> , with assistance from Learning and Teaching Senior Adviser if sought	Approximately ten weeks before the review
Circulate SED and advance materials	<b>Subject contact</b> working with faculty administrator	Eight weeks before the review
Preliminary meeting	<b>Review panel chair</b> and <b>servicing officer</b>	Four weeks before the review
Brief participants: team members, students and employers (if appropriate)	<b>Subject contact</b>	Four weeks before the review
The review	<b>Review panel chair</b> and <b>servicing officer</b>	
Draft enhancement plan circulated	<b>Review panel chair</b> and <b>servicing officer</b>	One week after the review
Final report and enhancement plan circulated	<b>Review panel chair</b> and <b>servicing officer</b>	Six weeks after the review
Presentation of approved report to programme board and Faculty Academic Committee (FAC)	<b>Subject leader</b> (programme board) <b>Faculty Head of Quality (FAC)</b>	Two months after the review
Presentation of report and faculty response to the Academic Quality and Standards Committee (AQSC)	<b>Subject leader</b>	Six months after the review
Monitoring of outcomes by the programme board and FAC	<b>Subject leader</b>	In line with the dates in the enhancement plan
Interim monitoring of enhancement plan	<b>Quality Officer (Review and Improvement)</b> to initiate with subject team	Approximately 12-18 months after the review

