Section 43: BIMM Institute Periodic Review Policy

Policy Overview:

The BIMM Institute policy for periodic review of Higher Education Provision is approved by its' Academic Board and overseen under delegated authority by its sub-committee the Learning, Teaching & Enhancement Committee (LTEC), which considers reports, action plans and themes resulting from periodic reviews. Periodic reviews operate on a risk-based review cycle, of between three and six academic years with a schedule of reviews approved periodically by LTEC and published on the Academic Development & Quality Assurance (ADQA) webpage.[1] Normally, newly approved provision in a subject area may be reviewed after three student intakes, whereas more established subjects where Key Performance Indicators, including annual monitoring data and external examiner reports are consistently positive may be reviewed on a four to six-year cycle.

The periodic review process itself is evaluated on a regular basis, with revisions informed at a national level by sector developments and at a local level through evaluations undertaken by ADQA to ensure it is fit for purpose. Through a robust mapping exercise, BIMM Institute can be assured that the process meets the expectation for standards and quality of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education[2] and, in particular, the guidance provided on course design and development as follows:

> The provider reviews its core practices for quality regularly and uses the outcomes to drive improvement and enhancement. In practice, this means that regular monitoring and evaluation are used to drive improvement and enhancement of course design and development processes.

The ADQA team is responsible for the organisation and management of periodic reviews, working closely with the subject teams under review. For scheduling purposes, reviews are initially grouped as follows:

1. Music courses: music, music performance, music technology and songwriting courses
2. Performing arts courses
3. Music business, event management and media courses
4. Film and screen production courses
5. Postgraduate courses

It is envisaged that reviews will normally be based at a single BIMM Institute college where all or the majority of the courses in a subject cluster are delivered although the review team may also visit a second site if specialist provision is based only at that site. Subjects may also be combined in order to ensure an efficient and logical approach to reviews. Representatives from all other colleges delivering courses in the subject cluster will also attend the review and be considered part of the course teams.

---

[1] https://www.bimm.ac.uk/academic-quality/
[2] https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code

Approved by Academic Board 06/12/19

Aims & Principles:

From a BIMM Institute perspective, periodic review provides a mechanism for the continuing approval of existing provision, together with an opportunity to review and consider incremental modifications that have been made since the last periodic review or course approval. It provides assurance to BIMM Institute of the following:

- Academic standards
- Quality of learning opportunities
- Student experience
- Currency and relevance in relation to the discipline, sector and profession
- Alignment with national and European expectations
- Coherence with BIMM Institutes' strategic priorities
- That the process meets the expectation of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, and its associated guidance on:
    - Course Design and Development[3]
    - Monitoring and Evaluation[4]

From a subject-based perspective, periodic review process provides an opportunity for course teams to consider the provision against a number of factors:

a) Coherence with external reference points such as:

- The UK Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ)
- UK Quality Code: Guidance - Course Design and Development
- UK Quality Code: Guidance - Monitoring and Evaluation
- QAA Subject Benchmark Statements[5]
- Standards & Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ENQA)[6]
- BIMM Institute's Academic and Regulatory Frameworks[7]
- Professional Statutory Regulatory Bodies (PSRB)

b) Compatibility and alignment with internal reference points, for example:

- BIMM Institutes' strategic priorities
- BIMM Institutes' Learning & Teaching Strategy

c) Quality of student experience and parity across locations of delivery (where relevant), for example:

- Learning and teaching methods
- Diversity of assessment that encourages and enables achievement of learning outcomes
- Learning resources
- Equality of opportunity
- Staff development and scholarly activity

d) Effective use of information, for example:

---

[3] https://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/course-design-and-development
[4] https://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/monitoring-and-evaluation
[5] https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/subject-benchmark-statements
[6] https://enqa.eu/index.php/home/esg/
[7] https://www.bimm.ac.uk/academic-quality/

- External examiners' reports, annual monitoring reports, module and course evaluations
- Student retention, progression and achievement data
- Destination of Leavers surveys
- National Student Survey (NSS) and Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES)
- Staff-Student Liaison meetings

Modifications proposed through periodic review

Periodic review provides course teams with an opportunity for reflection and, if desired, a platform to propose revisions to existing provision. Revisions may have been identified through feedback from a variety of stakeholders, for example completion of module evaluations by students and through external examiners' reports, as well as developments in the relevant subject area and the creative industries sector. Modifications may also result from changes to staffing and their expertise.

Course teams are encouraged to consult at an early stage with ADQA for advice regarding the extent of any modifications proposed to ensure that the correct process is followed. For example, modifications of a minor nature can be dealt with through consultation through Boards of Studies and the production of revised student course handbooks with an explanatory overview in the self-evaluation document (SED). However, where more major modifications are proposed, then ADQA will need to be consulted which should include circulation of documentation such as rationale for modification, revised module/course specifications and a draft student course handbook. This consultation should be undertaken well in advance of the review, allowing time for adjustment of documentation based on ADQA comments, and the production of a summary of feedback from stakeholders on the proposals together with a response from the course team/s.

Course team/s are encouraged to consult relevant stakeholders through Industry Advisory Panels (IAPs), Course Team Meetings and Boards of Studies (BoS) at an early stage in the discussions concerning course revisions.