Curriculum Review Reference Panels – Guidance for Panel Members

Thank you for agreeing to be a member of a Curriculum Review Reference Panel. In undertaking this role you will be supporting departments in reviewing their taught course provision to take account of the College’s new Learning and Teaching Strategy and to embed the four pillars of the Strategy:

- a review of our curricula and assessment
- an evidence-based transformation of our pedagogy to make teaching more interactive
- the fostering of an inclusive and diverse culture
- the use of online and digital tools to enhance curricula

This guidance note is intended to provide practical advice to panel members, and to help ensure a consistency of approach and equity of support between panels.

1) Purpose of Curriculum Review Reference Panels

a) The full Terms of Reference for the Curriculum Review Reference Panels are appended to this guidance note (appendix 1).

b) The purpose of Curriculum Review Reference Panels is to undertake peer-review scrutiny of programmes presented through Curriculum Review and to:

i) provide advice and guidance to departments and make recommendations for enhancement on the revised curricula in terms of content and presentation;

ii) ensure that the review of taught course provision has been undertaken with due regard for the Learning and Teaching Strategy;

iii) ensure that the revised curricula are in accordance with the College’s academic policy and the new regulatory framework set out in the single set of academic regulations and any additional accreditation requirements set out by Professional Regulatory or Statutory Bodies;

iv) review and endorse all programme and module specifications prior to their submission to the relevant Faculty Education Committee.

v) provide assurance to the Programmes Committee that modules have been developed to meet College requirements within the new modular structure.

2) Composition and Roles of Panel Members

a) The composition of panels, as stated in the Terms of Reference, are:

i) Member of Programmes Committee (from a different Faculty)

ii) Chair of FEC or their nominated member of the relevant FEC

iii) At least two members of academic staff or teaching fellows

iv) EDU representation

v) QA Team representation

b) Panel Convener - The member of Programmes Committee will act as Convener of the Panel and will lead the interaction with assigned departments in the first instance.

c) Panel members will work together as peers with their assigned departments and with other panel members to provide a ‘friendly critical eye’ to programmes presented
Curriculum Review

through Curriculum Review.

d) Work in reviewing and scrutinising the programmes is expected to be distributed evenly between panel members, although some specific responsibility may be delegated to panel members with particular knowledge or expertise. For example, the QA representative may provide specific guidance on the College’s academic policy.

3) Confirmation of Panels

a) A full list of reference panel members and the departments they have been assigned to support is appended to this guidance note (appendix 2).

4) Committee Structure and Timelines

a) The College’s normal course approval processes will apply to all taught courses which are reviewed through Curriculum Review.

i) Programmes will be considered firstly by the relevant Faculty Education Committee (FEC) and then Programmes Committee (PC), which will recommend approval of the courses to the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (QAEC).

b) Reference Panels should work with departments to agree a feasible timeline of submission to the relevant FEC and to Programmes Committee.

c) Faculty Education Committees – meeting dates and paperwork deadlines can be found here: www.imperial.ac.uk/about/governance/academic-governance/faculty-and-departmental-governance

d) Programmes Committee – meeting dates and paperwork deadlines are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee dates (Academic year 2018/19)</th>
<th>Submission deadlines (Academic year 2018/19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 September 2018</td>
<td>21 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 October 2018</td>
<td>25 September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 November 2018</td>
<td>06 November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 January 2019</td>
<td>14 December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 February 2019</td>
<td>29 January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 March 2019</td>
<td>05 March 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Programmes to be rolled-out for the 2019/20 academic year must have been approved by Programmes Committee by 31st March 2019.

5) Supporting Departments

a) Reference Panels will agree how best to conduct the process through the review of the programme documentation and through meetings with departmental representatives and student representatives as required throughout the process.

b) Reference Panels are encouraged to work with departments in a flexible manner, and to develop a conversation with the departmental Curriculum Review team in relation to the development and scrutiny of their programme. It is likely that Reference Panels will engage with departments with a case-by-case approach. However, an example approach is detailed below for indication.
c) **Example Approach**

i) The Reference Panel agrees a timeline of 2-3 review meetings with the departmental Curriculum Review team between August – November 2018, including dates for submitting paperwork to the Reference Panel to allow time for review;

ii) Prior to meetings, working Curriculum Review paperwork is uploaded to SharePoint for the Reference Panel to review and comment on;

iii) During the meetings feedback from the Reference Panel is discussed with the departmental Curriculum Review team; any needs for refinement and further support are identified; actions prior to the next meeting defined and agreed upon;

(1) Further meetings with specific Reference Panel members might be required (e.g. discussion with EDU or QA representative)

iv) The Reference Panel and departmental Curriculum Review team agree an appropriate date for submission to FEC and Programmes Committee

v) A final meeting or off-line review is held to determine if the Reference Panel is prepared to endorse programmes at FEC and PC, in good time for submission to FEC paperwork deadline.

d) If the Reference Panel is not prepared to endorse a programme at committee, this should be discussed with the department within good time and a discussion should be to convey feedback and agree a revised timescale for submission to the relevant committee.

6) **Review of Programmes**

a) Programmes should be reviewed in their entirety. This includes review of programmes specifications, module level outlines for all years of the programme (including electives).

b) The Reference Panel must also have sight of the Curriculum redesign proposal form, which is to be submitted by way of a covering sheet to FEC and Programmes Committee.

c) In reviewing programmes and providing advice and guidance to departments, the Curriculum Review Reference panel are recommended to consider the following prompt questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has the Curriculum Review versions of the Programmes Specification Template and Module Outline Template been used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are departments developing the Curriculum redesign proposal form?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are programmes appropriately structured within the new modular framework?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do departments have any outstanding needs for support/guidance? How might these best be addressed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do the 10 - 12 programme-level learning outcomes reflect and capture the essence of the programme and expected year on year progression?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do the programme-level learning outcomes integrate and enable students to attain the Imperial Graduate Attributes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do the learning outcomes reflect present disciplinary contexts and future directions?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent do the module-level learning outcomes contribute to, and align to, the programme-level learning outcomes? How can this alignment be improved?

To what extent are optional learning pathways clear and do each of these enable achievement of the programme-level learning outcomes?

Are the programme and modular-level learning outcomes pitched at the appropriate level and build in complexity?

**Assessment and Feedback**

- Do assessments enable assessment and feedback on students’ mastery of important skills and behaviours/attitudes, as well as their knowledge?
- Will the range of assessment methods enable all students to demonstrate their ability to achieve the learning outcomes?
- Are there an appropriate number and range of assessment methods at each level?
- Are assessments spread throughout the year to enable students to monitor their study strategies and to learn from and feed forward their teachers’ feedback?
- Are summative assessments positioned to capture the student’s final integrated learning?
- Will students understand what is expected of them for each assessment and how to use feedback to guide their learning?

**Research-based**

- Are there opportunities for students to experience the disciplinary research culture?
- In what ways will students taught how to formulate and answer research questions and learn by discovery?
- In what ways will students learn research design, method, analysis and interpretation and to communicate research to diverse audiences?
- When will students learn about research integrity and their role in promoting and maintaining a culture of honesty, openness and responsibility?
- What are the opportunities for students to develop independent problem solving skills and approaches to evidence-based evaluation?
- Does the programme enable a diverse student body to answer the questions and solve the problems that are of interest and relevance to them, both in terms of content and method?

**Active and Inclusive Learning**

- Does each module incorporate a range of opportunities for student participation?
- Are active learning pedagogies employed? e.g. peer-learning, team-based learning and problem-based learning.
- Which labs could benefit from a less prescriptive and a more enquiry, research-based format?
- How are students supported in learning Higher Education and disciplinary terminology and the intentions and expectations behind aspects of their programme?
- Do examples, cases studies and ideas represent a range of experiences and perspectives, along the lines of culture, gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion and age?
- Does group work make use of the diversity of student experience and background available in the cohort?

**Digital**

- How can the online/blended content be deployed most effectively to transform pedagogy and enhance student learning experience?
- Do the classroom activities within flipped classroom allow students to engage with (or apply) concepts that were covered online? Is there sufficient space created in the curriculum to allow for student preparation and thinking?
- How is technology used to facilitate active and inclusive learning in the classroom (and outside of the classroom)?
- Are there appropriate learning analytics behind the tools used to help evaluate student engagement?
What are the opportunities/roles for students to student engagement in online peer learning (e.g., as UG and PG Teaching Assistants)

Evaluation and Research

Are specific goals of the changes planned established and articulated?

How will the success and effectiveness of the changes be evaluated?

How will this evaluation be used to inform ongoing improvement?

How will deeper insights into the nature of the student experience, at module and programme levels, be gained?

Can the students’ achievements be benchmarked against enduring/established standards?

How could the changes contribute to the educational research community, both within Imperial and beyond?

7) Resources and Further Support for Reference Panels

a) Further resources developed to support Curriculum Review can be found on the Resources for Staff page on the Learning and Teaching Strategy webpages: www.imperial.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching-strategy/resources

b) Departments may find it useful to engage with the Educational Development Unit’s Teaching Toolkit: www.imperial.ac.uk/staff/educational-development/teaching-toolkit

c) If further support and guidance needs are identified by the Reference Panel these can be referred to the Project Manager (Learning and Teaching Strategy) – Hailey Smith (hailey.smith@imperial.ac.uk).
The Curriculum Review process has been developed to support departments who are reviewing their taught course provision to take account of the College’s new Learning and Teaching Strategy and to embed the four pillars of the Strategy:

- a review of our curricula and assessment
- an evidence-based transformation of our pedagogy to make teaching more interactive
- the fostering of an inclusive and diverse culture
- the use of online and digital tools to enhance curricula, pedagogy and community

The Review process will also ensure that programmes adopt the new modular framework which has been approved by the College Senate.

The College’s normal course approval processes will apply to all taught courses which are reviewed through Curriculum Review with consideration firstly by the relevant Faculty Education Committee and then Programmes Committee, which will recommend approval of the courses to the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee.

The Role of the Reference Panel will be to undertake the peer-review scrutiny of programmes presented through Curriculum Review, and to:

1. provide advice and guidance to Departments and make recommendations for enhancement on the revised curricula in terms of content and presentation;
2. ensure that the review of taught course provision has been undertaken with due regard for the Learning and Teaching Strategy;
3. ensure that the revised curricula are in accordance with the College’s academic policy and the new regulatory framework set out in the single set of academic regulations and any additional accreditation requirements set out by Professional Regulatory or Statutory Bodies;
4. review and endorse all programme and module specifications prior to their submission to the relevant Faculty Education Committee.
5. provide assurance to the Programmes Committee that modules have been developed to meet College requirements within the new modular structure.

The Reference Panel will agree how best to conduct the process through the review of the programme documentation and through meetings with departmental representatives and student representatives as required throughout the process.
## (Appendix 2) Curriculum Review Reference Panels – Composition and Assigned Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Panel 1</th>
<th>Panel 2</th>
<th>Panel 3</th>
<th>Panel 4</th>
<th>Panel 5</th>
<th>Panel 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of Programmes Committee (from a different Faculty)</td>
<td>Lorraine Craig</td>
<td>Vijay Tymms</td>
<td>Sue Smith</td>
<td>Jolande Bot-Vos</td>
<td>Betty Yue</td>
<td>Roberto Trotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of FEC or their nominated member of the relevant FEC</td>
<td>Huw Williams</td>
<td>Lorenzo Picinali</td>
<td>Martyn Boutelle</td>
<td>Errikos Levis</td>
<td>David Evans</td>
<td>Jo Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional FEC representative/teaching fellow</td>
<td>Laura Patel</td>
<td>Bassam Izzuddin</td>
<td>Jason Riley</td>
<td>Martin Blunt</td>
<td>Mike Tennant</td>
<td>Don Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional FEC representative/teaching fellow</td>
<td>Mark Pope</td>
<td>Esther Perea</td>
<td>Andy Brand</td>
<td>Jeffrey Vernon</td>
<td>Carl Paterson / Bob Forsyth</td>
<td>Sophie Rutschmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU representative</td>
<td>Kate Ippolito</td>
<td>Tiffany Chiu</td>
<td>Iro Ntonia</td>
<td>Monika Pazio</td>
<td>Mark Anderson</td>
<td>Jo Horsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA Team representative</td>
<td>Lucy Heming</td>
<td>Kirstie Ward</td>
<td>Scott Tucker</td>
<td>Men-Yeut Wong</td>
<td>Judith Webster</td>
<td>Judith Webster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>FoNS</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>FoNS</th>
<th>Medicine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Aeronautics</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>Dyson</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>MBBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
<td>Computing</td>
<td>EEE</td>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>PGT progs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>(BMB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechan Eng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>