Periodic Curriculum Review (PCR) Protocol

Supersedes the Periodic Programme Review (PPR) Procedure

Document record

Field	Detail
Maintained by	Quality Assurance
Owned by	University Education and Student Experience Committee (UESEC)
Approval date	November 2026

Version history

Version	Amendments	Amended by	Date	Approved by
1.0	New Protocol replacing the Periodic Programme Review (PPR) Procedure.	Quality Assurance	Nov 2026	PVC Education

Contents

1 Introduction 4
2 Purpose and Principles 4
3 Overview of PCR 5
4 Timeline 5
5 The Review Event 6
6 Outcomes and Reporting 7
7 Documentation and Evidence Requirements 8
8 Panels 12
9 Responsibilities 13
10 Presenting Programme Documentation and Proposing Modifications 14
11 Committee Approval of PCR Documentation 14
12 PCR and External Accreditation 14
13 Modification of Programmes outside PCR 15
14 New Programmes, Title Changes and Withdrawals 15
15 Alignment with External Reference Points and Internal Policies 15
Appendix A Schedule for Periodic Curriculum Review 16

1 Introduction

1.1 Periodic Curriculum Review (PCR) is the process through which a subject's taught programmes are reviewed, modified and re-approved through self-evaluation and peer review.

1.2 PCR gives the University confidence in the continuing standards, currency, coherence and relevance of a subject's provision, and that all students are able to achieve their intended learning outcomes.

1.3 The Protocol adheres to the expectations of the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education and its Advice and Guidance on Monitoring and Evaluation, and to the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG) 2015, Part 1.

1.4 PCR provides a structured opportunity to reflect periodically on student achievement and experience, academic standards, and the continuing currency and relevance of provision. It is central to the University's quality assurance and enhancement arrangements, and to ensuring that programmes deliver a high-quality academic experience and support progression to further study and professional employment.

1.5 PCR is undertaken by a Panel of internal and external academics, student representatives and representatives of Professional services, chaired by a senior member of Brunel academic staff who is independent of the subject under review. For Brunel Pathway College (BPC), the role of external academics is undertaken by Brunel academic staff who are not involved with the pathway provision.

Scope

1.6 PCR covers all taught programmes delivered by the University, organised into "subject" groupings of one or more related programmes. Each subject is normally reviewed on a five-year cycle, in accordance with the schedule approved by UESEC (Appendix A).

1.7 With College Management Board approval, cognate subjects may be grouped and considered under a single review. The schedule at Appendix A identifies where this is the case.

1.8 For BPC, PCR is undertaken for Foundation and pre-Masters programmes. Alternative Level 4 and Level 5 provision at BPC is reviewed through the associated Brunel programme's PCR, which will typically require corresponding mandatory changes to the BPC alternative Level 4 and Level 5.

2 Purpose and Principles

2.1 The purpose of PCR is to enable the University to assure the continued quality and standards of its programmes and to identify enhancements. Through PCR, the University confirms that programmes maintain academic standards (in line with the FHEQ and relevant Subject Benchmark Statements), deliver a high-quality learning experience, and produce successful student outcomes.

2.2 PCR combines reflective self-evaluation by the programme team with constructive peer scrutiny by the Panel, embedding a culture of continuous improvement. It applies the QAA's

principles for monitoring and evaluation, robust data, student and stakeholder feedback, and alignment with institutional mission and strategy and meets ESG Standard 1.9 by confirming that programmes remain up to date, relevant to societal need, and delivered in a supportive learning environment. Actions and modifications arising from PCR are documented and followed through, and resulting improvements are communicated to staff and students.

Enhancement focus

2.3 PCR is an opportunity to align provision with the University's strategic priorities and sector good practice. Programme teams are expected to demonstrate that the curriculum is:

- research-informed and industry-relevant, supporting graduate employability through practical experience and employer engagement;
- inclusive and accessible, enabling all students to succeed and actively addressing awarding gaps; and
- sustainable, mapping learning outcomes to relevant UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and embedding sustainable practice in the curriculum.

2.4 These dimensions, academic rigour, industry alignment, inclusivity and sustainability, are integral to the evaluative scope of PCR and are examined through the self-evaluation and the Panel's scrutiny (Sections 7 and 8).

3 Overview of PCR

3.1 PCR involves: (a) review of a subject's taught programmes in the context of academic standards, student and stakeholder feedback, student outcomes and programme design; and (b) scrutiny of the programmes, including any proposed modifications, leading to re-approval for a period of five years.

3.2 A review is conducted over one or more days, depending on the complexity of the provision, and all PCR meetings are held online unless otherwise arranged.

3.3 To conduct a review effectively, the Panel considers the matters set out below, drawing on the indicated evidence base. The precise agenda, and the time devoted to each area, are confirmed once the pre-review student meeting has taken place.

Consideration	Evidence base / data
Academic standards	External Examiner reports; alignment of learning outcomes with the FHEQ and Subject Benchmark Statements; PSRB accreditation outcomes.
Student and stakeholder feedback	Pre-review student meeting; survey data (NSS, module evaluation, internal surveys); PSRB reports; employer and industry advisory feedback.
Student outcomes	Continuation, completion and progression data (OfS B3 measures); attainment and award profiles; awarding-gap (EDI) analysis; Graduate Outcomes data.
Programme design — curriculum	Programme Specifications and Module (Block) Outlines; Subject Benchmark Statements; Curriculum and Assessment Mapping.

Consideration	Evidence base / data
Programme design — teaching and assessment	Programme Specifications and Module (Block) Outlines; stakeholder feedback; External Examiner reports; alignment with the University's Education and Student Experience strategy.

4 Timeline

4.1 The indicative timeline for PCR is set out below, with lead times expressed relative to the Review Event (Week 0). The timeline follows the established schedule and may be adjusted for practical scheduling; subjects are advised to begin planning programme changes well ahead of the formal timeline.

Stage	Timing
Planning discussions	January of the year prior to the year of review
Window for PCR identified	−20 weeks
Chair approved	−18 weeks
Confirmation of PCR date	−16 weeks
Panel approved	−12 weeks
Meeting invitations issued to Panel and students	−12 weeks
Submission of documentation	−4 weeks
Documentation circulated to Panel	−2 weeks
Pre-review student meeting	−2 weeks
Confirmation of agenda	−1 week
Review Event	Week 0
Conditions (where applicable) agreed by College	+1 week
Report of the Review Event	+1 week after conditions are met

4.2 A scoping meeting should take place at the outset, between the subject under review and department or College representatives, to identify expected outcomes and agree the areas of focus for the self-evaluation and any proposed modifications.

4.3 For BPC provision, consultation meetings with representatives of the associated Brunel departments must take place before documentation is submitted. A minimum of two meetings is required: an initial meeting to discuss proposed modifications, and a final meeting to agree the revised documents and proposals. Minutes of the final meeting, recording the agreement of all associated Brunel departments, must be submitted with the review documentation; where agreement is reached by correspondence, evidence should be appended to the minutes.

4.4 A review normally takes place in Term 1, enabling approved programme or module changes to be implemented for the following academic year. The timescale for implementing changes

depends on the timing of the event and the nature of the changes. Panels confirm that changes are approved and should be implemented, but are not required to fix precise implementation dates.

5 The Review Event

5.1 The Review Event is the formal meeting of the Panel with the subject under review. It lasts at least one day, with the total duration determined by the complexity of the provision. Where a review runs over more than one day, the first day will typically include the private Panel meeting and the meeting with the subject.

5.2 The Review Event day is normally structured as follows.

Activity	Purpose
Private Panel meeting	Panel members discuss the self-evaluation, supporting data and the programmes submitted (including any proposed modifications), and agree the conversation points to raise with the subject team.
Meeting with the subject	The Panel explores the agreed conversation points with the subject team.
Private Panel meeting	The Panel identifies commendations, confirms re-approval of all programmes and any modifications, and agrees recommendations and/or conditions.
Feedback meeting with the subject	The Panel informs the subject of the outcome of the review.

6 Outcomes and Reporting

6.1 PCR results in two principal outcomes for the subject: a recommendation to the College Education Committee for re-approval of the programmes; and an Action Plan. Verbal feedback on the draft outcomes and Action Plan is provided at the close of the Review Event.

Outcome	Explanation	Implementation
Recommendation for re-approval	All programmes considered are recommended to the relevant College Education Committee for re-approval for a period of five years, confirming ongoing suitability of curriculum, learning outcomes, structure, pedagogy and assessment strategy. Any conditions must be met before re-approval is confirmed.	Modifications approved through PCR are implemented on an appropriate timescale. Revised Programme Specifications and Module (Block) Outlines are published for the year in which they take effect.

Outcome	Explanation	Implementation
Action Plan	A plan identifying specific actions for the subject, which may include conditions and recommendations.	Actions are monitored by the Board of Studies and Department Management Board until completed or closed. College Education Committees maintain oversight through annual monitoring.

6.2 A PCR outcome may include one or more of the following:

- **Commendations** — recognition of good practice.
- **Recommendations** — suggestions for the further enhancement of a programme, which do not require a formal response for the review to be concluded.
- **Conditions** — specific actions that must be addressed before re-approval of a programme can be confirmed. Where a condition is attached to a programme, the programme is not re-approved until the condition is met.

6.3 A draft Action Plan is provided to the subject and College shortly after the event; the College endorses it and, where necessary, consults the Panel Chair. Conditions should normally be addressed within four weeks of the Action Plan being endorsed.

6.4 Where a condition requires significant revision to a programme, an appropriate timescale is set. This may also require the Panel, or selected members where appropriate, to reconvene virtually to review the modified programme(s) and confirm re-approval.

6.5 Following confirmation by the Chair that all conditions in an Action Plan have been met, the review is considered closed and Quality Assurance produces the PCR Outcome Report. The report typically includes an executive summary; the context of the review (date, Panel membership, programmes reviewed); how the review was conducted; the documentation considered; the commendations, conditions and recommendations; and the conclusion on re-approval.

Reporting

6.6 The PCR Outcome Report is submitted to the associated College Education Committee, which considers the recommendation for re-approval and confirms the outcome. The College Education Committee reports PCR activity to UESEC. Reviews relating to Brunel Pathway provision are reported to UESEC.

6.7 Systemic issues identified through PCR, for example, matters affecting multiple programmes or requiring a policy change may be escalated to University-level committees. Effective and innovative practice identified through review may be disseminated more widely across the University.

7 Documentation and Evidence Requirements

7.1 PCR is a paperless process; all documentation is provided electronically and shared with Panel members via Microsoft Teams. All documentation is gathered by, or submitted to, the

Quality Assurance Manager assigned to the review. The Pre-review Student Meeting Summary is circulated to the Panel as a separate document once available.

7.2 The documentation required for PCR is set out below.

Document / evidence	New or existing	Owner
Self-Evaluation Document (PCR-SED)	New	Subject area
PSRB / accrediting body reports covering the review period	Existing	Subject area
Programme Specifications and Module (Block) Outlines, with proposed modifications shown by tracked changes	Existing (from the Programme Documentation Repository)	Subject area
Curriculum and Assessment Mapping for each programme	New / updated	Subject area
Revised or new HEAR statements (if applicable)	Existing & new	Subject area
Pre-review Student Meeting Summary	New	Quality Assurance Manager
Previous PPR / PCR report	Existing	Quality Assurance
Annual monitoring data covering the review period	Existing	Quality Assurance
External Examiner reports and responses covering the review period	Existing	Quality Assurance
Destination / Graduate Outcomes data	Existing	Professional Development Centre
Student feedback data (NSS; module evaluation)	Existing	Strategic Planning

7.3 The Self-Evaluation Document (PCR-SED) is a reflective narrative (typically 10–15 pages) supported by the evidence above. It should address each of the domains below, cross-reference the evidence clearly, and note alignment with internal and external reference points where relevant.

Academic standards

7.4 Confirm that programme learning outcomes align with the Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) at the appropriate level and meet any relevant Subject Benchmark Statements. Summarise External Examiner feedback across the review period — including any themes such as grade distribution, academic rigour or comparability with other institutions — and how issues were addressed. Where the programme is accredited by a PSRB, reference the latest accreditation outcomes and how any conditions or recommendations were addressed.

Student and stakeholder feedback

7.5 Analyse student feedback and other stakeholder input since the last review. Cover student satisfaction metrics (NSS for undergraduate programmes; module evaluation and internal

survey data), identifying trends and areas of high or low satisfaction and the actions taken in response. Include feedback from student–staff liaison committees, focus groups and other consultations, together with employer and industry feedback (for example, from an industry advisory board, alumni surveys or placement providers).

Student outcomes and key performance indicators

7.6 Provide a data-driven evaluation of student achievement and progression over the past five years (or since the last review), covering recruitment (intake size and entry profile), progression and retention (continuation and attrition), completion, and degree outcomes (classification profiles). Analysis of the OfS B3 measures: continuation, completion, and progression to graduate employment or further study, is expected, benchmarked against sector or competitor data where possible, alongside NSS results and Graduate Outcomes data. The evaluation should also address:

- **Equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI):** awarding-gap data, differences in outcomes between student groups (for example by ethnicity, gender or disability). Where significant gaps exist, acknowledge them and set out planned actions consistent with the University's equity commitments.
- **"Problematic" modules:** identify any modules with high failure rates or notably lower student performance, and discuss possible causes and remedies (such as curriculum changes or additional support).
- **Engagement data:** where systematically recorded (for example, attendance via SEAtS), include data to inform discussion of student engagement.

Curriculum design and coherence

7.7 Review the programme's curriculum structure, content and any proposed modifications. Explain how the curriculum remains current in light of new knowledge and disciplinary or industry developments, and how modules build student knowledge, skills and attributes progressively. Where multiple programmes are reviewed together, describe how pathways or specialisations diverge or overlap and how consistency of quality is maintained. Set out any proposed curriculum changes (new modules, credit rebalancing, assessment changes, or alignment with new frameworks), justified with reference to evidence, and confirm that overall programme aims and learning outcomes remain appropriate.

7.8 **The 30-credit structure:** programme teams are encouraged to move from a 15-credit to a 30-credit modular structure. A programme with a mixed 15/30-credit structure undergoing PCR for the first time is expected to transition to 30-credit blocks as part of the review, unless exempted for sound pedagogic or PSRB reasons. Any such restructuring should be explained here.

Learning outcomes and alignment

7.9 Confirm that programme learning outcomes (LOs) are aligned to the correct FHEQ level for the award (for example, Level 6 for a bachelor's degree, Level 7 for a master's) and correspond appropriately to module (block) learning outcomes. Typically a programme has approximately 6–8 programme-level LOs per award, and each 30-credit module approximately 3–6 LOs; review whether the count and scope align with these norms. All LOs must be assessable and measurable, using clear action verbs appropriate to the level.

7.10 Learning outcomes should also be inclusive and avoid inadvertently excluding any group of students, for example, rephrasing "Verbally present a pitch to a live audience" as "Present a pitch to a target audience using an appropriate format", which allows students to demonstrate the skill through various modalities. Check the LOs against the latest Subject Benchmark Statement and, where applicable, PSRB competencies or industry standards, and highlight any proposed changes (for example, to reflect digital literacy or sustainability).

Teaching, learning and assessment strategy

7.11 Evaluate how teaching methods and assessment design facilitate achievement of the learning outcomes. Describe the range of teaching approaches used and their effectiveness for the subject and cohort, noting any innovation or good practice (for example, technology-enhanced learning, flipped-classroom elements or research-led projects).

7.12 Set out the assessment strategy and confirm that assessments are mapped to the learning outcomes; every programme LO should be assessed through one or more tasks, and each assessment should correspond to one or more LOs, with multiple opportunities to demonstrate each outcome by the end of the programme. Review the assessment load, variety and authenticity, identifying and addressing any over-assessment, and comment on feedback processes and student perceptions drawing on NSS assessment and feedback data. The narrative must align with the Curriculum and Assessment Mapping (below) and the Assessment Strategy Statement in the Programme Specification. Assessment briefs and marking criteria should include guidance on good academic practice and the use of generative AI.

Inclusivity and accessibility

7.13 Set out how the programme embeds inclusive curriculum, teaching and assessment design, for example, making lecture content available in advance, applying universal design for learning principles, offering a variety of assessment types, and providing alternative assessment arrangements where needed so that no group is disadvantaged. Reference the awarding-gap data and the measures being taken to close any gaps and demonstrate alignment with the University's equality and inclusion strategies. Competence standards should be clearly defined, so that alternative assessment arrangements can be made without compromising them.

Employability and graduate skills

7.14 Evaluate how the programme develops students' employability and transferable skills and connects with employment opportunities. Map where in the curriculum the University's five graduate-attribute clusters: critical thinking; communication; digital and information literacy; professionalism and wellbeing; and sustainability and ethics are introduced and developed, citing specific modules or co-curricular activities. Describe any placement or internship opportunities, industry projects, employer involvement and professional accreditation, and how the programme supports career development (for example, through the Professional Development Centre). Employability should be an embedded, ongoing effort; describe any new initiatives planned. The PCR Employability Guidance sets out the graduate attributes and the practices that support graduate employability, and how the evaluation is recorded in the PCR-SED, including a RAG rating of programme learning outcomes against the five graduate attributes.

Sustainability and global outlook

7.15 State how and where sustainability themes (Education for Sustainable Development) are covered in the curriculum, from discipline-specific content to broader skills such as systems thinking and ethical reasoning. Map the relevant UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to learning outcomes or modules, for example, an engineering programme might map outcomes to SDG 9 or SDG 7, and a business programme to SDG 8 and note any sustainability-related projects, research opportunities or campus initiatives. Where sustainability is not yet evident in the curriculum, reflect on opportunities to embed it.

Previous action plans and enhancements

7.16 Report on progress against recommendations or conditions from the last periodic review (PPR or PCR) and any action plans from annual monitoring and outline major changes since the last review (new pathways, curriculum overhaul, and so on). This demonstrates a closed feedback loop.

Summary of proposed changes

7.17 Provide a concise checklist of all modifications submitted for approval as part of PCR, for example, new or withdrawn modules, credit changes, revised programme learning outcomes, or changed assessment patterns. Each change should be justified in the preceding narrative; the checklist ensures nothing is overlooked in approval. The checklist is provided in Appendix 1 of the PCR-SED, together with the description and rationale for each change required by paragraph 10.1.

Curriculum and Assessment Mapping

7.18 The submission must include a completed Curriculum and Assessment Mapping for each programme under review. It comprises a Curriculum Map (programme LOs as rows and modules as columns, showing the FHEQ level of each module, indicating where each LO is introduced (I), developed (D) and assessed (A), and distinguishing compulsory from optional modules) and an Assessment Map (each assessment component per module and how it maps to LOs). The mapping verifies that all LOs are appropriately covered and that the volume, variety and weighting of assessment are balanced, and it reveals any gaps (unassessed LOs) or over-assessment. The Curriculum and Assessment Mapping Template is provided for this purpose and includes an optional row for mapping the UN Sustainable Development Goals (paragraph 7.15).

7.19 For each assessment item, specify: duration (for an exam or test); word count or equivalent (for coursework); weighting as a percentage of the module mark; coursework type (essay, report, presentation, portfolio, and so on); and whether it involves group work (clearly indicated, for example "(G)"). The mapping must be kept accurate and up to date with any proposed changes, and must be consistent with the Assessment Strategy Statement in the Programme Specification. Panels use the mapping to identify misalignments and to frame questions, so a well-prepared map and a coherent assessment narrative pre-empt such concerns.

Programme documentation

7.20 Submit the updated Programme Specification(s) and Module (Block) Outlines for all provision under review, drawn from the Programme Documentation Repository, with changes shown by tracked changes (see Section 10). Specifications should use the latest template and reflect any revisions to aims, learning outcomes, module diet or regulations

being approved through PCR. Provide a change log or commentary so Panel members can readily identify alterations. Documentation must be internally consistent with the PCR-SED and the mapping — for example, a new module must appear in the specification, the outline and the map, with matching learning outcomes. Where multiple programmes are reviewed, include all relevant specifications and clarify any shared modules or combined teaching.

Evidence appendices

7.21 The following evidence is typically appended or made available to the Panel:

- External Examiner reports (last 3–5 years) and any departmental responses;
- NSS summary data (last 5 years) and internal survey or module evaluation summaries;
- statistical data tables (admissions, progression, awards, and demographic breakdowns to identify awarding gaps);
- the latest PSRB accreditation report or review letter, if applicable;
- previous action plans (from the last periodic review or annual monitoring); and
- supporting strategies or frameworks referenced, and any case studies or student testimonials illustrating specific innovations (optional).

7.22 Quality Assurance provides a checklist of required documentation. All submissions are uploaded to the designated platform by the deadline, after which Quality Assurance distributes the pack to Panel members in advance.

8 Panels

8.1 The Panel composition for PCR is as follows.

Panel member	Number and criteria	Role
Chair	A senior academic who is external to the subject's College, typically a Vice Dean (Education), Head of Department, or Director of Education. For BPC reviews, the Chair must be a Deputy Dean or Vice Dean (Education).	● Confirms the agenda for the review. ● Ensures the review is conducted in line with this Protocol. ● Facilitates effective discussion between Panel members and with the subject team. ● Ensures student feedback is appropriately considered. ● Ensures the Action Plan has value for both the University and the subject.
Internal academic member	An academic who is external to the subject and its department.	Scrutinises the programmes in the context of the information provided, the University's Education Strategy, regulations and policies, and general expectations of higher education provision.

Panel member	Number and criteria	Role
External academics	Academic staff external to the University with relevant subject expertise; normally two at minimum, and sufficient to cover the programmes submitted for review and re-approval.	Scrutinise the programmes in the context of the information provided, expectations regarding the subject and wider sector, and general expectations of higher education provision.
External stakeholder	Where applicable and practicable, a representative of a stakeholder group (for example, industry, business or a professional body), appointed in addition to an external academic.	Scrutinises the programmes in the context of the information provided and the wider sector, including graduate destinations and skills needs.
Student Panel member(s)	One undergraduate and one postgraduate student, each external to the subject area. Where only one level (UG or PGT) is reviewed, only one student member is required.	Scrutinises the programmes in the context of the information provided and expectations regarding the student experience.
University representative	As required, depending on the nature of the subject and its programmes.	Provides specialist input on curricula or operational aspects of the programmes under review.
Quality Assurance Manager	The Quality Assurance Manager for the College in which the subject sits.	Guides the Panel and advises on University programmes, policy and regulations.

8.2 Panel membership is proposed by the subject under review, in consultation with Quality Assurance, and formally approved by the College Management Board. For BPC reviews, external academics are Brunel staff not involved with the pathway provision. All members are briefed on their role and on the PCR procedure and operate under clear terms of reference to ensure consistency and objectivity.

9 Responsibilities

9.1 The responsibilities for PCR are as follows.

Team	Responsibilities
College Management Boards	Approve subject groupings for PCR; approve PCR Panels.
Subject area	Produce the Self-Evaluation Document (PCR-SED); provide PSRB / accrediting body reports; assemble and, where necessary, modify programme documentation (Section 10); complete the Curriculum and Assessment Mapping; and propose external academics and stakeholder representatives for appointment.
Quality Assurance	Appoint the Panel; arrange all formal meetings; provide Quality Assurance-owned documentation; supply Panel members with the full documentation set; advise on procedure; organise and record the pre-review student meeting; and produce the PCR Outcome Report.

Team	Responsibilities
Professional Development Centre	Provide destination / Graduate Outcomes data at the request of Quality Assurance.
Strategic Planning	Provide NSS and other student survey data at the request of Quality Assurance.
Boards of Studies	Monitor progress against the PCR Action Plan.
Department Management Boards	Monitor progress against PCR Action Plans for all subjects within the department.
College Education Committees	Monitor progress against PCR Action Plans for all subjects within the College; confirm re-approval; and report PCR outcomes to UESEC.
UESEC	Consider PCR outcomes; approve the PCR schedule; and approve amendments to this Protocol.

10 Presenting Programme Documentation and Proposing Modifications

10.1 Modifications to any Programme Specification or Module (Block) Outline proposed as part of PCR must be shown by tracked changes, with a description and rationale for each change included in the Self-Evaluation Document (Appendix 1 of the PCR-SED).

10.2 When developing and proposing modifications, subjects should carefully consider, and where appropriate consult, related programme and module leads, subjects and other departments. This may include:

- alternative Level 4 provision delivered by BPC; any change to Level 4 of a Brunel programme must be reflected appropriately in the BPC alternative Level 4;
- Foundation or pre-Masters programmes delivered by Brunel or BPC, giving consideration to their ongoing suitability in light of the proposed modifications;
- joint awards; and
- other subjects whose programmes draw on modules delivered by the subject undergoing PCR.

10.3 All Programme Specifications and Module (Block) Outlines relevant to a review must be drawn from the Programme Documentation Repository.

11 Committee Approval of PCR Documentation

11.1 College Education Committees and College Management Boards approve all documentation to be submitted for a subject's PCR. This includes specific consideration and approval of the Self-Evaluation Document and all proposed modifications before formal submission to the Panel.

12 PCR and External Accreditation

12.1 Where appropriate, the scheduling and format of a PCR may be aligned, or amended, to coincide with a major accreditation event, enabling the subject to undertake both processes and to use documents, meetings and outcomes from either to satisfy the requirements of the accrediting body and the University.

13 Modification of Programmes outside PCR

13.1 The comprehensive and significant revision of a programme should ideally be undertaken through PCR. Processes for the modification of programmes outside PCR are defined in the University's Programme Modification Policy.

14 New Programmes, Title Changes and Withdrawals

14.1 Where a PCR includes the proposal of a new programme, or an amended title for an existing programme, strategic and final academic approval must be obtained under the Programme Approval Protocol typically after the Review Event and before the specific outcome is confirmed. Approval may be given by Chair's action.

14.2 Where a PCR includes the proposal to withdraw a programme (including a pathway or specialist route that results in a distinct award title), approval must be obtained under the Programme Suspensions and Withdrawal Policy typically after the Review Event and before the specific outcome is confirmed. Approval may be given by Chair's action.

15 Alignment with External Reference Points and Internal Policies

15.1 This Protocol has been developed to satisfy both external quality frameworks and the University's internal academic policies. The table below summarises how the PCR process maps to key reference points.

Reference point	How PCR meets it
QAA UK Quality Code — Monitoring and Evaluation	PCR applies the Guiding Principles for monitoring and evaluation: it is strategically driven, evidence-based and improvement-focused, using both quantitative and qualitative information; it defines clear roles (Chair, members, committees); it actively involves students through surveys, the pre-review meeting and Panel membership; it systematically uses external input (examiners, PSRBs, employers); and it uses outcomes (Action Plans) to drive enhancement, revisited for impact through annual monitoring.
ESG 2015, Standard 1.9 — On-going monitoring and periodic review	PCR confirms that programmes achieve their objectives and remain responsive to student and societal needs, examining the currency of content, student progression and outcomes, assessment effectiveness, student feedback and satisfaction, and the adequacy of resources and support, with students and stakeholders involved throughout.

Reference point	How PCR meets it
ESG 2015, Standard 1.7 — Information management	PCR relies on the systematic collection and use of key performance indicators, student data and feedback — including student profiles, progression, continuation, completion, attainment and graduate outcomes — analysed by staff and students through the self-evaluation and Panel discussion.
ESG 2015, Standard 1.8 — Public information	Revised Programme Specifications and Module (Block) Outlines are published and changes are communicated to students, providing clear and up-to-date information on programmes, including intended learning outcomes and qualifications.
The Essentials of Programme Design and Programme Curriculum Review (internal)	PCR operationalises the internal guidance: research-informed and industry-aligned curriculum design; inclusivity in learning outcomes and teaching; sustainability and SDG mapping; the move to 30-credit modular blocks; data-led evaluation; standards for writing learning outcomes; and assessment design that maps to outcomes, uses authentic tasks and provides multiple opportunities to demonstrate each outcome.
Guidance on writing effective learning outcomes (internal)	PCR requires learning outcomes to be assessable, measurable, level-appropriate and inclusively worded, and aligned to the FHEQ and Subject Benchmark Statements.
PCR Employability Guidance (internal)	PCR applies the University's graduate employability framework: programme teams evaluate where the five graduate attributes are introduced and developed, and how the five practices that support graduate employability are embedded in the programme (paragraph 7.14).

15.2 By following this Protocol, programme teams meet external quality standards while advancing the University's strategic goals for programme excellence. PCR is best approached not as a bureaucratic exercise but as a valuable opportunity to reflect on the curriculum, recognise success, engage stakeholders and plan meaningful enhancements that benefit current and future students. The Panel, in turn, serves as a supportive but rigorous peer-review body, bringing external insight and institutional oversight to confirm that each Brunel programme remains of high quality and standard.

15.3 The Protocol will itself be subject to periodic evaluation. This aligns with ESG Standard 1.10: as Brunel participates in cyclical external quality assurance, its internal quality processes — including PCR — are examined and refined, demonstrating the University's commitment to continuous quality improvement.

Appendix A Schedule for Periodic Curriculum Review

A.1 The schedule for PCR, and any amendment to it, is approved by UESEC. The template below is maintained by Quality Assurance and populated with the approved review year for each subject. Insert "X" in the relevant academic-year column for each subject, appending "(T1)" where a Term 1 event is required.

Department	Subject	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30