Quality Handbook

Annual Programme Review Process

1. Aims and Principles

a) The aims of Annual Programme Review are that it should:

    i. support the quality of the student experience by assuring and enhancing the quality of taught programmes - hence looking both forwards and backwards, monitoring and planning developments;

    ii. support strategic decisions at Faculty level and inform university-level discussion, particularly in terms of learning enhancement;

    iii. provide a secure basis for internal periodic review and for external visits, particularly by Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs);

    iv. fulfil the requirements of the QAA Quality Code;

    v. provide a process which is focused and stream-lined.

b) The principles behind the operation of the process are that it should:

    i. recognise the move from QAA HER to HEFCE Quality Assessment and TEF;

    ii. require responses from programme teams where the metrics show that there is a problem to be addressed but does not require responses where the data is meeting the required standard;

    iii. take account of, without duplicating, activities which are on-going during the year, such as

        a) consideration of external examiners' reports and responses;

        b) action plans related to student satisfaction and retention/achievement

        c) providing responses to DLHE data

        d) consideration of any issues related to delivery of the programme at a collaborative partner

    iv. provide an auditable mechanism for ensuring that such processes have been followed;

    v. evolve through the year as issues are discussed and processes followed to support continuous development. This will be achieved through a portfolio and development grid which will provide an on-going summary, drawing on existing documentation, and reducing the need to 'write up' past discussions at the end of the year;

    vi. provide an opportunity to share good practice

    vii. provide a mechanism whereby issues which cannot be addressed at programme level are 'funnelled' upwards to Faculty and University levels, so that more strategic concerns can be considered at higher levels. This will inform university-level decisions about priorities for enhancing the student learning experience;

    vi   support immediate intervention to make minor changes to the student experience mid-year as well as working towards an informed position at the end of the year which may result in changes for the following September or in longer-term plans for the development of the programme (or of a new programme) – or both

2. Key features of the process

a) The process enables response at Faculty level to relevant metrics in relation to student retention, achievement and satisfaction and requires programme responses only where problems are identified;
b) A portfolio approach ensures that there is minimal duplication;
c) The process focuses on continuous improvement
d) An evolving 'development grid' is completed by the Programme Studies Board (PSB) as the year progresses, noting issues and actions to be taken
e) Module leaders evaluate their modules at the end of the academic year and report on the strengths and development points arising
f) Programme leaders update the programme specification at the end of the year
g) Issues of strategic significance are picked up at Faculty level or passed on to SSC via Student Data Analysis Group (SDAG) or to QMSC. Thus more focused analysis reaches higher-level committees. This enables them to ensure that processes have been properly conducted at Faculty level and make strategic decisions about developments which need to be progressed at University level, particularly in respect of themes for quality enhancement. This will inform academic staff development.

3. The process

Portfolio element	Process	Portfolio report
	QS will generate a portfolio report for each programme.	
Student satisfaction, retention, progression, achievement, DLHE	SDAG will triage and pass to FAC for action. (see timeline) FAC will pass to programme leaders/PSB for response FAC will produce action plan SDAG will consider action plan SDAG will refer back where necessary SDAG will report to SSC	QS will update portfolio reports with links to action plans where applicable
External examiners reports	PSBs to consider and agree response SSC receives summary of reports	QS publish reports and responses
Responses to long term recommendations made at periodic review or programme approval if applicable	PSBs to consider and agree response. FAC Chair or nominee signs off response QMSC approves response	QS updates requirements and recommendations database.
Review and respond to new Subject Benchmarks (where applicable)	PSBs to consider and agree whether changes to programme are required. External examiner to agree response Report to QMSC	QS notifies programme leader that new subject benchmark is published. QS updates records and reports to QMSC.
Collaborative provision if applicable	PSB to consider reports and responses where it applies to programme rather than partnership	PSB officer updates report.
For modules and subjects which are part of CSP	See appendix 1	
Programme	Programme leader updates	Programme leader updates

specification	programme specification where required	programme specification and forwards to QS & Marketing to update web QS holds definitive copy
Module evaluations	Discussed at MSB/PSB – issues & actions recorded on development grid	Programme leader updates development grid
Module questionnaires	Outcomes discussed at MSB/PSB – issues & actions recorded on development grid	Programme leader updates development grid
Student feedback	Discussed at PSB – issues & actions recorded on development grid	Programme leader updates development grid
PSRB reports & developments if applicable	Discussed at PSB – issues & actions recorded on development grid	Programme leader updates development grid
Confirmation that portfolio reports completed	QS provides summary report for FAC/QMSC by cluster FAC follows up any omissions	QS checks portfolio reports
Summary of issues	PSB agrees summary of issues by programme QS provides summary report for FAC by cluster FAC agrees issues that should be forwarded to QMSC QS provides summary report for QMSC by Faculty QMSC considers and forwards as necessary	PSB officer updates the portfolio report QS extracts information from portfolio reports
Summary of good practice	PSB agrees summary of good practice by programme QS provides summary report for FAC by cluster FAC agrees good practice that should be forwarded to QMSC QS provides summary report for QMSC by Faculty QMSC considers and forwards as necessary/ includes on good practice database	PSB officer updates the portfolio report QS extracts information from portfolio reports

4. Timeline
[Timeline for Annual Review](#)

Roles and Responsibilities

5. Module leader

a) The module leader should provide an evaluative report on the module at the end of the academic year. This should consider the strengths and weaknesses of the module on the basis of student feedback, assessment outcomes and any other evidence, and make recommendations regarding actions which need to be taken to improve the module. The module leader is responsible for discussing this report with others teaching on the module and for alerting the leaders of all the programmes whose students take the module to ensure that the proposed changes would not have adverse consequences for their students, and resolving any issues which arise.

b) The Annual Module Review report form should be completed**. [Annual Module Review Report Form.](#)** Relevant evidence can be appended to or inserted in the form, and the report should focus on analysis, development points and good practice which could be shared. Module reviews should be passed to the relevant Module Studies Board (MSB) where these exist; otherwise to the relevant Programme Studies Board(s) (PSB). Where the module is taught as part of CSP a copy should also be forwarded to the relevant Subject leader.

c) Questionnaires should be administered not later than December for semester 1 modules and not later than just before Easter for year-long and semester 2 modules. Formative feedback should in addition be sought not later than December for year-long modules (e.g. through student representatives on the Student-Staff Liaison Committees (SSLC) so that minor problems can be addressed which would not require formal approval of a change to the module.

6. Module Studies Board

Where Module Studies Boards are part of the Faculty structure they will:
  a) consider the review of modules submitted by module leaders. This will include:
      ➢ taking into account the range of programmes which a module serves (where applicable);
      ➢ ensuring that actions suggested are appropriate to the feedback presented;
      ➢ discussing with the module leader any further or alternative actions which may be appropriate;
  b) consider changes to modules – these are subject to the usual approval process through Programme Studies Board;
  c) notify Programme Boards of wider issues relevant to the programme which have come to light as a result of the review of modules.
Where Module Studies Boards are not used, these responsibilities will fall to the Programme Studies Board.

7. Programme Leader / Programme Studies Board
(see also under Module Studies Boards above)

a) The Programme Leader is responsible for the overall management of the programme. This includes ensuring that issues are considered and addressed as they arise, that development activities are progressed through the year and. He/she is responsible for:
  ➢ Ensuring the portfolio report is completed; [Annual Programme Review Portfolio Report Form](#)
  ➢ updating the development grid;
  ➢ ensuring that actions arising from the development grid are progressed between meetings of the Programme Studies Board;
  ➢ keeping the Programme Studies Board informed of progress, of issues arising between meetings, and of any problems;
  ➢ Highlighting issues to be referred to the Faculty and to the University
  ➢ Highlighting good practice to be disseminated across the Faculty/University

b) The Programme Studies Board is responsible for the review of the programme. The board is responsible for:
  ➢ Receiving, updating and monitoring the progress of the development grid
  ➢ Receiving feedback from Module leaders reports
  ➢ Receiving feedback from Centre Leader/Faculty Partnership Leader reports
  ➢ Considering key issues which have arisen through the year as development points or problems
  ➢ The academic direction of the programme in the light of changes in the subject area or in staffing or research developments
  ➢ Graduate employment (DLHE) data

- ➢ Learning resources
- ➢ Ensuring that a summary of issues and good practice is provided for each programme

c) The outcomes of the annual review will be:
   - ➢ The Annual Programme Review Portfolio Report which includes
     a. Confirmation that the different elements of review have been considered where appropriate
     b. The final version of the development grid
     c. An updated programme specification
     d. Issues to be considered by the Faculty/University

8. Faculty Academic Committee (FAC)

a) The Faculty Academic Committee is responsible for
   - ➢ Responding to SDAG on issues raised in relation to Student Satisfaction, Achievement and Satisfaction
   - ➢ Monitoring action plans in relation to SDAG responses
   - ➢ Ensuring that all programmes have completed the Annual Programme Review Portfolio Report and confirming that to QMSC;
   - ➢ Discussing issues and good practice for each cluster of programmes in the Faculty
   - ➢ Escalating issues and good practice to QMSC where University action is required.

9. Quality Management Sub-Committee (QMSC)

a) QMSC is responsible for:
   - ➢ Receiving confirmation from FAC that each programme has completed the Annual Programme Review Portfolio Report
   - ➢ Receiving issues from FAC for consideration at University level
   - ➢ Receiving items of good practice from FAC for dissemination via CELT and other mechanisms

10. Student Data Analysis Group (SDAG)

a) SDAG is responsible for:
   - ➢ Triaging data sets for student satisfaction, retention, progression and achievement and passing to FACs and service areas for response
   - ➢ Reviewing action plans in relation to the above provided by FACs and services
   - ➢ Reporting to SSC on the process and outcomes

11. Student Success Committee (SSC)

a) SSC is responsible for:
   - ➢ Consideration of the report from SDAG
   - ➢ Consideration of the external examiner summary reports

Combined Subjects Programme (CSP)

The process should operate as far as possible in the same way as outlined in (3) above with the following additional steps:

1. Data identified by SDAG in relation to student satisfaction, retention, progression and achievement which is also applicable to CSP will also be copied to the FES FAC.
2. Module leaders should complete the CSP element of the Annual Module Review report where applicable. Module leaders are responsible for ensuring that the Subject Leader receives a copy of the Annual Module Review report.
3. Subject leaders should use the Module reviews to complete the Subject Review Report form Annual Programme Review CSP Report Form which will be considered by the CSP Programme Studies Board and will inform the completion of the development grid for the programme.
4. The CSP Programme Studies Board should focus on the combinations that attract the larger number of students.