**U N I V E R S I T Y O F Y O R K**

**TEACHING COMMITTEE**

**Annual Programme Review (APR) *Pro Forma***

**Review of the Academic Year 2012/13**

|  |
| --- |
| **Department:**  **Did UTC departmental contact attend: Y/N (delete as appropriate)**  **Did the student representatives attend? Y/N (delete as appropriate)**  **Was the departmental response discussed at a full Board of Studies meeting? Y/N (delete as appropriate)**  **Form completed by:** |

**Please see guidance notes for prompts on the content of this summary report.**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. In the context of the quality of the student and staff experience, what has gone well over the past year at individual, department, module and programme levels? *You may wish to refer to the* [*Learning and Teaching Strategy*](http://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/strategy/landtstrategy.pdf) *and other policies when completing this section.* |
| *Indicative length: Usually no more than 500 words* |
| 2. What significant issues were identified and resolved by the department, including contributions from student representatives (including PGR students), or others such as UTC, student surveys (NSS/PRES), external examiners, advisory boards, graduate destinations data, professional bodies or placement providers, and how were they resolved? |
| *Indicative length: Usually no more than 500 words* |
| 3. What significant issues were identified that have not been resolved, and what actions are being pursued/are required to resolve these issues? |
| *Indicative length: Usually no more than 500 words* |
| 4. If the Department’s provision includes programmes delivered in collaboration with other external providers (e.g. other HEIs in the UK or overseas) please highlight whether any significantissues have been identified relating to these programmes and how they have been resolved. |
| *Indicative length: Usually no more than 500 words* |
| 5. Are there any further issues that the department wishes to raise with UTC? Please give brief details. |
| *Indicative length: Usually no more than 300 words* |
| 6. Please outline your mechanisms for student representation in 2012/13, including how students were involved in the APR process, and any enhancements that have arisen in your department as a result of student engagement. |
| *Indicative length: Usually no more than 300 words* |

The completed APR pro-forma should be returned to [David Clarke](mailto:david.clarke@york.ac.uk) by email **before *Friday 29 November 2013***

**ANNUAL PROGRAMME REVIEW: GUIDANCE NOTES FOR DEPARTMENTS**

The following guidance notes are divided into two parts: Part A provides specific advice on completing the pro-forma; Part B provides general background information on the APR and the process by which departments are expected to identify the salient points to present to UTC through the pro-forma.

**Purpose of the Annual Programme Review**

The APR is an opportunity for departments to reflect on the teaching and learning activity of the previous academic year, and to raise any issues with the UTC. This reflection includes celebrating successes, identifying addressed issues and proposing a way forward for any areas which remain unresolved.

The APR process should

* reflect on both quality and standards,
* encompass undergraduate and postgraduate (taught and research) programmes,
* should involve student representatives and
* should engage all staff in the department.

The review is an important part of the University’s quality assurance and enhancement framework, which in turn contributes to the over-riding objective of the Learning and Teaching Strategy: to achieve a *consistent culture of quality*. An important aspect of the APR is to provide assurance that issues identified, both internally and externally, are acted upon and to inform university level priorities for support and policy development.

Within the department the APR should promote:

* student involvement in quality review
* reflection and evaluation;
* honesty and openness;
* forward planning;
* sharing experiences and good practice;
* consideration of interdisciplinary and external perspectives;
* ownership throughout the department of the APR outcomes.

It is important that the review does not replicate existing work; rather that it takes a *holistic* review of provision, drawing on the review activities that take place in the department during the year.

Involvement of the departmental UTC contact is designed to ensure consistency and continuity and to help departments to think about ways of improving quality and the student experience.

1. **Completion of the pro-forma**

Departments are asked to complete the pro-forma by commenting on those matters which are of particular significance to the student and staff experience, be they related to successes, good practice, risks to quality, or challenges. This ‘by exception’ approach is intended to encourage reflection and discourse with the University Teaching Committee, rather than providing a large volume of descriptive information. It will also help UTC to share good ideas more widely, so that the University as a whole can benefit from this experience.

**Please note:** The APR process is intended to cover all levels of study, including PGR students, so please bear this in mind when consulting colleagues, arranging meetings and completing the form itself!

We have included indicative word lengths under each section. Please note that these should not be treated as hard and fast rules, but rather as a suggested upper limit.

1. ***In the context of the quality of the student and staff experience, what has gone well over the past year at individual, department, module and programme levels? You may wish to refer to the Learning and Teaching Strategy (***[***http://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/strategy/landtstrategy.pdf***](http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/aso/teach/policies/landtstrategy.pdf)***) and other policies when completing this section.***

This section might highlight achievements such as:

* a module which adopted innovative learning and teaching techniques and received exceptional feedback;
* particular improvements in areas of the NSS/PTES/PRES;
* improvements in student achievement through progression rates, classification grades or completion rates;
* initiatives to develop students’ employability skills (reflection which might be informed by comments from employers or placement providers);
* enhancement projects which have resulted in exceptional student feedback and/or developed themes such as internationalising the curriculum;
* improvements which have been made in response to student feedback;
* an increase in the number and quality of admissions;
* contributions by PGWTs;
* external examiner comments which indicate exceptional achievements;
* successes by individual staff or teams such as Vice-Chancellor’s Teaching Awards, YUSU Supervisor of the Year awards, commendation from a professional body;
* improvements in response to recommendations by UTC during the programme approval process.

1. ***What significant issues were identified and resolved by the department, including contributions from student representatives (including PGR students), or others such as UTC, student surveys (NSS/PRES), external examiners,*** ***advisory boards, graduate destinations data, professional bodies or placement providers, and how were they resolved?***

This section will outline weaknesses, challenges and/or areas of risk to academic standards and the quality of the staff and student experiences. Sources may include:

* student feedback/evaluation;
* contributions from student representatives;
* External Examiners’ reports;
* recommendations from advisory boards;
* PhD completion rates; student applications data;
* poorly performing modules or programmes;
* evidence relating to student employability and destination data;
* feedback from organizations that provide placement/work based learning opportunities or feedback from students during their placement.

Please detail how they have been resolved successfully, which may include input from a departmental visit, a Periodic Review action plan or BoS discussions.

Student input in this discussion is very important. The University is committed to gathering and responding to student feedback as a vital resource for bringing about improvement in the quality of the student experience and developing learning and teaching within the institution.

Please detail any issues that have arisen when implementing any recommendations from UTC regarding new programme approval and/or major programme modifications (if applicable) and how they were resolved.

This section helps to assure UTC that departments are self-regulating, committed to a consistent culture of quality and responding to issues as they arise, and are engaging in dialogue with students on matters of quality. The section also informs UTC of issues that are being experienced around the University. This may make it easier to find solutions to common problems, and will inform UTC’s future agenda.

1. ***What significant issues were identified that have not been resolved, and what actions are being pursued/are required to address these issues?***

For the APR process to be forward thinking and to take stock of the programmes, discussion of outstanding issues and disappointments is essential. Engaging with difficult issues and discussing the way forward can help to identify solutions which may not have previously been considered, and can help the UTC to identify or refine institutional priorities. It is important that departments complete this section in an open and honest way.

1. ***If the Department’s provision includes programmes delivered in collaboration with other external providers (e.g. other HEIs in the UK or overseas) please highlight whether any significant issues have been identified relating to these programmes and how they have been resolved.***

This section is applicable to those departments who deliver programmes in collaboration with other providers. This will include collaborations with FE institutions such as York College and other HEIs who share in the delivery of the programme (e.g. Erasmus Mundus consortia). As there are further levels of risk associated with such programmes UTC needs to be aware of any issues that have come to light during this period.

1. ***Are there any further issues that the department wishes to raise with UTC?***

This is an opportunity to raise any issues that have not been covered in the above sections.

1. ***Please outline your mechanisms for student representation in 2012/13, including how students were involved in the APR process, and any enhancements that have arisen in your department as a result of student engagement.***

This section will outline how the department provides opportunities for effective student representation, how it addresses any issues that may have arisen, and how it involves students in the APR process. You may also wish to make reference to how the role of student representative is publicised and supported by the department and what the department is doing to promote and encourage student participation in the staff-student forums and other committees. If the department has introduced any supplementary mechanisms to engage with students (such as focus groups, regular meetings between senior departmental staff and student representatives, etc.) these should also be mentioned. Please also outline any improvements within your programmes, or in the student experience more generally, that have resulted from your processes for engaging students.

1. **Departmental Annual Review Meeting**

***Attendance***

The APR may take place in a full staff meeting, an exceptional Board of Studies or, where ‘normal business’ permits, the BoS held early in the autumn term.

All staff who teach on the programmes concerned should contribute to the APR. In large departments it might be possible to split the process into separate meetings for different groups of staff, but care should be taken to ensure that this does not compromise the need for a departmental perspective (such as themes that cut across undergraduate and postgraduate programmes) and shared ownership of the APR outcomes. The ‘conduct of the meeting’ section below suggests ways of engaging a large group of staff at a single event.

***Student involvement***

The involvement of student representatives in the APR meeting is crucial. To facilitate this, it is recommended that the Chair should hold a briefing with the student attendees in advance of the meeting, to ensure that they understand the process and the opportunities to contribute, and to clarify any matters with regard to possible topics for discussion. Particular consideration should be given to briefing student representatives who may only recently have taken up the role; liaison with YUSU and the GSA may be helpful in this regard. It is also important that the department considers obtaining feedback from distance learning students who are not physically present at the time of the APR meeting.

Occasionally, the APR meeting will be held before the student representatives have been finalised for the current academic year. If this is the case please do ask the previous year’s reps if they would be willing to attend.

The UTC departmental contact should also be present.

***Timing***

The APR process reflecting on the previous academic year is completed in the Autumn Term, with departments submitting APR documentation to be considered by UTC in December. This will provide departments with feedback from UTC early in the Spring Term.

***Conduct of the meeting***

Departments can decide for themselves how they conduct their annual review meeting(s). Suggestions include:

* splitting the meeting into break-out groups to stimulate creative thinking and reflection, asking each to discuss an issue relating to the student experience. This enables all staff to contribute fully to the process and helps to create a greater sense of ownership. It may also be particularly helpful to make meetings more manageable in large departments. Each group could identify examples of excellent practice from within the department and beyond, and consider how to share this across the department, as well as identifying where improvements are necessary (supported by evidence such as programme evaluation feedback or external examiner reports) and how to achieve these;
* identifying recurrent issues raised by External Examiners and students over the past 2-3 years and using these as key agenda items to explore where improvements can be made;
* considering a theme such as the development of academic and employability skills, and tracing the student experience through programmes and modules;
* asking programme directors to provide a report on risks, successes and areas for action in advance of the meeting then discussing these reports at the relevant part of the meeting (undergraduate, taught postgraduate and research postgraduate).
* adopting ‘creative thinking’ techniques such as brainstorming, feasibility/impact matrix, identifying and challenging underlying assumptions.
* nominating a small group of people to act as final editors of the APR pro-forma, who will pull together the ‘by exception’ issues to report.

***Content***

Consideration of the following is a minimum requirement:

* last year’s APR report, in particular progress with issues that were unresolved at that time;
* comments made by External Examiners and the actions to address issues, with any significant matters included on the pro-forma;
* feedback from students, e.g. from internal module/programme evaluations, cohort meetings, focus groups, supervisory meetings, exit questionnaires, student representatives and from external reviews such as the NSS, PTES and PRES (looking at trends across the last three years where possible);
* feedback from staff, in particular module/programme leaders’ reports on the year, and thesis advisory panels;
* the impact of introducing new programmes or modifications to existing programmes;
* experiences of significant new policies or procedures, such as the new modular scheme;
* implementation of the departmental VLE strategy;
* reports and action plans from UTC reviews or visits, such as periodic reviews, and how they have been used to facilitate programme development and improvements;
* reports from Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) accreditation visits, and how they have been used to facilitate programme development and improvements;
* statements from combined executive committees;
* student achievement data from the last three cohorts of students (classifications, degree completion/withdrawal rates, progression statistics, transfer data, PhD submission rates and upgrading data);
* indicators of the development of employability skills and destination data/feedback from employers and students;
* complaints and appeals data;
* developmental and training opportunities for research students, such as take-up of PGWT opportunities;
* any issues of equality and diversity, such as differential attainment rates by students from different groups and/or the effectiveness of support for students with disabilities;
* external reference points (such as subject benchmark statements);
* feedback on public information about programmes (such as handbooks and websites).

Source information should be made available to the UTC departmental contact, student representatives and other relevant staff in advance of the meeting, to enable full engagement.

***After the meeting***

The APR pro-forma should be completed. All parties should have the opportunity to comment on the content and should take collective ownership of the key successes, issues and risks, and the identified measurable future actions.

***Central Support***

You are encouraged to work with your departmental Teaching Quality Support Officer in the Academic Support Office who can attend the annual review meeting (diary clashes permitting), contribute to the process, suggest ideas for ways forward, disseminate best practice from within the institution and generally assist in helping departments to make the most of the APR.