

Extract from the Minutes of the Meeting of University Teaching Committee held on 4 February 2016

(full Minutes at <https://www.york.ac.uk/about/organisation/governance/sub-committees/teaching-committee/>)

M16-17/75 Outcomes from Annual Programme Reviews

The Committee **considered** a University-level summary report and a report from each Faculty on the outcomes from Annual Programme Reviews for 2015/16 (UTC.16-17/48). Members were thanked for having supported the process by attending their departments' APR meetings.

Some of the themes identified in the University summary report and in the Faculty-level summary reports were highlighted:

- The pedagogy had been identified by several departments as a priority for the next year.
- A number of initiatives to improve employability and assessment and feedback had been highlighted.
- Implications of increasing student numbers had been identified.
- The reports noted increased pressure on Student Support Services and particularly the Open Door Team.

Issues relating to Student Support Services were discussed. It was noted that the reports were a reflection on 2015/16 and since then the University had invested significantly in support for students with mental health issues (Open Door in particular). Significant effort had been made to communicate these developments and it was hoped that the investment would help to address the concerns which had been raised. Although the responsibilities of the Director of Student Support had been reallocated, a number of members expressed concern about the decision not to reappoint to this post. Members were invited to contact the Academic Registrar if there were any suggestions regarding how the new arrangements could be better communicated to departments.

Members noted that the FLTG reports had been submitted in different formats and **agreed** that the Social Sciences summary report should be used as the template for future reporting. Members were advised that the FLTGs had questioned how issues raised through APR were taken forward. The Committee emphasised the importance of informing departments of actions that were taken to ensure that staff understood the value of the process and its role in achieving a consistent culture of quality. In addition to each department receiving an individual response to its APR, each faculty would receive a response to their summary report. The Academic Quality Team would write the departmental-level and faculty-level APR responses and these would be signed-off by the Chair of UTC. A concern regarding the timeframe for completing the Faculty summary reports was noted. It was **agreed** that the Secretary to UTC would give this further consideration.

The Committee's oversight of progress with the implementation of the York pedagogy would be maintained by the APR process in 2017. The Committee **recommended** that the APR report pro-forma be amended to require departments to report on progress made with their enhancement plans and (where applicable) recommendations made by the UTC Pedagogy Approval Panel. In addition, to support the embedding of the emphasis in the Pedagogy on programme-level design and the role of the programme leader, the Committee **agreed to recommend** suggestion 3.4.2 in the paper: that the APR pro forma be revised to capture programme-level reflections on quality and standards whilst otherwise maintaining the current 'by exception' approach to reporting. A revised APR template would be brought to the next meeting for the Committee's approval.

Action: Academic Quality Team