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

**TEACHING COMMITTEE**

**YORK GRADUATE RESEARCH SCHOOL**

**Annual Programme Review (APR) *Pro Forma*: Summary Review of the Academic Year 2016/17**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Department** | *Name* |
| **Programmes covered by this report**Please list all UG, PGT and PGR programmes covered by this report. Combined programmes shouldbe included where the Programme Leader is a member of the Department. Where the Programme Leader for a combined programme is a member of a partner department you may stillwish to comment on the programme from your departmental perspective. | *Programme Titles* |
| **Did your UTC departmental contact attend the APR meeting? If not, please state why.**NB Your APR meeting date should be set in coordination with your UTC departmental contact to facilitate their attendance. | *Y/N (delete as appropriate)* |
| **Did your student representatives (UG, PGT, and PGR) attend the APR meeting? If not, please state why.** | *Y/N (delete as appropriate)* |
| **Undergraduate external examiner table completed?** *[NB: the table this year will take the form of a Google Sheet (rather than a Word Document) and thus there is no need to append the completed table as in previous years]* | *Y/N (delete as appropriate)* |
| **Updated periodic review action plan appended (as appropriate)?**If you had a **periodic review** in 2016/17 or have ongoing issues from an earlier review, please return your action plan with an update on progress.  | *Y/N (delete as appropriate)* |
| **Form completed by?** | *Name(s)* |
| **Form approved by (e.g. full BoS, Chair of BoS, HoD, APR meeting)?** | *Name(s)/body* |

**Please see guidance notes at the end of the pro forma for prompts on the content of this report.**

|  |
| --- |
| **A. PROGRAMME-LEVEL SUMMARY COMMENTARY**  |
| **Please comment by exception on issues arising from the undergraduate programme level reviews authored by each Programme Leader (including combined programmes where the Programme Leader is a member of staff in the Department),** **to inform the later sections of this pro forma. This should include:** **(1) notable successes and challenges that have arisen with individual programmes**This might include levels of student engagement, the quality of student work and the volume of applications. **(2) implementation of enhancement plans for individual programmes which were approved by UTC**This should include reference to:* the outcome of any funded projects or working groups/reviews, such as assessment reviews, skills development or employability initiatives;
* how UTC Pedagogy Approval Panel meeting recommendations have been considered and addressed (including the rationale for recommendations that have not been actioned)

Include appropriate reference to combined programmes, particularly where the Programme Leader is a member of staff in the Department.Programme level reviews authored by each Programme Leader should be retained in the Department for review by UTC if required, such as for the purpose of Periodic Review. |
| *Indicative word limit: no more than 500 words* |

|  |
| --- |
| **B. DEPARTMENT-LEVEL COMMENTARY – TAUGHT PROGRAMMES** For Undergraduate programmes this should be informed by the programme summaries above. |
| **1. How has the role of Programme Leader (PL) been embedded in departmental teaching and learning practice and how effective has it been in maintaining the momentum of the York Pedagogy in the Department?** This section may comment on how PLs have been supported by, and communicate with, the DMT; how they have established programme teams and how they have worked with the student body. |
| *Indicative length: no more than 500 words* |
| **2. In the context of the quality of the student and staff experience (UG, PGT, CPD), what has gone well over the past year at module and programme levels?** ***You may wish to refer to the*** [***Learning and Teaching Strategy***](https://www.york.ac.uk/media/staffhome/learningandteaching/documents/L%26T%20strategy%202015%20to%202020%20final.pdf) ***and other policies.***This section might highlight achievements such as:* Improvements: in student satisfaction survey results; as a result of other student or UTC feedback; in student achievement or completion rates and in applications.
* Staff/ student successes in internal or external award or recognition schemes for excellence in teaching and learning activities, conferences or professional development.
* Innovative practice that has been introduced such as module content; developing employability, digital literacies or skills training leading to positive feedback from students, external examiners or other stakeholders.
 |
| *Indicative length: no more than 500 words* |
| **3. What significant issues (UG, PGT, CPD) have not been resolved and what actions are being pursued/are required to resolve these issues?**For the APR process to be forward thinking, discussion of outstanding issues and disappointments is essential. This section may highlight difficult issues and potential new solutions. It is important that departments complete this section in an open and honest way.  |
| *Indicative length: no more than 500 words* |
| **4. If the department’s provision (UG, PGT, CPD) includes programmes delivered in collaboration with external providers (e.g. FE Colleges and HEIs in the UK or overseas) please highlight notable successes and any significantissues that have been identified relating to these programmes and how they have been resolved.** |
| *Indicative length: no more than 500 words*  |
| **5. Are there any further issues (UG, PGT, CPD) that the department wishes to raise with UTC?** This is an opportunity to raise any pressing or unresolved issues with UTC that have not been covered above. APR should not be used as a form of feedback to support offices and services – departments should contact these offices and services directly about any issues as they arise to ensure a timely response/action. Any issues raised here that are outside UTC’s remit will be forwarded to relevant committees/offices with a request for a response/update where appropriate.  |
| *Indicative length: no more than 300 words* |
| **6. For undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes: looking forward, what are the top 3 priorities for the department relating to teaching and learning in the next 12 months?**The main focus of this report is reflection on the previous academic year, but FLTGs and UTC are interested to hear about the department’s/programme team’s priorities in the next 12 months to identify patterns/shared issues across the University and to offer any required timely support/guidance. |
| *Indicative length: no more than 300 words* |

|  |
| --- |
| **C. DEPARTMENT-LEVEL COMMENTARY – RESEARCH PROGRAMMES** |
| This section will be considered by the York Graduate Research School. Please note that the APR is for reporting on the PGR student experience and PGR academic quality – PGR strategy (e.g. funding of studentships) should be reported in the department’s Annual Department Research Review.**In relation to PGR students (including those on research programmes delivered in collaboration with others e.g. through inter-departmental DTPs and double and joint PhDs with other institutions):**1) Which aspects of the PGR student experience have been of particular note (strengths and/or challenges) in the past year? *This could include reference to quality and frequency of supervision, annual progression rates, percentage of successful outcomes (e.g. pass without referral), training and development and other student-focused activities.* ***Where appropriate, you should comment on your PRES results and actions to address identified issues.***2) Have any new PGR programmes (e.g. by distance learning or in DTPs), PGR programme changes (e.g. taught requirements or thesis format) or PGR organisational changes (e.g. student representation in decision making) been implemented this year? If so, what successes and challenges have you faced? 3) Are there any further PGR programme or PGR student experience issues that the department wishes to raise with YGRS? *This may include space, facilities, access to training and* *entrant quality.*4) Looking forward, what are the top 3 priorities for the department relating to the student experience of PGR students or the academic quality of PGR programmes in the next 12 months?This section of the form should be completed by (or, as a minimum, with input from) the Chair of the Graduate School Board or departmental equivalent. Where a department’s PGR provision includes programmes delivered in collaboration with others (inter-departmentally or externally) input should be sought from those with responsibility for those programmes – see guidance note for more details. |
| *Indicative length: no more than 800 words* |

|  |
| --- |
| **D. DEPARTMENT-LEVEL COMMENTARY – ALL PROGRAMMES** |
| **Please outline the department’s mechanisms for student representation in 2016/17, including how students were involved in the APR process, any enhancements that have arisen in your department as a result of student engagement, and how these were communicated to students.** |
| *Indicative length: no more than 300 words* |

The completed APR pro forma and undergraduate external examiners’ table (and updated periodic review action plan where applicable) should be returned to the Academic Support Office (aso@york.ac.uk) by email **by *15 November 2017.***

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

**TEACHING COMMITTEE**

**Annual Programme Review (APR)**

**Individual Undergraduate Programme Review for the Academic Year 2016/17**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Department** | *Name* |
| **Programme Title** | *Name* |
| **Programme Leader** | *Name* |
| **Form completed by** (if not the Programme Leader) | *Name(s)* |
| **Other staff and (their roles) consulted to compile this review** | *Name(s)* |
| **Did students on the programme contribute to the compilation of this form?** Please briefly detail any student contribution | *Y/N (delete as appropriate)* |

**Please see guidance notes at the end of the pro forma for prompts on the content
of this Individual Undergraduate Programme report**

This pro forma should be completed by the Programme Leader (PL) and be used by the Department to inform its APR meeting and report to UTC. HoDs are responsible for determining the deadline for submission of PL reflections to allow sufficient time for their consideration in advance of the APR meeting).

Where a Programme Leader is responsible for more than one programme they may choose to include more than one programme on the same form where these programmes are sufficiently similar and in such a way as to clearly distinguish references to the individual programmes.

**Programme Leaders should seek the advice from their** [**Academic Quality Team**](https://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/academic-support/staff/#quality) **contact if they are unsure whether it is appropriate to include more than one programme on the same form.**

These programme level documents should be retained in the Department for review as required by the University, for example in Periodic Review.

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Please comment on your experience of the role of Programme Leader and of implementing programme changes in line with the principles of the York Pedagogy.** This section may comment on: * how you as the Programme Leader (PL) have led the programme team;
* how you have been supported by, and communicated with, the Chair of BoS and the DMT;
* how you have worked with the student body to gain and act upon their feedback;
* any challenges you face in fulfilling the role of Programme Leader and any solutions you propose.
 |
| *Indicative length: no more than 200 words* |
| **2. How are you implementing, or have you implemented, the enhancement plan approved by UTC and any recommendations made by UTC in approving the programme’s alignment with the York Pedagogy?** This should:* include the outcome of any funded projects specific to the programme or the impact of any wider departmental working groups/ reviews arising from aspects of the York Pedagogy;
* explain how recommendations have been actioned with brief justification if any recommendations have not been actioned (if there were no UTC recommendations please indicate with N/A).
 |
| *Indicative length: no more than 300 words* |
| **3. How effectively are students and staff using the framework provided by the PLOs to understand or communicate the design of the programme and to support its smooth delivery?**For example, staff and students’ understanding of what the PLOs mean and how modules contribute to the progression and achievement of them. |
| *Indicative length: no more than 200 words* |
| **4. How effectively is formative and summative assessment supporting and evidencing students’ progression towards and achievement of the PLOs?**This section may comment on:* the volume and variety of tasks used throughout the programme to assess student progress;
* indications from student surveys of the value of formative and summative feedback;
* any proposed revisions to the assessment strategy to further enhance the learning experience.
 |
| *Indicative length: no more than 200 words* |
| **5. How effectively is students’ independent work contributing to their progression towards and achievement of the PLOs?**This section may comment on:* new or revised independent study activities introduced;
* new or revised online resources;
* indicators of success, such as enhanced engagement or levels of student attainment.
 |
| *Indicative length: no more than 200 words* |
| **6. How effectively is staff-student contact meeting the aims of the York Pedagogy and the PLOs?**This section may comment on:* the use of different teaching methods to achieve progression and achievement of the PLOs;
* the use of e-learning and other non-face-to-face/ classroom based interactions with staff;
* any proposed revisions to staff-student contact to further enhance the learning experience.
 |
| *Indicative length: no more than 200 words* |
| **7. Any further comments regarding successes or challenges encountered in the delivery of this programme that you wish to bring to the Department’s attention as part of Annual Programme Review?** |
| *Indicative length: no more than 100 words* |

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

For 2016/17 the Annual Programme Review (APR) process and documentation has been revised to better focus reflection on individual programmes of study. The following guidance notes are divided into three parts: Part A provides specific advice on completing the Individual Undergraduate Programme Review Pro Forma; Part B provides specific advice on completing the Departmental Review Pro Forma and Part C provides general background information on the APR and the process by which departments are expected to identify the salient points to present to Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups (FLTG), University Teaching Committee (UTC) and the York Graduate Research School (YGRS) through the pro forma.

**Purpose of the Annual Programme Review**

The principal objectives of the APR are to ensure that academic standards are maintained and to improve programme quality through the engagement of staff and students in reflection and action planning. This is a continuing process, and should not be confined to the APR meeting.

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 FLTGs, UTC and YGRS. This reflection includes celebrating successes, identifying addressed issues and proposing solutions for any areas which remain unresolved.

The APR process should:

* reflect on both quality and standards;
* encompass undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research programmes (including CPD and distance learning programmes);
* encompass individual programme level review and overarching departmental themes and priorities
* involve student representatives;
* 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 key principles of the Learning and Teaching Strategy, particularly: *excellence in learning and teaching*. 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.

As part of the implementation of the Learning and Teaching Strategy, APR also provides a valuable opportunity for reflection on progress towards the key strategic theme of implementing the York Pedagogy. For this reason, in the APR process for the year 2016/17 departments are asked to ensure Programme Leaders for *undergraduate* programmes complete an individual programme level pro forma. This will explain how the programme enhancements and alignment with the York Pedagogy is being embedded and to highlight any concerns or areas of good practice at the programme level.

Within the department the APR should promote:

* student involvement in quality review;
* reflection and evaluation;
* honesty and openness;
* forward planning;
* sharing of 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.

**Part A. Completion of the Individual Undergraduate Programme pro forma**

Introduced for the APR of the academic year 2016/17, the Individual Undergraduate Programme pro forma captures at the level of each individual programme of study (or cluster of programmes) key strengths, challenges, concerns and good practice that shall then be used to inform the Department level APR report concerned with key themes identified and acted upon. The pro forma focuses review and reflection through the lens of the York Pedagogy for undergraduate programmes, on the ongoing implementation and development of the programme following UTC confirmation of its alignment with the principles of the Pedagogy.

HoDs are responsible for determining the internal deadline for submission of the Individual Programme pro formas from each PL to ensure that they can be reflected on in suitable time by colleagues and student representatives to feed into the department-level face-to-face APR meeting.

Each individual undergraduate PL should complete the pro forma reflecting and reporting on the delivery of ‘their’ programme during the academic year. Where an individual Programme Leader (PL) is responsible for more than one programme *and* where the programmes are similar in nature, the Department may wish to complete a single pro forma for these programmes, ensuring that any nuances between them are captured clearly. It is otherwise expected that each distinct programme will have its own pro forma for consideration as part of the Departmental APR.

**Programme Leaders should seek the advice from their** [**Academic Quality Team**](https://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/academic-support/staff/#quality) **contact if they are unsure whether it is appropriate to include more than one programme on the same form.**

For combined programmes, where the PL is a member of staff based in the department they should complete the pro forma for that programme as part of the department’s APR, *in consultation with* appropriate colleagues from partner departments who may wish to raise any concerns or areas of good practice themselves in their own department’s APR.

A proportionate approach should be taken to the completion of the pro forma, that is, the PL should:

* involve those colleagues within the programme team or wider department(s) (in relation to combined programmes) that are well-placed to comment on the questions asked;
* involve the student body (e.g. the Course Reps for 2016/17) as required to have a suitably informed, rounded perspective of the programme’s delivery;
* report *by exception* on key, significant issues and activities pertinent to answering the questions;
* complete the pro forma in the context of the stage of development of the programme in terms of alignment with and embedding of the principles of the York Pedagogy.

**Part B. Completion of the Departmental Review pro forma**

Departments are asked to complete the Departmental Review pro forma by commenting on those matters which are of *particular significance* to students and staff in terms of the teaching and learning 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 FLTGs, UTC and YGRS, rather than providing a lengthy descriptive account or set of data. It will also help FLTGs, UTC and YGRS 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 provision) and all modes of delivery (including distance learning and CPD activities), so please bear this in mind when consulting colleagues, arranging meetings and completing the pro forma itself.**

* **Sections A and B.1 relate to UG programmes only.**
* **Sections B.2-6 relate to taught provision (UG, PGT, CPD) only.**
* **Section C (1-4) relates to PGR provision only (PhD, MPhil, Master’s by Research, EngD).**
* **Section D relates to all levels.**

Indicative *maximum* word lengths are provided for each section which departments are asked to respect.

**Section A – Undergraduate programmes only**

**Please comment by exception on issues arising from the undergraduate programme level reviews authored by each Programme Leader (including combined programmes where the Programme Leader is a member of staff in the Department),** **to inform the later sections of this pro forma.**

This section focuses on *undergraduate* programmes as departments have undertaken considerable work to align them with the York Pedagogy. For 2016/17 it is acknowledged that alignment of postgraduate taught programmes with the York Pedagogy will be at too early a stage for thorough reflection on progress. However, postgraduate taught programme enhancement plans being completed as part of the York Pedagogy approval process will cover these questions and themes.

**This should include comment on:**

**(1) notable successes and challenges that have arisen**

This might include reference to:

* changing levels of student attendance and engagement;
* the quality of student independent work;
* the volume of applications from prospective students;
* the relationships with partner departments in the delivery of combined programmes;
* the perceptions of the programme from external stakeholders such as employers, professional bodies and external examiners.

**(2) how the Department has been/ intends to address any overarching elements of enhancement plans approved by UTC and affecting a number of programmes**

This should include reference to:

* the outcome of any funded projects or working groups/ reviews of specific aspects of the enhancement plans, such as departmental assessment reviews, skills development or employability initiatives;
* combined programmes where the Programme Leader is a member of staff in the Department;
* how UTC Pedagogy Approval Panel meeting recommendations have been considered and responded to.

**Section B.1 – Undergraduate programmes only**

**How has the role of Programme Leader (PL) been embedded in departmental teaching and learning practice and how effective has it been in maintaining the momentum of the York Pedagogy in the Department?**

For *Undergraduate* programmes this section should be informed by the programme summaries provided by individual programme leaders.

Programme leadership is one of the five essential and integral principles underpinning the York Pedagogy. All staff who teach should contribute to the design of learning and teaching, but for every programme of study the named individual Programme Leader is crucial.

In the initial period of development and implementation of the York Pedagogy, FLTGs and UTC are keen to monitor how departments are managing undergraduate programme change, principally the introduction of Programme Leaders. The programme level reviews authored by each PL should be used to inform this section should be retained in the Department for review by UTC if required, such as for the purpose of Periodic Review.

Include appropriate reference to combined programmes, particularly where the Programme Leader is a member of staff in the Department.

It should be completed openly and honestly and may comment with reference across the Department’s provision *(including combined programmes)* on:

* how effectively PLs have been supported by, and communicated with, the DMT;
* how effectively PLs have established programme teams;
* how effectively PLs have worked with the student body to embed the principles of the York Pedagogy and enhance learning and teaching.
* how ongoing programme design, maintenance and improvement is being managed;
* how PLs are monitoring the effective delivery of the programme in operation;
* how PLs have approached the task of coordinating the programme team.

**Sections B.2-6– All Taught Provision (UG, PGT, CPD)**

**B.2. In the context of the quality of the student and staff experience (UG, PGT, CPD), what has gone well over the past year at module and programme levels?**

You may wish to refer to the [Learning and Teaching Strategy](https://www.york.ac.uk/media/staffhome/learningandteaching/documents/L%26T%20strategy%202015%20to%202020%20final.pdf) and other policies when completing this section.

This section might highlight achievements such as:

* innovative practice that has been introduced in such as delivery of module content;
* a module/ programme which adopted innovative learning and teaching techniques and received exceptional feedback;
* particular improvements in areas of the NSS/PTES;
* improvements in student achievement through progression rates, classification grades or completion rates *(but please do not simply summarise your student achievement data for the year)*;
* initiatives to develop students’ employability skills (reflection which might be informed by comments from employers, placement providers or DLHE data);
* 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 *(but please do not simply summarise admissions data)*;
* contributions by PGWTs;
* external examiner comments which indicate exceptional achievements;
* successes by individual staff or teams such as Vice-Chancellor’s Teaching Awards, YUSU Excellence in Teaching and Supervision awards, commendation from a professional body;
* student successes in award or recognition schemes related to their academic activities;
* the successful resolution of problems or challenges identified since the previous APR;
* improvements in response to recommendations by UTC during the programme approval process.

Student input in this discussion is very important. The University is committed to gathering, acting upon and monitoring the outcome of responses to student feedback as a vital resource for bringing about quality improvement and in measuring successes. Students’ positive observations about their study experience can help to highlight areas of best practice to share across the University.

**B.3. What significant issues (UG, PGT, CPD) were identified that have not been resolved, and what actions are being pursued/are required to address these issues?**

Student input in this discussion is very important as the University is committed to gathering, acting upon and monitoring the outcome of responses to student feedback. This section helps to assure FLTGs and 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 FLTGs and UTC of issues that are being experienced around the University. This may make it easier to find solutions to common problems, and will inform FLTGs’ and UTC’s future agendas.

The APR process should be forward thinking and so taking stock of outstanding issues and disappointments is essential. Using APR to discuss and reflect on difficult issues can identify solutions which may not have previously been considered, and can help the FLTGs and UTC to identify or refine institutional priorities. Departments should therefore complete this section openly and honestly.

You may choose to append an action plan for this section, cross referencing to it rather than repeating information on the form. However, it is important that the action plan can be easily understood as a standalone document by members of committees and the ASO who may not be familiar with the details of issues in the department.

**B.4. If the department’s provision (UG, PGT, CPD) includes programmes delivered in collaboration with *external* providers (e.g. FECs or HEIs in the UK or overseas) please highlight notable successes, any significantissues that 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 *external* providers (that is not combined programmes solely involving University of York departments). This will include collaborations with Further Education Colleges (e.g. York College), Higher Education Institutions (e.g. Erasmus Mundus consortia) and other agencies or employers (e.g. the NHS) who share in the delivery of the programme.

As there are further levels of risk associated with such programmes FLTGs and UTC need to be aware of any issues that have come to light during this period. This section might include comment on:

* how effective channels of communication are for the smooth delivery and administration of the programme;
* any internal or external influences (positive and negative) on recruitment to the programmes and to their sustainability;
* any innovative developments to teaching and learning methods on the programme;
* any notable staff of student achievements directly related to the collaboration;
* any issues arising from the delivery of work-based learning partnerships.

**B.5. Are there any further issues (UG, PGT, CPD) that the department wishes to raise with UTC?**

This is an opportunity to raise any *pressing or unresolved* issues of particular concern to the Department, in *relation to teaching and learning*, with UTC that *have not* been covered in earlier sections.

APR *should not* be used as a form of feedback to support offices and services for issues that are best resolved directly. Departments should contact relevant support offices and services directly about any issues as they arise during the year to ensure a timely and proportionate response/action.

Any issues raised here that are outside UTC’s remit will be forwarded to relevant committees/offices, where appropriate, with a request for a response/update to the Department/ UTC.

**B.6. For undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes: looking forward, what are the top 3 priorities for the department relating to teaching and learning in the next 12 months?**

Although the main focus of APR is reflection on the previous academic year, FLTGs and UTC are interested to hear about departments’/programme teams’ priorities in the next 12 months to identify patterns/shared issues across the University and to offer any required timely support/guidance. This section should reflect priorities relating only to undergraduate and taught postgraduate provision (which may include CPD activities).

**Section C – Research Provision Only (Master’s by Research, MPhil, PhD, EngD)**

This section will be considered by the York Graduate Research School Policies and Programmes Sub-committee.

The focus of the APR report should be the *student experience*of PGR studentsand the*academic quality*of PGR programmes. **Matters relating to delivery of the department’s Research Strategy (e.g. funding of studentships, recruitment against targets, on-time (and within funded period) submission rates, PGR contributions to publications, enhancements to Department’s research environment that impact on PGR students etc.) should be reported via the department’s Annual Department Research Review (ADDR).**

This section of the form should be completed by (or, as a minimum, with input from) the Chair of the Graduate School Board or departmental equivalent. Where a department collaborates with another York department to offer a PGR programme (e.g. through an inter-departmental DTP or CDT), the departments involved should ensure that there are mechanisms in place to enable joint discussion and reporting of key issues via the APR process. As a minimum, the director(s) of the inter-departmental programme(s) should be asked to contribute to this section of the APR report.

Where a department collaborates externally to offer a PGR programme (e.g. with another university in the UK as part of a DTP/CDT, or a university overseas for a joint or double PhD programme), the director (or other person responsible for that programme) should be asked to contribute to this section of the APR report.

*1) Which aspects of the PGR student experience have been of particular note (strengths and/or challenges) in the past year?*

This could include reference to:

* quality and frequency of supervision;
* annual progression rates;
* percentage of successful outcomes (e.g. pass without referral) but you do not need to summarise all completion data;
* improvements as a response to student feedback;
* employability, training and development and other student-focussed activities.

**In years when PRES results are available please comment on your PRES results and note any actions being taken to address identified issues. In subsequent years, it would be helpful to receive an update on actions initiated in previous years.**

*2) Have any new PGR programmes (e.g. by distance learning or in DTPs), PGR programme changes (e.g. in terms of taught requirements or thesis format) or PGR organisational changes (e.g. student representation in decision making) been implemented this year? If so, what successes and challenges have you faced?*

*3) Are there any further PGR programme or student experience issues that the Department wishes to raise with YGRS?* This may include space, facilities, access to training, entrant quality or policy/ regulation (e.g. TAP, annual progression, examination).

*4) Looking forward, what are the top 3 priorities for the department relating to the student experience of PGR students or the academic quality of PGR programmes in the next 12 months?*

Although the main focus of APR is reflection on the previous academic year, YGRS is interested to hear about the department’s priorities in the next 12 months to identify patterns/shared issues across the University and to offer any required timely support/guidance. This section should reflect priorities relating only to the student experience or academic quality pertaining to PGR provision.

**Section D – All Programmes**

**Please outline the department’s mechanisms for student representation in 2016/17, including how students were involved in the APR process, any enhancements that have arisen in your department as a result of student engagement, and how these were communicated to students.**

This section should be completed with reference to all students – undergraduate, postgraduate taught and research.

It 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 student-staff forum 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 and how these changes have been communicated to students.

**Part C. Departmental Annual Programme Review Meeting**

The role of the APR meeting should serve as a focal point for: (i) consolidating the various discussions on programme quality that take place in different fora in a department and (ii) formulating a programme of action to address identified issues and build upon identified strengths. It should be useful for the department and not just an exercise required to comply with University policy.

***Attendance***

The format and constitution of the APR meeting will vary between departments, (i.e., it 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).

However, *all staff* who teach or supervise 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.

|  |
| --- |
| **The UTC departmental contact should be present at the main APR meeting.** Please set the date of your APR meeting *in liaison with* your UTC departmental contact to facilitate their attendance, and by the start of the Autumn Term at the latest. Please ensure that the UTC departmental contact receives meeting documentation in good time. If the APR meeting is lengthy it is not necessary for the UTC contact to attend for the whole period, as long as they attend for the most salient part of the meeting (i.e. discussion and formulation of actions). UTC contacts attend the meetings as critical friends and to help UTC to better understand issues in departments. UTC departmental contact list: <https://www.york.ac.uk/about/organisation/governance/sub-committees/teaching-committee/contacts/> |

***Student involvement***

**The involvement of student representatives in the APR meeting is crucial**. To facilitate this, it is recommended that the Chair holds 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 and any other students based off campus at the time (such as those studying abroad or on work placements) 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. In such cases please ask the previous year’s reps if they would be willing to attend.

***Timing***

The APR process reflecting on the previous academic year is completed in the Autumn Term, but will often start in the Summer Term, with departments submitting APR documentation to the Academic Support Office in mid-November. FLTGs, UTC and YGRS members will then consider the reports and provide departments with feedback in the Spring Term.

**Please Note:** For the APR of the academic year 2016/17 and to accommodate a period of thorough review by FLTGs and UTC, departments will be asked to submit their APR slightly earlier than in previous years. Departments will therefore need to ensure they plan the submission of Individual Programme pro formas, student consultation and their APR meetings in good time for the submission deadline in mid-November.

***Conduct of the meeting***

**Departments can decide for themselves how they conduct their APR 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 how work to align programmes, teaching and learning with the five principles of the York Pedagogy have been managed, and with what results, in the department;
* considering a theme such as the development of academic or employability skills and tracing the student experience through programmes and modules;
* using Programme Leaders summary reviews to provide information on risks, successes and areas for action in advance of the meeting then discussing these reports at the relevant part of the meeting (though focused on undergraduate provision in 2016/17, a similar approach could be taken with regard to taught postgraduate, CPD and research postgraduate provision);
* adopting ‘creative thinking’ techniques such as brainstorming, feasibility/impact matrix, identifying and challenging underlying assumptions.

***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) and the feedback received from FLTGs, UTC and YGRS;
* comments made by external examiners and the actions to address issues, with any significant matters included on the pro forma. If reports from PGT external examiners have not been received, the minutes of externals’ comments from the PGT Boards of Examiners meetings should be used. If your postgraduate boards take place after the APR meeting, then please remember to carry forward discussion of any points raised, and the actions taken in response, to the following year’s APR (and remember to look back at last year’s PGT reports to pick up any outstanding issues in this year’s APR).

*Please share the PGT externals’ reports and your response with your student representatives when they become available.*

* feedback from students, e.g., from internal module/programme evaluations, cohort meetings, focus groups, supervisory meetings, exit questionnaires, student representatives and from external surveys 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 and thesis advisory panel reports;
* the impact of introducing new programmes or modifications to existing programmes;
* experiences of significant new University policies or procedures;
* 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 exercises/visits, and how they have been used to facilitate programme development and improvements;
* statements from Combined Board 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 confirmation data);
* indicators of the development of employability skills, such as analysis of DLHE data and feedback from employers and students. *Careers Liaison Officers and HoDs have access to a tool to undertake in-depth analysis of the DLHE results. Please do make use of this information in your APR discussions;*
* appeals and complaints and 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, especially where revised statements have been published by the QAA);
* 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 APR 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.

The completed pro forma should be approved/signed-off by an individual or group with responsibility for teaching and learning matters in the department (e.g., full Board of Studies, Chair of BoS, Chair of GSB, HoD, APR meeting).

***Central Support***

You are encouraged to work with your departmental [Academic Quality Team](https://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/academic-support/staff/#quality) contact 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 good practice from within the institution and generally assist in helping departments to make the most of the APR.