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

Report for consideration by Teaching Committee at its meeting on 8 February 2017

ANNUAL PROGRAMME REVIEW 2016/17

1   SUMMARY

The attached paper summarises the APR reports for the 2016/17 academic year. Issues for support offices and other committees will be forwarded to them for action and/or information. Members of Teaching Committee have access to the APR reports (for information) via the shared google drive 'APR 2017'.

In addition to this University-level summary report, faculty-level summary reports have also been produced by the Deans (UTC.17-18/**54b-c-d**)

2   RECOMMENDATION(S)

UTC is asked to:
   a) **consider and approve** the report;
   b) **make decisions on the issues raised in the report (section 4)**

A final version of this report (incorporating any comments from the Committee) will be published on the website
https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/procedure/review/annual/

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:

AUTHOR'S NAME: Jane Iddon, Academic Quality Team
DATE: 30 January 2018
_____

Report contents & attachments:
- *Cover sheet (1 side)*

- *Report (15 sides)*

Overview of Annual Programme Review 2016/17

1.   **INTRODUCTION**

1.1.   Members of Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups (FLTG), the Chair of University Teaching Committee (UTC) and the Academic Support Office (ASO) considered Annual Programme Review (APR) reports for the 2016/2017 academic year over the course of December 2017 and January 2018. Members of FLTG reviewed the APR reports for those departments/centres belonging to the Faculty and completed a reflective commentary; the Dean then prepared a faculty-level summary report, informed by members' reflections (UTC.17-18/**54b-c-d**).

1.2.   This paper provides a brief summary of issues identified from the 2016/2017 APR process by FLTG, the Chair of UTC and the ASO that relate to undergraduate, taught postgraduate and supplementary provision. This paper highlights substantive issues that are common across a number of departments/centres. Where issues relate to a single department/centre, or small number of departments/centres, they are not included unless they are of sufficient interest or concern to be raised at University level.

1.3.   As in previous years departments, centres, supplementary providers and validated partners will receive an individual response to their APR report.

1.4.   Issues outwith UTC's remit will be forwarded to the appropriate committee(s) or support office(s) for action and/or information. Where appropriate, an update/response from the committee or support office will be requested, for report to UTC, during the Summer term.

1.5.   Issues identified by FLTG, the Chair of UTC or ASO relating to postgraduate research provision will be fed into the equivalent paper to be presented to the Policy and Programmes Sub-Committee of the York Graduate Research School.

1.6.   There were several amendments to the APR process for 2016-17:

- the introduction of a programme-level reflection (to inform the departmental APR) for undergraduate programmes;

- revisions to the APR pro forma to reflect (i) the implementation of the Pedagogy and (ii) the different reporting routes for Postgraduate Research programmes (to ensure that the APR process focuses on the PGR student experience rather than strategic issues which is the focus of the Annual Department Research Review process);

- a slightly earlier deadline for submission of the APR (to ensure sufficient time for FLTG scrutiny of the reports).

Teaching Committee is asked to consider the APR process for 2018 (paragraphs 3.3-3.8).

2.   THEMES

The York Pedagogy

2.1   At its meeting in February 2017 members agreed that Teaching Committee's oversight of progress with the implementation of the York Pedagogy (including progress with enhancement plans and the embedding of the emphasis on programme-level design and the role of the programme leader) should be maintained by the APR process in 2017 (M16-17/75 refers).   In accordance with UTC's recommendation regarding the 2016-17 APR process the pro forma was revised (including the introduction of an individual programme review pro forma for undergraduate programmes / group of cognate programmes) and approved by UTC at its March 2017 meeting (M16-17/105 refers).

2.2   In the light of the revisions to the process outlined in 2.1, the principles of the York Pedagogy, including the role of the programme leader, emerge as a clear theme across APR reports.   At its March meeting UTC will receive, for consideration, recommendations arising from an initial evaluation report of the York Pedagogy.   Feedback with respect to the York Pedagogy, gathered via APR reports 2016-17, was used to inform the initial evaluation report.

2.3   Departments across all three faculties reflect positively on the way that the implementation of the Pedagogy has informed curriculum development and provided a clear framework for reflection with respect to programme design / enhancement.   For example diversification of assessment (Archaeology, Economics), more explicit embedding of formative assessment (Criminology, Health Sciences), provision of a clear pathway for progressive development of academic skills (SPSW), and programme coherence and consistency across provision (Environment).

2.4   Several departments highlight the learning and teaching initiatives, connected with the Pedagogy, which have been implemented with the support of central funds. For example Environment (development of an online Skills Hub); Electronic Engineering (support to develop laboratory sessions and new group projects); Physics (introduction of online materials into Stage 1 modules); TFTV (production of new publicity and marketing materials to express the principles of the Pedagogy).

2.5   The implementation of enhancements and curricula amendments identified via the Pedagogy process is, as last year, identified as a major priority for the coming year (2017/18) by many departments.

2.6   Departments (Chemistry, Mathematics, Physics, Psychology, History, Philosophy, Centre for Medieval Studies, Language and Linguistic Science, Politics, Archaeology, Management, History of Art) across all three faculties highlight the workload associated with the implementation of Pedagogy. There remains a perception in some departments that the pedagogy has imposed a burden on staff that is disproportionate to the benefit gained from it. All three faculty-level summary reports (UTC.17-18/**54b-c-d**) note, as a theme, the challenges of managing the implementation of the Pedagogy.

2.7   Related to workload are the challenges noted by several departments with respect to using the Programme Design Document (PDD). Mathematics note that they feel the programme map is not fit for purpose for a large programme. Politics and Management both note problems with the administration-side of the Pedagogy and report that the documentation is not user friendly. The interim (Google Sheet-based) format of the PDD has been an acknowledged weakness throughout the implementation phase and links to the continuing need for an online Programme Catalogue.

2.8   Reports from History and Language and Linguistic Science suggest that the relationship between the Programme Leader and that the Chair of the Board of Studies is not clear. Minor additions were made (December 2017) to the Programme Leader role descriptor to make clearer the relationship between the Programme Leader, who takes responsibility for the programme (in terms of design, monitoring and enhancement), and the Board of Studies, which has formal governance oversight of the department's portfolio of programmes.

2.9   Specific issues raised in APR reports relating to the implementation of the York Pedagogy will be fed back to the York Pedagogy Project team and, as outlined in paragraph 2.2, recommendations arising from the York Pedagogy initial evaluation report, which has been informed by 2016-17 APRs, will be considered by UTC in March.

Combined and interdisciplinary programmes

2.10   As in previous years several departments highlight the challenges associated with the delivery / management of combined and interdisciplinary programmes. The faculty-level summary reports for Arts and Humanities (UTC.17-18/**54b**) and the Social Sciences (UTC.17-18/**54d**) also note, as a theme, the complexities associated with managing combined courses.

2.11   Biology and Computer Science note that combined programmes have a disproportionate adverse effect on the timetable that negatively affects much larger single subject cohorts.

2.12   Criminology note the challenges arising from delivering interdisciplinary provision with limited systematic administrative support. In the absence of a separate administrative entity (as in the case of the School of Social and Political Sciences) to manage the programme, Criminology have successfully adopted a cross-departmental administrative support model whereby the various administrative roles are shared across contributing partner departments.

2.13   Whilst dedicated administrative posts do exist in the case of the School of Social and Political Sciences (SPS) the report highlights the challenges of coordinating APR-related meetings when key information is delayed from partner departments. SPS also highlight concerns raised by students which derive from varied departmental practice with respect to exam feedback and Lecture Capture.

2.14   Several departments from the Arts & Humanities highlight initiatives (to be taken forward in 2017/18) with respect to combined degrees:

•   English – exploring methods of communicating better between partner departments and more tailored dissertation provision for students on combined courses
•   History – undertaking a review of Stage 1 of its single subject programme (which is particularly problematic for joint honours students)

- Philosophy – undertaking a review of its participation in some joint degrees and the continuation of some 10 credit Stage 2 modules

  The Arts and Humanities FLTG has recently established a Working Group on Combined Courses (UTC 17-18/**49a**) which has been convened to consider (and address) the higher degree of dissatisfaction (as reported by the NSS) amongst combined course students in comparison to students on single subjects across the Faculty (UTC 17-18/**35a**).

Student numbers

2.15   As last year concerns are raised in a number of reports around the impact on the student experience of large cohorts. The faculty-level summary reports for the Sciences (UTC.17-18/**54c**) and Social Sciences (UTC.17-18/**54d**) also note concerns about unplanned student number growth and the need "to ensure that all relevant information is taken into full account within the planning and budgeting processes" (page 3 UTC.17-18/**54c**). Politics report that, due to growth in numbers, one of its core modules has to be timetabled twice because the cohort size is larger than the largest capacity lecture theatre. Laboratory capacity is a particular issue for many Science departments (Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Psychology). Related to this are the challenges noted by two departments (Biology, Environment) with respect to planning caused by uncertain numbers coming from the International Pathway College and the School of Natural Sciences.

2.16   In addition to pressure on laboratory facilities other concerns include the pressure on small group teaching (History, Law), project supervision (Psychology, Centre for Women's Studies), increasing number of staff on fixed-term contracts (Politics), sense of community (Psychology), availability of space to host entire cohorts (History) and the availability of equipment / kit / computers (TFTV, Politics).

2.17   Issues relating to student numbers will be passed to the Planning Office for information and, where appropriate, for response. UTC should note that following discussion at the October 2017 meeting (M17-18/4 refers) it was agreed that UTC would receive a paper from the Planning Office, regarding student growth patterns and cohort number targets, during the Spring term (M17-18/28 refers).

Student support

2.18   Given its prominence in 2015-16 APRs it is worth noting that, whilst demand for Student Support Services remains high (Centre for Medieval Studies, History, Archaeology) concerns

about the resourcing of Disability Services and the availability of Open Door Team appointments do not feature heavily in this years' APRs. Physics note that 72 members of staff (which included all but four academic members of staff) undertook Mental Health Training during the reporting year.

Student engagement / attendance

2.19   A number of reports highlight student attendance as being an issue (Management, Politics, SPS, Physics) and a number of departments have reflected on using attendance or other data to track engagement, for instance:

- SPSW – in 2016/17, the introduction of a more robust and improved system of monitoring has helped to boost student attendance markedly (this has run alongside a more explicit linking of good attendance with the professional fitness to practise)

- Electronic Engineering – creation of an online quiz app to encourage engagement (the app includes the facility for supervisors to monitor engagement)

- Psychology – plans to review attendance data at Board of Studies meetings

- Mathematics – recent approval (November 2017) of a revised (and strengthened) departmental attendance monitoring system

- Physics – monitoring of student engagement via attendance at classes (laboratory, tutorial problem classes) and records of practice questions

2.20   SPS request a steer from UTC about how to deal with serial non-attenders and note that other universities have compulsory attendance policies (whereby students are denied credit for modules where attendance at scheduled contact sessions is less than 50%). Economics request that UTC look at systems for attendance monitoring such as scanners on entrance doors to record student attendance. Senate recently endorsed (July 2017) an *Attendance Monitoring Policy*, developed and approved by UTC, for implementation once an IT system has been developed to support it. The *Attendance Monitoring Policy* is supportive in approach rather than punitive and articulates key University expectations which include requirements that:

- departments set thresholds for attendance (which are approved by the relevant Board of Studies and Faculty Learning and Teaching Group);

- attendance is reported on by departments and reviewed on an annual basis by Boards of Studies and Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups;

- a student welfare meeting be held in cases where a student fails to meet the attendance threshold on more than one occasion.

2.21   During discussion of the draft Attendance Monitoring policy at its meeting in June 2017 UTC noted that the implementation of the Policy was dependant on the procurement of appropriate IT systems and that attendance monitoring was not feasible unless processes were automated and robust (M16-17/155 refers).

Timetabling and space

2.22   As in previous years a number of reports highlight issues relating to timetabling and space; these should be considered within the context of the annual report on timetabling and space (see separate agenda item [UTC.17-18/**58]**).

2.23   As last year both Physics and Mathematics raise concern about the quality of teaching space. That said Physics note the improvements with respect to some elements of its teaching estate and similarly Mathematics highlight the positive impact of two new research/teaching/social spaces.

2.24   The Centre for Medieval Studies also note concerns about the provision of high-quality work spaces at King's Manor for its postgraduate (taught and research) students and highlight in particular that the pressure on space impacts negatively on the sense of a community (a unique selling point of the Centre). Similarly History highlight the challenges of creating a strong learning community given that teaching takes place over two sites.

2.25   The Centre for Lifelong Learning reflect positively on the impact on the sense of collective identity of the introduction of the Spring Lane Building, which housed the majority of evening classes in 2016/17. The Centre comments that "from a student perspective, there is a now a much clearer sense of Lifelong Learning being anchored in a central location with good links to public transport".

2.26   Other issues relating to teaching spaces include defective equipment in teaching rooms (Economics) and lack of communal spaces (SPSW, Economics). These concerns and those raised by other departments will be forwarded to Estates and Campus Services.

2.27   Issues around timetabling featured much less than in previous years. Psychology and the Centre for Medieval Studies raise specific concerns about the central organisation of timetabling. Biology note that its largest cohort exceeds the capacity of the laboratories (see para. 2.15) and lecture theatres; therefore creating timetabling difficulties.

Assessment Policy

2.28   Concerns regarding the revised University Policy on feedback turnaround time are expressed in a number of reports (Education, Centre for Medieval Studies, History, Archaeology, Philosophy, Faculty of Arts and Humanities summary report [UTC.17-18/**54b**]).   Whilst supportive of the lower turnaround times, Philosophy note that it will be challenging to implement without any change to the structure of the academic year; "We would welcome the introduction of (for example) a week for marking after the Spring CAP or, indeed, semesterisation." Whilst the Faculty of Social Sciences Summary report (UTC.17-18/**54d**) notes acceptance of the feasibility of the revised feedback turnaround time, it expresses concern about the extent to which it might have a disproportionate impact particularly in the Spring term, and, "following discussion in FLTG, this was given as a reason to re-open the discussion about extending term to accommodate a marking period in term 2 or a discussion about the overall benefits of semesterisation."

2.29   Similarly the Faculty of Sciences Summary report (UTC.17-18/**54c**) requests that the Common Assessment Periods (CAP) be reconsidered. The context for this request is the concentration of examinations in the CAPs; concerns about the proximity between the end of teaching in Summer term and the Summer CAP; a suggestion that the Summer CAP could be revisited in light of changes to the timing of graduation; and a suggestion that there would be value in revising the University's policy requiring assessment after a module finishes.

2.30   At UTC's February 2017 meeting it was agreed that it was timely to consider lengthening the Spring CAP (and to consider a 31 week academic year to accommodate this) (M16-17/ 78 refers). The Chair had taken this forward via the VC's Advisory Group, which had been supportive (M16-17/98 refers), and the Faculty Executive Groups, which had rejected the proposal (M16-17/144 refers). In the light of concerns raised in the 2016/17 APRs, **UTC is asked to consider whether to re-open the discussion about the timing and / or length of**

the CAPs, or the benefits of semesterisation, and / or associated policies surrounding timing of assessment.

Assessment and feedback

2.31 As in previous years assessment and feedback feature widely across reports (across all faculties [UTC.17-18/**54b-c-d**]), in terms of both issues resolved and issues still to be resolved.

2.32 Natural Sciences report that, given the complicated nature of its provision (which span several partner departments), there are assessment pressure points. In response the School is compiling a year-long pressure map which will be shared with students to help students to plan work load. Economics report a series of planned changes with respect to assessment which relate to its undergraduate pedagogy enhancement plan and the recommendations arising from its 2017 Periodic Review. Management too have identified revised assessment schedules as being a key priority for undergraduate programmes for the coming year.

2.33 Politics reflect on its initiatives employed in recent years to improve the quality and timeliness of feedback; success in these initiatives is reflected via continual improvement in NSS scores in the *assessment and feedback* dimension. Health Sciences reflect on a successful initiative to increase opportunities for formative feedback in its undergraduate nursing and midwifery provision.

Communication

2.34 Ineffective communication between UTC / FLTG and departments, in relation to changes to teaching and learning, is raised by several departments. Whilst the proposal to discontinue combined Boards of Studies was discussed at UTC in March and May 2017 and FLTGs had been consulted on this proposal in April 2017, Politics report that it only became aware of this proposal when it was brought to the Department's attention by a student representative (and that a partner department was also unaware of the proposal).

2.35 As last year the Centre for Lifelong Learning reports that its position outside the faculty structure presents challenges with respect to communication and requests a "notional affiliation with the relevant faculty to ensure that Lifelong Learning remain abreast of developments, and that the programmes' stature within the institution as a whole is

recognised". UTC should note that whilst there is a clear process with respect to CLL's provision in terms of the planning approval of new proposals and modifications to existing programmes (the relevant FLTG is determined by the partner department(s)), CLL is not represented on FLTGs. Similarly, in relation to consultation regarding the revised policy on feedback turnaround time, the Centre for Medieval Studies notes that it is not represented on Faculty Executive Group and requests that the involvement of Centres in faculty-level conversations be reviewed.

2.36 **UTC is asked to recommend that the Chair of UTC, the Deans and the Associate Deans for Teaching and Learning** (for which the appointment process is currently underway) **consider how best to strengthen the communication channels between departments/centres, Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups and University Teaching Committee**.

E-Learning

2.37 The issues arising from APR reports relating to E-leaning should be considered within the context of the annual report on E-learning services in support of learning and teaching (see separate agenda item [UTC.17-18/**57**]).

2.38 Physics and Chemistry note that improvements to facilities for lecture capture / video capture have been useful. Chemistry report that the percentage of Chemistry undergraduate lectures available on Replay has increased from 64% to 84%. Physics note too the extension of hardware to a number of lecture rooms and comment positively on the support provided by Audio-Visual and E-Learning to improve the reliability of the system. Language and Linguistics highlight the successful use of Lecture Capture for language classes for the module 'Articulatory and Impressionistic Phonetics'.

2.39 TFTV raise a concern about Storage as a large-file submission system and Education request support regarding the process for setting up of e-exams. These specific queries will be forwarded, for response / advice, to the E-learning Development Team.

Module Catalogue

2.40 As last year concerns regarding the implementation and functionality of the module catalogue feature widely in APR reports. Concerns include the user interface (Chemistry), resourcing of the project (Computer Science, Psychology), errors in the web publish

following assessment amendments [which perhaps results from the manual intervention required in the current process] (Environment, Chemistry), constraints within the current set up of the module catalogue (which arise from its connection to SITS) which prevent modules for future years featuring in the web publish (Physics) and the work flow (Archaeology, TFTV).

2.41   During the Autumn and Spring terms 2017/18 the project team has been working to develop and implement a series of 'Top 20' enhancements to the Module Catalogue.   These enhancements were identified via a number of feedback channels (including APRs 2015/16, process mapping sessions undertaken during the summer 2017, Chairs of Board of Studies September Conference) and were considered, and endorsed (with minor amendments), by the Programme Module Catalogue steering group at its September meeting. The approach taken by the project team has been to work on the 'Top 20' in discrete batches, and deploy them for departments' use in 'sprints' (after they have been tested). In line with this approach a number of enhancements were deployed at the end of the Autumn term which included a series of amendments intended to improve the work flow in line with feedback from departments.   The second 'sprint', which included a series of amendments intended to improve the process for assessment proposals, is due to be released at the beginning of February.

2.42   At the end of each 'sprint' cycle a communication, which outlines the enhancements, is circulated to module catalogue users (including Chairs of Board of Studies).

Careers and employability

2.43   Careers and employability feature widely (across all faculties) again in APR reports this year and also a theme highlighted within the faculty-level summary report for the Social Sciences (UTC.17-18/**54d**). A large number of departments in the Faculty of Sciences highlight the success of their students in employment and the way this is supported by employability being embedded in their provision. English too reflect on the explicit embedding of employability skills in 'Topic Modules' which form part of undergraduate programmes.

2.44   A number of departments outline successful employability initiatives for example: a dedicated supervision at the start of Stage 2 (History); a partnership with Estates on a year 2 compulsory module for Environmental Geography and Environmental Science students

whereby students get practical experience by tackling environmental problems on campus (Environment); the development of a tripartite programme, to be introduced in 2017/18 and delivered weekly throughout the year, based around employability, personal development and academic skills (Sociology); 'Life after Women's Studies' conference, a bi-annual careers event with alumni (Centre for Women's Studies).

2.45   Specific issues relating to careers raised by Education (scheduling of events and communication from the Careers Service) will be forwarded to the Faculty Employability Manager for the Social Sciences to follow-up.

3   THE APR PROCESS

UTC Departmental Contact Attendance at APR meetings

3.1   During the Autumn term a number of departments did not have a designated UTC Departmental contact due to vacancies on the Committee, these were Environment, Politics, Sociology, Centre for Women's Studies, Criminology, Social and Political Science and Social Policy and Social Work. In the case of Criminology the Academic Quality Team (AQT) contact participated in the meeting and in the case of Sociology the AQT contact provided comment on the draft report. In the case of SPSW the Chair of Board of Studies met with the AQT contact ahead of the APR meeting.

3.2   Of the 24 departments/centres with a designated UTC contact 9 were conducted without the presence of the UTC departmental contact. In all cases this was due to diary clashes (in some cases the clash was another APR meeting) or illness.

Timing

3.3   In order to ensure sufficient time for members of FLTG to review and scrutinise APRs by the end of the Autumn term the deadline for submission of the 2016/17 reports was brought forward by 10 calendar days (to Wednesday 15 November 2017). Only one department (Music) commented that the earlier deadline was problematic (due to its closeness to postgraduate taught examination boards). In the light of the benefits with respect to FLTG scrutiny of reports **it is recommended that the slightly earlier deadline be maintained and that the deadline for departmental-level reports to the Academic Support Office be Wednesday 14 November 2018.**

York Pedagogy – maintaining the momentum

3.4   In order to ensure that UTC's oversight of progress with the implementation of the York Pedagogy is maintained **it is recommended that that APR requirement, introduced last year, to report on progress with enhancement plans is retained.**

Maintaining the focus at the programme-level

3.5   Last year's APR process included the introduction of a programme-level reflection for undergraduate provision to inform the department-level APR (which retained its 'by exception' focus).

3.6   Two departments raised concerns about the introduction of the programme-level reflection. Philosophy raised the concern in the context of the workload associated with the implementation of the Pedagogy; "The introduction of Individual Programme Reviews in this year's APR provides just one example of the way in which implementing the Pedagogy has created further work."   Music raise concern with respect to the extent and prescriptive nature of the new reporting processes and the opportunity cost of undertaking the additional reflection.

3.7   In order to ensure sufficient focus on the academic quality of programmes **it is recommended that:**

•   **the requirement for a programme-level reflection for each programme (or cluster of related programmes) be maintained for undergraduate provision;**

•   **the requirement for a programme-level reflection be extended to postgraduate taught programmes (or cluster of related postgraduate taught programmes);**

•   **the programme-level pro forma be simplified to support a concise reflection** (with references, where relevant, to Pedagogy enhancement plan implementation); prompts might include

    –   What has gone well?

    –   What significant challenges or major risks has the programme(s) faced?

    –   How were the challenges / risks addressed, or how will they be addressed?

Outcomes

3.8   The APR guidance notes include a section which outlines the minimum requirements with respect to the content of the APR meeting; this includes consideration of indicators of the development of employability skills, such as analysis of Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education Survey (DLHE) data and feedback from employers and students. The approach with respect to the departmental-level APR is 'by exception' and therefore whilst departments are invited to reflect on initiatives to develop students' employability skills there is no requirement for the write-up of the APR meeting to include a reflection on employability data such as DLHE. In the light of the focus in the sector on student outcomes (including the metrics which underpin the Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework) **UTC is asked to consider whether the focus on employability in the current APR process is sufficiently strong.**

4   **SUMMARY OF THE DECISIONS TO BE TAKEN**

4.1   UTC is asked to:

- **consider** whether to re-open the discussion about the timing and / or length of the CAPs, or the benefits of semesterisation, and / or associated policies surrounding timing of assessment (para. 2.30)**;**

- **recommend** that the Chair of UTC, the Deans and the Associate Deans for Teaching and Learning (for which the appointment process is currently underway) consider how best to strengthen the communication channels between departments/centres, Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups and University Teaching Committee (para. 2.36);

- **approve** that the deadline for 2017/18 departmental-level APR reports be Wednesday 14 November 2018 (para. 3.3);

- **approve** that it continue to be a requirement of the APR process to report on progress with Pedagogy enhancement plans (para. 3.4);

- **approve** that it be a requirement for a programme-level reflection for each programme (or cluster of related programmes) for taught provision (para. 3.7);

- **approve** that the programme-level pro forma be simplified to support a concise reflection which focuses on major issues, risks and planned actions (para. 3.7);

- **consider** whether the focus on employability in the current APR process is sufficiently strong (para. 3.8).

Next steps

4.2 The APR report templates and guidance will be revised to reflect UTC's consideration of the issues outlined above. UTC will receive, for approval, the revised templates and guidance at its March meeting.