To: Heads of Department; Chairs of Boards of Studies; Chairs of Graduate School Boards; Faculty Deans; Associate PVC for Teaching, Learning & Students; Associate Deans for Teaching, Learning & Students; Academic Support Office; YUSU (James Hare, Nick Glover, Gabby Morgan); GSA (Charlotte Chamberlain, Chris Bovis), Departmental Managers/Administrators, University Executive Board

FOR ACTION: NSS and Annual Programme Review reporting processes

Dear colleagues

I am writing to explain the changes to the Annual Programme Review (2018-19) reporting processes (approved by University Teaching Committee at its May 2019 meeting) and to outline the process for the analysis and reporting of the National Student Survey results for 2019.

The changes approved by Teaching Committee can be summarised as follows:

- Previously, departments were asked both to complete a pro forma reflecting on their NSS results (incorporating an action plan in response to NSS) and to complete a separate department level APR pro forma. The NSS pro forma has been embedded into the department level APR pro forma. There is now a single revised document (pdf version appended for information only; the actual pro forma will be in the form of a GoogleDoc – see below).

- Departments will be asked to complete those sections of the form that relate to NSS by **Friday 16 August** and the remainder of the form by **Wednesday 13 November**.

- The revised form incorporates a departmental learning and teaching action plan, which incorporates actions arising from NSS and what was formerly the section of the APR form that asked departments to identify their top 3 priorities. Departments will be asked to start populating the action plan in response to NSS results in August and complete the action plan in light of their more general APR reflection at the same time as they complete the rest of the form.

- The department-level APR form will move from being Word-based to GoogleDoc based and will be include some prepopulated sections (e.g. section 2 will be pre-populated with NSS 2018 actions [for those departments that participated in the NSS] and the top three APR priorities identified in last year's report). The move to a GoogleDoc allows different sections of the form to be completed at different times and thereby moves away from the idea that such documents should be static.

- Reflection on the results of the Subject TEF pilot has been embedded into the APR process.

- The question on employability has been retained but has been refocused to be a more general reflection on employability rather than a focus specifically on DLHE and LEO results, in light of the fact that there have been no new DLHE or LEO metrics

this year. Careers will provide departments with some other employability metrics as part of the annual Department Employability Plans.

- The wording for the question on Student Representation has been amended to be a more general one on student partnership (ie not just focusing on representatives).

- Some redundant questions have been removed; some sections have been merged into others to avoid unnecessary overlap in the form.

NB: The Individual Programme pro forma (appended), for reflection at the programme-level (or cluster of related programmes), **is retained**. As in previous years, Chairs of Boards of Studies are responsible for determining the internal deadline for submission of the individual programme pro formas.

These changes act to remove unnecessary duplication within the NSS and APR processes. They form part of a wider ongoing review of the University's reporting processes for learning and teaching, which has as key aims a desire to avoid unnecessary workload whilst moving towards a holistic (rather than overlapping and separate) process.

NSS reporting

NSS results will be released by the Office for Students on **Wednesday 3 July.** Please note that this release date is three weeks earlier than last year. As happened last year, all data except for open comments will be publicly available from the outset. This removes the window that HE providers had in previous years for private access to their own results before public release and media analysis.

The attached flow chart summarises the process and the PDF document explains further how and when information will be released and analysed. The Academic Support Office and Business Intelligence Unit will work with me, to publish the results and to give access to the data as quickly as possible whilst maintaining confidence that the data is accurate and presented in the most accessible format.

Accessing the Results and Open Comments
Results will be presented in Tableau and accessed via the ASO
webpage: https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/procedure/students/nss/ according to the timeline in the attached document. Our aim is to publish summary presentations from 5 July and then more sophisticated and detailed views of University and Department data through the following weeks. All appropriate staff in academic departments and Professional Services should have access to this page through UoY login. The open comments will also be accessed via the webpage in Excel format, but due to their added sensitivity, access is restricted to a smaller group of senior staff including HoDs, Chairs BoS and professional services managers. The open comments will be released in mid-July to give time for the data to be checked to ensure its anonymity and to format it for ease of reference. ASO will also be analysing the results in the context of the 2019 subject TEF pilot benchmarks in order to give an initial analysis of what the NSS results might mean for subject TEF. This too will be sent to Departments in mid-July.

Department Action
Departments will be asked to complete the relevant sections of the APR document on a GoogleDoc, that is: initial interpretation of 2019 results; update on progress with actions arising from the 2018 survey; and identifying three key priorities for action this year. The Departmental APR GoogleDoc will be made available no later than 4 July. The deadline for completion of the elements that relate to the NSS is Friday 16 August.

Using and Sharing the Data
Colleagues are asked to use their discretion in how they circulate the open comments amongst their staff, as through their free text composition there can be quite specific references to modules, staff or issues even after all reasonable attempts to anonymise the comments have been undertaken.

Care also needs to be taken in the sharing of results data. The reporting threshold for the public data is 50% response rate and a minimum of 10 responses. Data for internal use only continues to be where at least 10 students responded at programme/ department level, for the indicative rankings and for some of York's departments/ schools. Detailed notes provided with the Tableau Workbooks will explain what can be publicly shared and what is for internal use only.

Guidance on the sharing of results and how departmental performance in the NSS can be publicised can be found at: https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/procedure/students/nss/ Please can I also draw your attention to the Policy on student surveys and guaranteeing confidentiality of feedback

If you do not already have access to Tableau and the MI Gateway, please complete the appropriate form. If you have queries about the calculations and methods used in compiling NSS data, please contact business-intelligence@york.ac.uk. If you have general queries about the NSS, please contact sally.oconnor@york.ac.uk in the Academic Support Office.

Please note that to be able to fully access the Academic Support Office website and Tableau, you need to be on campus or use the VPN if you are off campus.

Kind regards

Professor John Robinson
PVC Teaching, Learning and Students

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

TEACHING COMMITTEE AND

YORK GRADUATE RESEARCH SCHOOL

Annual Programme Review (APR) *Pro Forma*: **Summary Review of the Academic Year 2018/19**

Department	*Name*
Programmes covered by this report Please list all taught and PGR programmes covered by this report. Combined programmes should be included in the report of the Lead Department, of which the Programme Leader is a member. The Partner Department for combined programmes, of which the Associate Programme Leader is a member may also wish 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 (taught (all levels) and PGR) attend the APR meeting? If not, please state why.	*Y/N (delete as appropriate)*
Undergraduate external examiner table completed? *[NB: the table takes the form of a Google Sheet and thus there is no need to append the completed table]*	*Y/N (delete as appropriate)*
Updated periodic review action plan appended (as appropriate)? If you had a **periodic review** in 2018/19 or have outstanding actions from an earlier review, please save your action plan with an update on progress in your departmental APR google folder.	*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 for prompts on the content of this report.

A. COMMENTARY – TAUGHT PROGRAMMES

1. Success and Innovative Practice 2018/19

In the context of the quality of the student and staff experience for taught programmes (both UG and PGT), what has gone well over the past year? Please comment on notable successes and examples of innovative practice that are particularly noteworthy, if these have been introduced in the past year. Please ensure that this reflection is both at department **and** programme level, drawing on the programme level-reviews authored by each Programme Level.

This might include, for instance, reference to levels of student engagement; the quality of student work; awards or other recognition (internal or external) for teaching and learning; the outcomes of any projects, working groups or reviews; programme leadership; improvements to employability; successes evident within the Subject TEF pilot 2019; or improvements in metrics relating to the student experience.

It would be particularly useful to reflect on examples aligned to the Subject TEF criteria (see the guidance notes). Noting evidence of good / innovative practice linked to the criteria (and the impact this practice has had) will help support Subject TEF submissions in 2020. However, this section should not be limited to such examples. APR crosses all provision (UG and PGT) whilst Subject TEF is UG only

Indicative length: no more than 500 words.

Programme Level (as appropriate):

Department Level:

2. Reflection on last year's actions: APR Priorities, NSS Action Plan (as appropriate)

Please reflect on progress made against the 'top 3' priorities for learning and teaching in relation to taught programmes identified in last year's APR and the actions identified in response to the results of NSS 2018 and provide a brief update on these. (*The update on progress with NSS 2018 actions should be completed by **Friday 16 August 2019,** in advance of the completion of the rest of the form.*) What impact has this work had?

(*Departments that do not participate in the NSS should focus on the top 3 priorities in APR only*)

Action	Update

3. Reflection on 2019 NSS results (if appropriate)

Note: departments that do not participate in the NSS should ignore this aspect of the form.

This section should be completed by **Friday 16 August 2019,** in advance of the completion of the rest of the form.

Please provide a concise departmental interpretation of this year's NSS results (NSS 2019) – the statistical data and the open comments (MAXIMUM 200 WORDS). Proposed actions in response to NSS results should be stated within the broader learning and teaching action plan (section 6), below.

Maximum length: no more than 200 words

4. Reflection on Challenges

What significant issues (all taught programmes) have emerged in relation to the student experience that have not been resolved? If these do not form part of the Department's action plan (below), what actions (if any) are being taken to resolve these issues?

Please reflect, by exception, at both department level and at programme level, drawing on issues arising from the programme level review forms authored by Programme Leaders.

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. The discussion might encompass challenges evident in student experience data (e.g. NSS, PTES, internal department surveys for UG and PGT provision) or the Subject TEF pilot 2019.

This section also provides an opportunity to raise any <u>pressing or unresolved issues</u> 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 500 words

Programme Level (as appropriate):

Department Level:

5. Graduate employability

Please reflect on how effectively you feel the taught programmes have prepared students for employment. Commentary here could be informed by the data provided by Careers and Placements within the Department Employability Plan, and also other metrics such as those provided in Subject TEF. Please work with your Faculty Employability Manager within the Careers and Placements team to access and navigate the relevant datasets.

Indicative length: no more than 500 words

6. Learning and Teaching Action Plan

Please identify the priority actions that the Department will focus on during the 2019/20 academic year in relation to taught programmes (UG and PGT). This should take into account the reflections above for UG and PGT programmes, the NSS 2019 results (if the Department runs UG provision); the Department's results for the Subject TEF pilot 2019 (as appropriate); and any relevant data for PGT programmes (e.g. PTES).

Progress against the actions will be monitored by FLTG (departments can use the 'update' column to support this). Note that there is no need to wait for FLTG endorsement prior to commencing work on the actions.

Departments are asked to note that actions on employability should be recorded in the Department Employability Plan (organised by Careers and Placements); but might be listed here if they are particular priorities.

Departments who participate in the NSS should begin to complete the action plan in response to the NSS results (giving three actions) by **Friday 16 August 2019.** The action plan should be completed in full at the submission of the APR form, by **Wednesday 13 November 2019.** This may involve revisiting, expanding and / or revising the actions proposed in response to NSS, if new priorities emerge. It is suggested that the action plan consist of around 6 actions.

Action (and Brief Explanation)	To be completed by whom and when?	Update

7. Collaboration

If the department's provision (all taught programmes) includes programmes delivered in collaboration with external providers (such as, but not limited to FE Colleges and UK or overseas HEIs, commercial or statutory partners) please highlight notable successes and any significant issues that have been identified relating to these programmes and how they have been resolved.

Indicative length: no more than 500 words

B. 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 <u>the student experience of PGR students or the academic quality of PGR programmes</u> 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

C. STUDENT VOICE – ALL PROGRAMMES

Please reflect on the department's mechanisms for engagement with the student voice in 2018/19, including student representation and (e.g.) students' role in module evaluation; and any partnerships with students to

enhance learning and teaching (for instance focus groups; projects). Reflection might focus not only on listing any initiatives, but also the benefits and limitations of these mechanisms.

Indicative length: no more than 300 words

The deadline for completion of this form is Wednesday 13 November 2019.

If you had a **periodic review** in 2018/19 or have outstanding actions from an earlier review, please remember to save your updated action plan (with an update on progress) in your departmental APR google folder.

TEACHING COMMITTEE AND

YORK GRADUATE RESEARCH SCHOOL

ANNUAL PROGRAMME REVIEW OF THE ACADEMIC YEAR 2018/19: GUIDANCE NOTES FOR DEPARTMENTS

The following guidance notes provide advice on completing the Departmental review proforma and, more generally, background information on the APR process 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. There are separate guidance notes for Programme Leaders on how to complete the Individual Programme Proforma, appended to the template for that proforma.

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;
- support enhancement of provision through reflection and action planning;
- 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 2018/19 departments have been asked to

ensure Programme Leaders for both undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes complete an individual programme level pro forma.

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.

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 (foundation, undergraduate, graduate, postgraduate taught and 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.

- **Section A relates to all taught provision only.**
- **Section B (1-4) relates to PGR provision only (PhD, MPhil, Master's by Research, EngD).**
- **Section C, Student Voice, relates to all levels.**

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

Section A – TAUGHT PROGRAMMES

1. Success and Innovative Practice (All Taught Programmes)

Please use this section of the form to comment on what has gone well over the past year and to highlight innovative practice introduced during the year. Please comment by exception on issues arising from the individual programme level reviews authored by each Programme Leader (including combined programmes where the Programme Leader is a member of staff in the Department), and highlight department-level successes.

Comments might include reference to:

- innovative practice that has been introduced in 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)*;
- changes to practice designed to support employability;
- improvements in student support (academic or non-academic);
- funded or non-funded enhancement projects which have resulted in exceptional student feedback and/or developed themes such as student engagement;
- 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 Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs);
- 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 external stakeholders such as employers or 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.

It would be particularly useful if the Department could highlight <u>new</u> instances of good / innovative practice in relation to the Subject TEF criteria, or <u>new</u> evidence of the impact of existing initiatives as this will help provide an evidence base for Subject TEF submissions. The current criteria are as follows:

Teaching Quality 1: Student Engagement	Students are engaged with learning and encouraged to commit to their studies, including through appropriate contact time and independent learning
Teaching Quality 2: Valuing Teaching	Excellent teaching in the subject is promoted and recognized, and innovation is supported
Teaching Quality 3: Rigour and Stretch	Curriculum, pedagogy and assessment stretch students to develop independence, knowledge and skills that reflect their full potential

Teaching Quality 4: Assessment and Feedback	Assessment and feedback practices effectively support students' development, progression and attainment
Teaching Quality 5: Student partnership	Students studying the subject are understood and engaged as partners in the delivery, development and enhancement of provision
Learning Environment 1: Resources	Physical and digital resources are used effectively to aid teaching, learning and the development of independent study and research skills
Learning Environment 2: Scholarship, research and professional practice	Teaching and learning is enriched by student exposure to and involvement in scholarship, research and professional practice
Learning Environment 3: Personalised Learning	Students are supported as individuals to succeed in their learning, progression and attainment
Student Outcomes 1: Employability and Transferable Skills	Students gain knowledge, skills, work readiness and personal development, which are embedded within the curriculum and wider student experience
Student Outcomes 2: Employment and Further Study	Students progress educationally and professionally, into graduate level employment or higher study
Student Outcomes 3: Positive Outcomes for All	Students from all backgrounds achieve positive outcomes. Potential differential outcomes of disadvantaged students are identified and addressed.

2. Reflection on Last Year's Actions

Please use this table to provide an update to FLTG and UTC on progress against the 'top 3 priorities' identified in last year's APR and (if the Department participates in the NSS) the three priority actions identified in the Department's response to last year's NSS results (the update on progress with NSS (2018) actions should be completed by **Friday 16 August 2019,** in advance of the completion of the rest of the form). If the Department has evidence on the impact of actions taken (e.g. within student feedback; survey results), it would be useful to list this here.

3. Reflection on NSS 2019 Results

Please provide a concise departmental interpretation of this year's NSS results – the statistical data and the open comments. This section of the APR form should be completed by **Friday 16 August 2019,** in advance of the completion of the rest of the form. This is to support institutional reporting and oversight of the response to the NSS results.

Departments / centres who do not participate in the NSS should leave this section of the form blank.

4. Reflection on Challenges (All Taught Programmes)

This section should be used to comment on significant issues in relation to the student experience on taught programmes (both UG and PGT) that have not been resolved. Please reflect at both department level and programme level, drawing by exception on issues arising from the individual programme level review forms authored by Programme leaders. The discussion might encompass challenges evident in for instance, student engagement, student experience data or the Subject TEF pilot 2019.

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.

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.

5. **Graduate Employability**

Please use this section to reflect on how effectively your taught programmes support students for employment. The commentary here can be informed by the employability data provided by Careers and Placements as part of the Department Employability Plan, as well as other data such as that provided in Subject TEF.

If you need support accessing the relevant data, please contact your designated Faculty Employability Manager within the Careers and Placements team:

- Arts and Humanities: Nancy Baines (nancy.baines@york.ac.uk)
- Science: Janice Simpson (janice.simpson@york.ac.uk)
- Social Science: Kelly McDonald (kelly.mcdonald@york.ac.uk)

6. **Learning and Teaching Action Plan**

This section of the form asks departments to identify top priorities / actions relating to teaching, learning and the student experience in the next 12 months, crossing both UG and PGT provision. These priorities should be identified as a result of the reflection captured within the APR form, including as appropriate reflection on NSS and Subject TEF results and any data relating to taught postgraduate programmes (e.g. PTES in years when it runs). The identification of priorities and actions helps FLTGs and UTC to identify patterns and shared issues across the University and offer timely support and guidance.

Departments should start to populate the action plan in response to the NSS results (completing three actions), by **Friday 16 August 2019.** The action plan should be completed in full by submission of the APR form, by **Wednesday 13 November 2019.** This may involve revisiting, expanding and / or revising the actions proposed in response to NSS if new priorities emerge in relation to UG provision; action should also extend to PGT provision. It is suggested that the action plan consist of around six actions. Note that there is no need to wait for FLTG endorsement prior to commencing work on the actions.

The 'By Whom / When' column allows departments to identify who in the Department has responsibility for supporting the identified actions, and when it is expected they will be complete. The 'Update' column can be used to keep track of progress against the actions.

Departments with ongoing Periodic Review action plans may wish to cross-refer to those plans (for instance, by replicating actions in the form).

7. **Collaboration**

If the department's provision (all taught programmes) includes programmes delivered in collaboration with *external* providers (such as, but not limited to FE Colleges and UK or overseas HEIs, commercial or statutory partners) please highlight notable successes, any significant issues 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, 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.

Section B – Research Provision Only (Masters 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 students and 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 <u>the student experience</u> of PGR students or the <u>academic quality</u> 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 C – All Programmes

Please reflect on the department's mechanisms for engagement with the student voice in 2018/19, including student representation; and any partnerships with students to enhance learning and teaching. Reflection might focus not only on listing any initiatives, but also the benefits and limitations of these mechanisms.

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

It will outline how the department provides opportunities for effective partnership with students, and how it addresses any issues that may have arisen as a result of student engagement. 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 other opportunities for student partnership.

If the department has introduced any 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 completing the APR documentation by mid-November. FLTGs, UTC and YGRS members will then consider the reports and provide departments with feedback in the Spring Term. Departments will need to ensure they plan the submission of Individual Programme pro formas, student consultation and their APR meetings in good time for the mid-November completion deadline.

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;
- 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;#
- the results from the Subject Level TEF pilot 2019, as they relate to the department;
- 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 Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) 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](#) 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.

UNIVERSITY OF YORK

TEACHING COMMITTEE

Annual Programme Review (APR)

Individual Programme Review for the Academic Year 2018/19

Department	*Name*
Programme Title	*Name*
Programme Leader	*Name*
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)*

This form should be completed by the Programme Leader. Please see guidance notes at the end of the pro forma for prompts on the content of this Individual Programme report

Please comment below on what has gone well in the programme(s) during the academic year under review, any significant challenges faced by the programme team, and how those challenges were / will be addressed.

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?
-

ANNUAL PROGRAMME REVIEW: GUIDANCE NOTES FOR DEPARTMENTS ON PROGRAMME LEVEL FORM

The following guidance notes provide advice to departments and Programme Leaders on how to complete the Programme-Level form. There are separate guidance notes on the purpose of the Annual Programme Review process and the completion of the departmental-level form, appended to that form.

Completion of the Individual Programme pro forma

The Individual Programme pro forma captures at the level of each individual programme of study (or cluster of related programmes) key strengths, challenges, concerns and good practice, in order to inform the Department level APR report. The completed forms are to be used to inform the Departmental-level APR report prepared by the Board of Studies.

Chairs of Boards of Studies are responsible for determining the internal deadline for submission of the Individual Programme pro formas from each Programme Leader (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 PL should complete the pro forma reflecting and reporting on the delivery of 'their' programme(s) during the academic year.
- Where an individual 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.
- As a general rule, taught postgraduate programmes should be considered on separate forms to undergraduate; and combined programmes on a separate form to single-subject.
- 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) that are well-placed to comment on the questions asked;
- involve the student body (e.g. the Course Reps) 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 (where relevant, references to Pedagogy enhancement plan implementation should be made).

Indicative content: PLs may wish to comment on the following:

- initiatives to improve the student experience, for instance in relation to assessment, feedback, staff-student contact, student independent work, employability;
- student outcomes (employability data, withdrawal and progression rates, classification data) and other student experience data (e.g. NSS, module and programme evaluation);
- issues raised by students / student representatives or changes made in response to student feedback;
- successes or challenges in relation to, for instance, student engagement, governance, organisation, relationships with partner departments (for combined programmes), embedding of the role of Programme Leader in the Department.