Background to Programme Review

Schools/institutes are expected to conduct a programme-level review as part of the revised process for Annual Programme Review (APR) approved by Senate in December 2013. It is suggested that the most appropriate time to do this is at the end of the academic year (after the Subject Examination Board). There is no prescribed process for conducting the reviews: schools/institutes may wish to do this exercise as part of an away day, or during a programme management meeting or other teaching and learning meeting. Programmes may be assessed individually or as cognate groups.

The programme review template is intended to assist programme leads/convenors in evaluating the programme(s) for which they are responsible. The questions cover areas that will be discussed at the Annual Programme Review meeting. If minutes/notes of programme management meetings or school/institute academic committees cover the review areas, these may be appended to the document (there is no need to reproduce information if this is the case). Some schools may wish to use the programme review template as a form to record the results of the review. The Faculty Deans for Taught Programmes will advise schools and institutes on how they wish to use the template in their Faculty.

The results of the review(s) should be submitted to the School / Institute Director of Taught Programmes (or equivalent). Review documentation (whether in the form of minutes or annotations to this document) should then be sent to Emma Rabin (e.rabin@qmul.ac.uk) who will share the documents with the appropriate Dean for Taught Programmes (or nominee). Points arising from the programme reviews will be discussed with the school or institute and, if necessary, how the review was conducted and the conclusions drawn.

Guidance for completing a programme review

This guidance is structured following the template programme review document. If you are completing the review in another forum such as a meeting, please refer to the guidance as necessary to ensure that all the relevant areas of discussion are covered.

The items included in the programme review are all areas which QMUL would expect to be considered in line with Strategic Aim 3: “That we provide all our students, wherever based, with an education that is judged internationally to be of the highest quality, and which exploits innovations in teaching, learning and assessment”. Schools and institutes should ensure that all of these topics are discussed at the programme review(s).
Programme Information

Reviewers should ensure that it is clear which programme(s) are under review, the level of the programme (UG/PGT), its UCAS code and the number of students enrolled on it.

If it is run jointly with another school than this should also be stated. The faculty may require that the partner school should have the opportunity to participate in the review of any joint programme(s) in some form (e.g. joint completion of a review document, right to review a completed document).

Please note that large collaborative programmes including those run with external partners should be reviewed separately.

The names of the staff completing the review should be stated as well as their role in the programme(s) for example, programme leader, senior tutor etc. The review is considered to be the responsibility of a programme team not an individual.

Topics for programme review

1. General overview

Please use this area to highlight any changes to the programme for the academic year. If there were any issues, you can note them here but provide more information under the relevant section below.

2. Programme content

This section expects you to confirm that you have reviewed your programme specifications at the time of the review.

If you find that the programme specification needs to be revised then please ensure it is amended and a corrected version sent to ARCS as soon as possible.

You can check the current specifications held for the programme(s) here:

http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality-assurance/programme-specifications/

3. Enrolments

Please consider any enrolment data available for the programme(s). Any large year-on-year changes (whether increases or decreases) should be discussed / explained.

It may also be useful to mention any developments that may impact the programme such as a planned expansion, a new allied programme being introduced or factors that will limit capacity to increase numbers (if this is desired).

4. Progression

This section is only applicable to UG programmes.

You are asked to review the progression data available to you and consider whether there are any problems/issues with progression in any year of the programme or with a particular cohort of students (clearing, non-standard entry routes etc). You should include data in this section to illustrate the conclusions being drawn.
If any issues are identified, you will be asked how you have addressed these and it would also be expected that these will be documented on the Taught Programmes Action Plan.

5. **Learning, achievement and award**

   This section should be completed with reference to:
   
   - Minutes of internal committees overseeing programme delivery
   - Student-Staff Liaison Committee minutes;
   - module evaluation data;
   - exam board minutes;
   - External Examiner reports and responses;
   - completion and final awards data;
   - student surveys (NSS/Queen Mary Student Survey/PTES).

   This is not intended to be an exhaustive list so please refer to other sources of information as necessary.

   You will be expected to confirm that the teaching, learning and assessment mechanisms on the course enabled students to achieve the expected learning outcomes or provide a commentary on where there have been issues and what actions have been taken in regards to these.

   If you have received a visit from an accrediting body (Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body - PSRB) during the course of the year, please ensure that you include information on the outcome in this section. Any relevant documentation such as a final report or confirmation of accreditation from the PSRB should be added as an appendix.

   You are advised to review the NSS or PTES results for your school/institute when they are available in case there are issues which impact at programme level.

   You should ensure that you make use of the available data when discussing achievement and award for students on the programme(s).

   Please also ensure you have considered the External Examiner report(s) and discuss any actions being taken as a result.

6. **Learning resources**

   Please use this section to comment on the use of:
   
   - QMplus
   - QReview (please note the school/institute’s policy on recording lectures)
   - TALIS Aspire – Reading Lists Online (if in use)
   - Library facilities (physical or electronic)
   - Facilities/space
   - Any other resources that are used to support learning that may be in use in the school/institute
You should consider your use of these learning resources (e.g., policies on QMplus uploading, consistency of practice between modules) but you are also welcome to identify areas of further development to increase functionality.

7. Good practice

Please use this section to highlight any instances of good practice or developments that you have introduced to the programme(s) in the academic year which have proved particularly effective.

These examples may be shared with other schools/institutes so please bear this in mind when completing this section.

Approval of the review

If the review has been done at a meeting, than the minutes should be supplied with an attendance list. If the template programme review document has been used than the person completing the review and the Director of Taught Programmes should sign it (electronic signatures are acceptable).

Appendices

The annual report from the Student-Staff Liaison Committee should be included here (please do not add SSLC minutes).

It is preferred that the number of appendices is limited so please consider carefully before attaching additional documents. All issues should be discussed within the main body of the review.